Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of English Language and Literature
British Cultural Studies Programme

A BHABHAESQUE APPROACH TO HYBRIDITY IN JEAN RHYS'S *WIDE SARGASSO SEA* AND CARYL PHILLIPS'S *THE FINAL PASSAGE*

Hatice ÇELİKDOĞAN

Ph.D. Dissertation

Ankara, 2021

A BHABHAESQUE APPROACH TO HYBRIDITY IN JEAN RHYS'S *WIDE SARGASSO SEA* AND CARYL PHILLIPS'S *THE FINAL PASSAGE*

Hatice ÇELİKDOĞAN

Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of English Language and Literature
British Cultural Studies Programme

PhD Dissertation

Ankara, 2021

YAYIMLAMA VE FİKRİ MÜLKİYET HAKLARI BEYANI

Enstitü tarafından onaylanan lisansüstü tezimin tamamını veya herhangi bir kısmını, basılı (kağıt) ve elektronik formatta arşivleme ve aşağıda verilen koşullarla kullanıma açma iznini Hacettepe Üniversitesine verdiğimi bildiririm. Bu izinle Üniversiteye verilen kullanım hakları dışındaki tüm fikri mülkiyet haklarım bende kalacak, tezimin tamamının ya da bir bölümünün gelecekteki çalışmalarda (makale, kitap, lisans ve patent vb.) kullanım hakları bana ait olacaktır.

Tezin kendi orijinal çalışmam olduğunu, başkalarının haklarını ihlal etmediğimi ve tezimin tek yetkili sahibi olduğumu beyan ve taahhüt ederim. Tezimde yer alan telif hakkı bulunan ve sahiplerinden yazılı izin alınarak kullanılması zorunlu metinleri yazılı izin alınarak kullandığımı ve istenildiğinde suretlerini Üniversiteye teslim etmeyi taahhüt ederim.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından yayınlanan ***"Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge"*** kapsamında tezim aşağıda belirtilen koşullar haricince YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi / H.Ü. Kütüphaneleri Açık Erişim Sisteminde erişime açılır.

- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulu kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren 2 yıl ertelenmiştir. (1)
- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren ….. ay ertelenmiştir. (2)
- Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. (3)

……/……/……

Hatice Çelikdoğan

"Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge"

*(1) Madde 6. 1. Lisansüstü tezle ilgili patent başvurusu yapılması veya patent alma sürecinin devam etmesi durumunda, tez **danışmanının** önerisi ve **enstitü anabilim dalının** uygun görüşü üzerine **enstitü** veya **fakülte yönetim kurulu** iki yıl süre ile tezin erişime açılmasının ertelenmesine karar verebilir.*

*(2) Madde 6. 2. Yeni teknik, materyal ve metotların kullanıldığı, henüz makaleye dönüşmemiş veya patent gibi yöntemlerle korunmamış ve internetten paylaşılması durumunda 3. şahıslara veya kurumlara haksız kazanç imkanı oluşturabilecek bilgi ve bulguları içeren tezler hakkında tez **danışmanının** önerisi ve **enstitü anabilim dalının** uygun görüşü üzerine **enstitü** veya **fakülte yönetim kurulunun** gerekçeli kararı ile altı ayı aşmamak üzere tezin erişime açılması engellenebilir.*

*(3) Madde 7. 1. Ulusal çıkarları veya güvenliği ilgilendiren, emniyet, istihbarat, savunma ve güvenlik, sağlık vb. konulara ilişkin lisansüstü tezlerle ilgili gizlilik kararı, **tezin yapıldığı kurum** tarafından verilir *. Kurum ve kuruluşlarla yapılan işbirliği protokolü çerçevesinde hazırlanan lisansüstü tezlere ilişkin gizlilik kararı ise, **ilgili kurum ve kuruluşun önerisi** ile **enstitü** veya **fakültenin** uygun görüşü üzerine **üniversite yönetim kurulu** tarafından verilir. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler Yükseköğretim Kuruluna bildirilir.*
Madde 7.2. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler gizlilik süresince enstitü veya fakülte tarafından gizlilik kuralları çerçevesinde muhafaza edilir, gizlilik kararının kaldırılması halinde Tez Otomasyon Sistemine yüklenir.

***** Tez **danışmanının** önerisi ve **enstitü anabilim dalının** uygun görüşü üzerine **enstitü** veya **fakülte yönetim kurulu tarafından karar verilir.***

ETİK BEYAN

Bu çalışmadaki bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, görsel, işitsel ve yazılı tüm bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu, kullandığım verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı, yararlandığım kaynaklara bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu, tezimin kaynak gösterilen durumlar dışında özgün olduğunu, **Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol** danışmanlığında tarafımdan üretildiğini ve Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Yönergesine göre yazıldığını beyan ederim.

Hatice Çelikdoğan

In loving memory of my parents…

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I am deeply grateful to my advisor, Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol for inspiring, encouraging, guiding and correcting me patiently in every stage of this dissertation. I am especially grateful to her for calming me down and daring to believe in me when I doubted. Without her this dissertation could not have been completed.

I am most thankful to my committee members, Prof. Dr. Belgin Elbir and Prof. Dr. Huriye Reis for guiding, challenging and encouraging me during the process of writing this dissertation.

I would also like to express my deep gratitude to Prof. Dr. Deniz Bozer, Prof. Dr. Serpil Oppermann, Prof. Dr. Aytül Özüm, Prof. Dr. Hande Seber, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şebnem Kaya, Assist. Prof. Dr. Alev Karaduman, Assist. Prof. Dr. Papatya Alkan Genca and Dr. İmren Yelmiş for guiding and inspiring me in my studies, which I hope are reflected in this dissertation.

I am thankful to Res. Assist. Hüseyin Alhas, Res. Assist. Ulaş Özgün, Res. Assist. Onur Çiffiliz, Res. Assist. Adem Balcı and Özkan Taş for helping me with computer. I am also thankful to Dr. Peter Hopkins for proofreading. My grateful thanks are also due to my friends in the Department for all their encouragement.

Last but not least, I am especially thankful to my husband Aydın Çelikdoğan for his amazing patience and generous support during my study, and for his help in proofreading.

ÖZET

ÇELİKDOĞAN, Hatice. Jean Rhys'in *Wide Sargasso Sea* ve Caryl Phillips'in *The Final Passage* Adlı Romanlarındaki Melez Kimliklerin Bhabha'nın Bakış Açısı ile İncelenmesi. Doktora Tezi, Ankara, 2021.

Bu tez Jean Rhys'in *Wide Sargas*so Sea (1966) ve Caryl Phillips'in *The Final Passage* (1985) adlı romanlarındaki karakterleri arada kalmış melez kimlikler olarak ele almaktadır. Bu nedenle, bu tez Homi Bhabha'nın sömürgecilik sonrası dönemi bağlamında geliştirdiği melezleşme, üçüncü alan, arada kalmışlık ve taklitçilik kavramlarını kullanarak *Wide Sargasso Sea* ve *The Final Passage* adlı romanlarda sömürgecilik sonrası farklı melez kimliklerin betimlendiğini savunmaktadır. Sömürgeciliğin sonucu olarak hem sömürgeciler hem de sömürgeleştirilmiş olanlar melezleşmiştir. Bu bağlamda, Giriş'te Homi Bhabha'nın tanımladığı melezleşme, arada kalmışlık, üçüncü alan ve taklitçilik kavramları ve sömürgecilik sonrası dönem bağlamında melez kimlikler konusu ele alınmaktadır. Birinci Bölüm'de Jean Rhys'in *Wide Sargasso Sea* adlı romanında çocukluğunu ve genç kızlığını geçirdiği Karayipler'den "İngiliz koca" ile mutsuz bir evlilik yaparak İngiltere'ye giden, beyaz bir Kreol varisi olan ve Bhabha'nın ifadesiyle "üçüncü alan"da yaşayan Antoinette'nin melez kimliği ve bu kimliğindeki değişimler incelenmektedir. İkinci Bölüm'de Caryl Phillips'in *The Final Passage* adlı romanında ne siyah Karayipli ne de beyaz Avrupalı olan ama nispeten açık bir renge sahip olan ve Bhabha'nın ifadesiyle "üçüncü alan"da yaşayan 19 yaşındaki Leila'nın melez kimliği incelenmektedir. Sonuç'ta ise bu romanlardaki melezlik ve melez kimliklerin yarattığı karmaşıklığın doğallaştırılmasındaki sorgulama belirtilmektedir. Hem *Wide Sargasso Sea* hem de *The Final Passage*'da arada kalmışlık yaşayan melez karakterler, üçüncü alanda melez kimliklerinin yeniden tanımlanması için sorgulamakta, müzakere etmekte ve alternatif çözümler sunmaktadırlar. İlk romanda daha önceki bir tarihte yer alan melez ilişkiler anlatılmaktayken, Phillips daha sonraki kuşakta bunu ele almaktadır. Melezlik kavramı dönüşmeyi sürdürürken iki kuşak arasındaki farklılıklar ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Jean Rhys, *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Caryl Phillips, *The Final Passage*, Melez Kimlik, Homi Bhabha, Üçüncü Alan.

ABSTRACT

ÇELİKDOĞAN, Hatice. A Bhabhaesque Approach to Hybridity in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Caryl Phillips's *The Final Passage*. PhD Dissertation, Ankara, 2021.

This dissertation reads the main characters in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) and Caryl Phillips's *The Final Passage* (1985) as hybrids, owning a hybrid identity and experiencing in-betweenness. Employing Bhabha's postcolonial concepts of hybridity, the Third Space, in-betweenness and mimicry, this dissertation argues that these novels depict a variety of characters as representations of postcolonial hybrids. As a result of colonisation, both the colonised and the coloniser end up as hybrids.

In the introduction of this dissertation the concepts of hybridity, the Third Space, in-betweenness and mimicry as defined by Homi Bhabha are introduced, and the issue of hybrid identity is explored in relation to postcolonial identity. The first chapter deals with *Wide Sargasso Sea* by Jean Rhys in order to explore how hybrid identity is depicted through Antoinette, a white Creole heiress, living in a Bhabhanian Third Space, from the time of her youth in the Caribbean to her unhappy marriage with the English husband and relocation to England. In this chapter her hybridity and the transformation of her identity are examined. The second chapter focuses on *The Final Passage* by Caryl Phillips in order to examine the concept of hybrid identity through Leila, a 19 year-old girl with a lighter skin who is neither black Caribbean nor white European, living in a Bhabhanian Third Space. In the conclusion, it is argued that these novels question and challenge the naturalisation of the complexity of hybridity and hybrid identities. The hybrid characters in both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *The Final Passage* inhabit a Bhabhanian Third Space where they experience in-betweenness, challenge, question, negotiate and offer alternative solutions to redefine their hybrid identities. While Rhys deals with the hybridity in the nineteenth century, Phillips focuses on the hybridity in the mid-twentieth century; as a result, the differences between the two generations can be seen while the nature of hybridity keeps on evolving.

Key Words: Jean Rhys, *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Caryl Phillips, *The Final Passage*, Hybrid Identity, Homi Bhabha, the Third Space.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Hybridity is an important and complicated concept, and it has been the focus of a number of debates and given rise to many publications. The concept of hybridity remains problematic implying the meeting or mixing of completely separate and homogeneous cultural spheres, but it has enabled one to recognise the production of new identities and cultural forms such as "British Asians." As a result, the concept of hybridity is acceptable as a device to capture cultural changes. On the other hand, the support for the new forms of fluid, hybrid identity can hide some difficulties; for example, are hybrid identities always a favourable option? Does everybody experience hybrid life in the same way? How do differences of class, gender, sexuality, region and age all affect hybrid communities?

The hybridisation and creolisation of language, literature and cultural identities is, therefore, a common theme of postcolonial literature and theory. Emphasising this theme, contemporary postcolonial British writers focus on the discourse of hybridity as it appears in the "Third Space" (*The Location of Culture* 37) where ambivalence of being neither/nor "meets the subversive practice of resistance" (Kraidy 58). Among the novelists who have used the discourse of hybridity and hybrid identities are Jean Rhys and Caryl Phillips, who are also hybrid writers rewriting their histories and stories. Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) and Caryl Phillips's *The Final Passage* (1985) are noteworthy postcolonial novels that introduce circumstances under which hybrid characters find themselves in the Third Space. Both Jean Rhys and Caryl Phillips were born in the Caribbean, dealing with common themes such as colonialism, alienation, loneliness, identity, namely hybrid identity. Not only did Jean Rhys write novels, but also she inspired writers and novelists such as Caryl Phillips to write about her. Caryl Phillips was interested in Jean Rhys with whom he had a lot in common. For instance, they were both interested in the Brontes. While *Wide Sargasso Sea* is a rewriting by Jean Rhys of Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*, *The Lost Child* is a rewriting by Caryl Phillips of Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights*'s Heathcliff, depicting him as Mr Earnshaw's illegitimate son and a former slave. In addition, Phillips praises Jean Rhys for her "precise and clear style" (*Extravagant Strangers* 63). Unsurprisingly, Phillips

turns his attention to Rhys's life and writes a novel titled *A View of the Empire at Sunset*, which is based on her experiences.

While Jean Rhys rewrites the story of Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea* which takes place in the nineteenth century, Caryl Phillips focuses on the immigrants in *The Final Passage* through the story of Leila and her family who come to England from the West Indies in the 1950s. Both writers create two different hybridity, concentrating on women characters, Antoinette and Leila. Interestingly, one is a woman and the other is a man, choosing to tackle the complexities of hybridity faced by women hybrids. In addition, it is observed that these hybrid characters that belong to different generations show different reactions and approaches. These two novels are chosen because they illustrate the process of the changes and differences in approaches adopted by the hybrid characters that belong to different eras, although they share the same geography.

Each novel questions and challenges the concept of hybrid identity in its own right, raising awareness about the complexity of hybridity. The question of the concept of hybridity in these novels shows that neither colonial nor colonised cultures and languages can be presented in "pure" form, inseparable from each other, giving rise to forms of hybridity which challenge the ideas of centre and margin. The aim of this dissertation is to examine and argue that Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Caryl Phillips's *The Final Passage* reflect the emergence and formation of hybrid identities, with regard to the concepts of postcolonial hybridity and hybrid identity based on racial, cultural, social, class, economic and religious levels. In addition, these two novels, which cover different periods, give us a chance to observe the changes that take place in hybridity and the reactions of the hybrids. The hybrids also display changes in the assertion of their identities; that is to say, hybridity is also open to change.

Forming new identities out of two or more different identities, hybrid characters find themselves not entirely belonging to either the one or the other, but dwelling in the Third Space; in consequence, they own a hybrid identity living within the in-between cultures. Within the context mentioned above, this dissertation argues that these characters, Antoinette Cosway and Leila, are hybrids as defined by Homi K. Bhabha so experience in-betweenness.

This dissertation employs Homi K. Bhabha's concepts of hybridity, Third Space, in-betweenness and mimicry in analysing Jean Rhys's and Caryl Phillips's characters. It sees them as representations of postcolonial hybrids who search for an alternative identity while challenging, distorting and destabilising the power of the coloniser in order to make room for negotiation and to deal with the complexities of hybridity. If questioned whether hybridity solves the problems, it can be argued that it offers alternative solutions for co-existence to be whole. This dissertation aims to present that hybridity is not static, but it changes; as a result, hybrids change and they change each other while co-existing and complementing each other in the Third Space.

The term hybridity has developed from biological and botanical origins: As a biological term, hybridity refers to the outcome of two different species of animals or plants; the term was also employed in racialist discourse, referring to mixed race. The *OED* explains it as "of human parents of different races, half-breed". The *OED* defines hybrid as: "the offspring of two animals, plants of different species, or (less strictly) varieties, a half-breed, or mongrel" ("Hybrid," def. 1a). The term hybrid regarding the mixture of people of different races was first used in the nineteenth century, showing the possibility of the increase in human hybrids. The word hybrid stems from Latin *hybrida* as a version of *ibrida* which means "mongrel" specifically the "offspring of a tame sow and a wild boar" ("Hybrida" emphasis original). According to the *Miriam-Webster* dictionary, the term hybridity dates back to the seventeenth century. In the first half of the nineteenth century, *Webster* defined a hybrid as "a mongrel or mule; an animal or plant, produced from the mixture of two species". In the nineteenth century miscegenation was used referring to people of mixed races such as the mongrel, mulatto, mestizo, and half-caste. Some anthropologists such as Sir Arthur Keith commented on how British people were regarded as a mixed and mongrel group of breeds. While it was employed in terms of physiology in the nineteenth century, it was used again in the twentieth century, this time, in terms of culture (*Colonial Desire* 16). Later, "hybrid" turned into a pejorative term which was employed in the Eurocentric portrayals of ethnic roots (*Colonial Desire* 6). Chris Rojek defines hybridity as "the mixing of cultural, ethnic, and racial elements" (58). Eventually, hybridity played the role of a bridge between "the racial categories of the past and contemporary cultural discourse" (*Colonial Desire* 25).

The concept of hybridity proves significant "for diaspora peoples, and indeed many others too, as a way of thinking beyond exclusionary, fixed, binary notions of identity based on ideas of rootedness and cultural, racial and national purity" (McLeod 219). The concept of hybridity is associated with the notion of identity, in particular, for migrants and diasporic societies; but it also relates to the issue of languages and of mixtures of cultures and traditions. Identity itself is always under construction and change; hybrid identities are never complete in themselves, remaining "perpetually in motion" (McLeod 219), pursuing unpredictable routes, open to change. Hybridity here is a key term that implies the impossibility of essentialism. Hybridity challenges notions of identities and cultures as fixed or stable entities, emphasising the interactions and exchanges that take place across cultures. Within the context of postcolonialism hybridity is defined as "the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization" (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 108). Vanessa Guignery argues that hybridity comes as "an alternative discourse," subverting "the very idea of a dominant culture," and inviting "a re-examination of power structures" (4). Thus, the concept of hybridity functions politically as a challenge to the binaries between coloniser/colonised or self/other that are often used to enforce and justify imperial and colonial politics. Some critics argue that hybridity can be seen as "both cultural exchange and commodification without being reduced to either one or the other" (Brah and Coombes 1). For example, music is a field in which hybridity can be observed in the way as mentioned above. On the other hand, some critics point out that hybridity can be described as a threat of contamination for the people who advocate the idea of purity (Brah and Coombes 1).

In discussions of hybridity as a key concept in cultural criticism, postcolonial studies, and debates about cultural contestation, critics have argued that it is the very issue which challenges and questions the politics of culture. In their discussions of hybridity and identity, theorists such as Stuart Hall and Homi Bhabha draw attention to the importance of the political role played by hybridity. Ien Ang argues this point in these words:

> For postcolonial cultural theorists such as Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Trinh Minha, Homi Bhabha and others, hybridity has an explicitly critical political purchase. They see the hybrid as a critical force that undermines or subverts, from inside out, dominant formations through the interstitial insinuation of the 'different', the 'other' or the 'marginalized' into the very fabric of the dominant. (198)

In the twentieth century, the concept of hybridity lent itself to the fields of linguistics and culture, with the potential of creating new perspectives, and mixing different languages, cultures, and genres. Developing a linguistic version of hybridity, Mikhail Bakthin describes hybridisation as " a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor" (358).

Bakhtin's emphasis on intentional and unconscious "organic" hybridity is important in understanding how "[i]ntentional semantic hybrids are inevitably internally dialogic […]. Two points of view are not mixed, but set against each other dialogically" (360). Elaborating on the difference between "intentional hybridity" and unconscious "organic hybridity," Bakhtin argues that:

> Unintentional, unconscious hybridization is one of the most important modes in the historical life and evolution of all languages. We may even say that language and languages change historically primarily by hybridization, by means of a mixing of various 'languages' co-existing within the boundaries of a single dialect, a single national language, a single branch, a single group of different branches, in the historical as well as paleontological past of languages. (358-9)

The co-existence of various languages in organic hybridity which are "mute and opaque" (360), for Bakhtin produces a "productive" effect of unconscious hybrids:

> It must be pointed out… that while it is true the mixture of linguistic world views in organic hybrids remains mute and opaque, such unconscious hybrids have been at the same time

> profoundly productive historically: they are pregnant with potential for new world views, with new 'internal forms' for perceiving the world in words. (360)

The idea of organic hybridity is also discussed by Robert Young who points out that "[i]n organic hybridity, the mixture merges and is fused into a new language, world view or object; but intentional hybridity sets different points of view against each other in a conflictual structure, which retains ' a certain elemental, organic energy and openendedness'" (*Colonial Desire* 20). Hybridity, Young argues, is an illustration "[…] of a doubleness that both brings together, fuses, but also maintains separation" (*Colonial Desire* 21). Young shows how hybridity functions "in two ways": "'organically', hegemonising, creating new spaces, structures, scenes, and 'intentionally', diasporising, intervening as a form of subversion, translation, transformation" (*Colonial Desire* 23). As he notes, intentional hybridity "enables a contestatory activity, a politicised setting of cultural differences against each other dialogically" (*Colonial Desire* 22).

Homi Bhabha turns Bakhtin's intentional hybridity, which is "a form of subversion," (*Colonial Desire* 21) into a challenge and resistance against the colonial discourse, which lead to his notion of hybridity, including mimicry and the Third Space, namely an in-between space. In other words, according to Bhabha, hybridity subverts the colonial discourse.

Expressing and theorising the concept of hybridity, Homi Bhabha presents the term in the colonial sphere and carries it to the postcolonial context in which it becomes a significant term in the fields of multiculturalism. Bhabha defines hybridity as "a problematic of colonial representation […] that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority" (*The Location of Culture* 114). According to Bhabha, hybridity happens at a moment of colonial contact, and he regards it as a positive element. Basing his concept of hybridity on the notions of Edward Said, Frantz Fanon, Jacques Lacan and Jacques Derida, Bhabha defines it as follows:

> Hybridity is the sign of productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name of the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal… Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. (*The Location of Culture 112*)

For Bhabha hybridity subverts the colonial discourse, and creates an outlet through which the colonised can express themselves. He asserts that hybridity is a mode of subversive resistance as "[i]t displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination" (*The Location of Culture* 112). Bhabha's concept of hybridity suggests that colonial discourse is never completely in control of the coloniser. Bhabha's idea of hybridity refers to something more than just the mere result of mixing or combining two cultures. To Bhabha, hybridity is a channel of negotiation between the boundaries and binaries that form identities and cultures. Homi Bhabha first presents the term in the colonial sphere and then carries it to the postcolonial context in which hybridity is linked to other terms such as mimicry and ambivalence.

Like hybridity, mimicry is "[…] 'a blurred copy' of the colonizer that can be quite threatening" (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 125). It subverts the colonial dichotomy of self/other, us/them and insider/outsider, disrupting the liminal character of hybrids; while it upends the colonial power and authority, it intensifies the dilemma and conflict of the colonised. Bhabha's theory of hybridity is associated with mimicry, which is ambivalent in that it entails a similarity and a dissimilarity: "a difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (*The Location of Culture* 86), but is also a denial that there were cultures already that became hybrid. This point becomes clear in the following quotation:

> [C]olonial hybridity is not a *problem* of genealogy or identity between two *different* cultures which can then be resolved as an issue of cultural relativism. Hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reserves the

> effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority-its rules of recognition. Again, it must be stressed, it is not simply the *content* of disavowed knowledges-be they forms of cultural otherness or traditions of colonialist treachery-that return to be acknowledged as counter-authorities. For the resolution of conflicts between authorities, civil discourse always maintains an adjudicative procedure. What is irremediably estranging in the presence of the hybrid-in the revaluation of the symbol of national authority as the sign of colonial difference-is that the difference of cultures can no longer be identified or evaluated as objects of epistemological or moral contemplation: cultural differences are not simply *there* to be seen or appropriated. (*The Location of Culture* 114 emphasis original)

This passage emphasises two points. First, the two different cultures are "not the source of conflict" but are "the effect of discriminatory practices" (*The Location of Culture* 114). Secondly, Bhabha argues that hybridity challenges the accuracy of traditional analyses of colonialism which change the terms of colonialism. These points lead to the connection that can be observed between colonial discourse and the postcolonial Third Space.

Hybridity plays a central role in what Bhabha calls "Third Space", which enables one to envision the identities of cultures surpassing the binary oppositions such as us / them, insider / outsider and inclusion / exclusion. In most of his works, Bhabha argues that colonial-and postcolonial- cultural systems and statements are constructed in the "Third Space of enunciation" (*The Location of Culture* 37), in which cultural hybridity comes into constant formation, is a place of movement, and of "fluidity," and which opposes the traditional fixity of national narratives. In other words, the Third Space ensures that cultural signs are not fixed but can be rehistoricised, translated, and reread. According to Bhabha, it is the Third Space "[…] which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew" (*The Location of Culture* 37). Bhabha regards it as "a place of agency and intervention" (142) where cultural meaning is formed. Bhabha asserts that it has a postcolonial importance in that it

> may open the way to conceptualizing an *inter*national culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's *hybridity*. To that end we should remember that it is the 'inter'- the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the *in-between* space- that carries the burden of the meaning of culture. It makes it possible to begin envisaging national, anti-nationalistic histories of the 'people'. And by exploiting this Third Space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves. (*The Location of Culture* 38-9 emphasis original)

This is a space intrinsically critical of essentialist positions of identity and a conceptualisation of "original" or "originary" culture (Rutherford 210). When interviewed by Jonathan Rutherford, Bhabha stated that "the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity […] is the 'Third Space,' which enables other positions to emerge" (Rutherford 211). The aim of his argument, then, is the deconstruction of the mostly Western and modern colonisers, essentialist claims of an inherent purity of culture. Despite the exposure of the Third Space to contradictions and ambiguities, it provides the politics of inclusion rather than exclusion that "initiates new signs of identity and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation" (*The Location of Culture* 1-2). Cultural differences then are not synthetised into a new third term, but continue to exist in a hybrid "Third Space of enunciation," a zone of exchange and negotiation with new possibilities.

Bhabha also refers to people who live "border lives," (*The Location of Culture* 1) explaining that living at the border, at the edge and in-between, requires a new art of the present. Borders are significant thresholds, full of contradiction and ambivalence, separating and joining different places. According to Bhabha, the border is also the place where conventional patterns of thought are disturbed and disrupted by the possibility of crossing over, from which new, shifting, complex forms of representation arise that deny binary patterning. Thus, it is noted that "imaginative" border-crossings are a result of migration like the "physical" crossing of borders. Because of the imaginative border-crossings, Bhabha challenges the received notions of identity and subjectivity which depend on fixed, binary definitions such as native/foreigner and

master/slave. Pointing out the fact that cultures are always leaking into each other, criss-crossing supposed barriers, Bhabha also uses the phrase "cultural difference" to endorse cultures as hybridised and fluid, where "cultural interaction emerges only at the significatory boundaries of cultures, where meanings and values are (mis)read or signs are misappropriated" (*The location of Culture* 34). Bhabha emphasizes the hybridity of cultures. In terms of cultural identities, hybridity refers to the fact that cultures are always in contact with one another leading to cultural mixed-ness.

Before analysing Rhys's and Phillips's characters as hybrids in the Bhabhanian sense, it may be helpful to clarify Bhabha's concept of identity in terms of hybridity. Bhabha focuses on identities which are constructed by the people "living on the borderlines" of different societies and being caught "in-between" in these societies; thus, Bhabha views borders as important thresholds summarising some "crises" and "conflicts" (*The Location of Culture* 1-2). In relation to border Bhabha says "[t]he beyond is neither a new horizon, nor a leaving behind of the past […] [that] produce[s] complex figures of difference and identity, past and present, inside and outside, inclusion and exclusion" (*The Location of Culture* 1). In addition to this, Bhabha notes that "[t]hese in-between spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood –singular or communal- that initiate new signs of identity […]" (*The Location of Culture* 1) which defines "the idea of society of itself" (*The Location of Culture* 2). Bhabha also argues that "[…] there is a return to the performance of identity as iteration, the re-creation of the self in the world of travel, the resettlement of the borderline community of migration" (*The Location of Culture* 9) In this way, Bhabha bases his argument on in-between spaces in which hybrids reside, pointing out that there is no room for pure culture since there is no fixed and stable identity.

Identity is a significant issue in cultural studies which, in Andrew Edgar and Peter Sedgwick's words, "[…] examines the contexts within which and through which both individuals and groups construct, negotiate and defend their identity or self-understanding" (166). In terms of definition, Chris Barker defines identity as "[a] temporary stabilization of meaning or description of ourselves with which we emotionally identify. Identity is a becoming rather than a fixed entity, involving the

suturing or stitching together of the discursive 'outside' with the 'internal' processes of subjectivity (442). In a similar fashion, Peter Brooker points out that "[c]ontemporary identities can […] be fluid or consciously delimited. Any number of factors are likely to be under [negotiation] in either case; whether of religion, nation, language, political [ideology] or cultural expression" (131).

As can be seen, in postcolonial studies identity and its construction are crucial. Edward Said, like Bhabha, comments that "[…] cultural forms are hybrid, mixed [and] impure […]" (*Culture and Imperialism* 14). Said explains his argument in these words: "Partly because of empire, all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogenous, extraordinarily differentiated, and unmonolithic" (*Culture and Imperialism* xxv). Along with Bhabha's argument, Hall and Young note that there is no culture which is unmixed and there is no identity which is fixed. With regard to this, Hall argues that identities "[…] are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are the sign of an identical, naturally-constituted unity - an 'identity' in its traditional meaning (that is an all-inclusive sameness, seamless without internal differentiation)" ("Introduction: Who Needs Identity" 4). In addition, in "The Spectacle of the 'Other' " Hall notes that difference or "the 'Other' is fundamental to the *constitution* of the self" (237) which leads identity into a state of instability. Young notes that the identity of the English has been persistently recognised as multifarious, "an identity which is not identical with itself" […] "from which the other is [never] excluded" (3). Thus, along with Bhabha's argument, Hall and Young suggest that identity is not fixed and pure as the other is in itself. David Huddort refers to Bhabha and his postcolonial concepts such as hybridity, mimicry, in-betweenness and the Third Space, and argues that these concepts "[…] undermine the simple polarization of the world into self and other" (4).

In the same manner, in *The Location of Culture* Bhabha argues that in the light of the psychoanalytical approach the identity of the coloniser, which is "self," and the colonised, which is "other," is incomplete and unstable; in other words, they are incomplete without each other. In fact, Bhabha draws on the notions of identity of Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Jacques Derrida and Jacques Lacan, and then develops his

terms in the postcolonial context. Therefore, it might be helpful to refer briefly to the views of these writers before examining Bhabha's concepts of hybridity and hybrid identity.

In his books titled *Black Skin, White Masks* and *The Wretched of the Earth,* Frantz Fanon explores colonialism and its relationship between the coloniser and the colonised. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, utilising his experience as a psychiatrist Fanon focuses on the psychological effects on the colonised. Looking back on his experience, he expresses his feelings when white strangers in France called him "[d]irty nigger!" or "[l]ook, a Negro!" (*Black Skin, White Masks* 109), specifying his blackness or his difference in these words:

> On that day, completely dislocated, unable to be abroad with the other, the white man, who unmercifully imprisoned me, I took myself far off from my own presence, far indeed, and made myself an object. What else could it be for me but an amputation, an excision, a haemorrhage that spattered my whole body with black blood? But I did not want this revision, this thematisation. All I wanted was to be a man among other men. I wanted to come lithe and young into a world that was ours and to help to build it together. (*Black Skin, White Masks* 112-13)

It can be seen that it was the power holders who defined Fanon's identity in dismissive terms, making him view himself as an "object," not a human subject. As a result, he feels degraded and "amputated." In this situation, identity is the very thing the French create for him while committing a "violence that splits his very sense of self" (McLeod 20). Fanon continues to explore the results of the sense of internalisation imposed on the colonised as the "other," namely inferior beings. "The white world," Fanon says, "the only honourable one, barred me from all participation. A man was expected to behave like a man. I was expected to behave like a black man […]" (*Black Skin, White Masks* 114). In the context of colonialism Fanon points out the difference between "man" or self with "black man" or the other's position. On the other hand, "The place of the Other," Bhabha argues, "must not be imaged, as Fanon sometimes suggests, as a fixed phenomenological point opposed to the self, that represents a culturally alien consciousness. The Other must be seen as the necessary negation of a primordial

identity […]" (*The Location of Culture* 51-2). While Fanon draws attention to the effects on the colonised and how to resist, Homi Bhabha notes that mimicry can be a way of subversion since it destabilizes the core of colonialist ideology such as self/other or us/them.

Unlike Fanon, who pays attention to the psychology of the colonised, Edward Said concentrates on the study of the Orient. Whereas Fanon stresses the relationship between the coloniser and colonised in Africa and the Caribbean, Edward Said focuses on India, Asia, and the Middle East. In *Orientalism* (1978), Said deals with how knowledge is "managed" by Europeans in order to maintain power, excluding the knowledge natives have. Said notes that Orientalism refers to an idea which can be regarded as a "Western style for dominating, restricting, having authority over the Orient" (*Orientalism* 3). He points out that:

> […] without examining Orientalism as a discourse one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage-and even produce-the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically and imaginatively during the post-Enlightment period. (3)

Said continues to argue that the Orient is vital in explaining the West "as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience" (*Orientalism* 2). In addition, "[…] Orientalism" Said argues, "was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, 'us') and the strange (the Orient, the East, 'them') (*Orientalism* 43). Through binary divisions, namely us/them, which Orientalism constructs, the West defines itself. As a result, Said points out that "European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self" (*Orientalism* 3).

In line with Said, who deals with the assumptions of Orientalism such as "Orientalism is legitimating," Bhabha argues that colonialism tries to legitimate and justify itself. "The objective of colonial discourse", Bhabha notes, "is to construe the colonised as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest

and to establish systems of administration and instruction" (*The Location of Culture* 70). Bhabha, however, differs from Said's Orientalism; Bhabha argues that concepts such as hybridity and mimicry subvert the concepts of Orientalism such as stereotypes.

While analysing Lacan's theory of identity, Bhabha states that "[l]ike [in Lacan's] mirror phase "the fullness" of the stereotype – its image as identity - is always threatened by lack" (*The Location of Culture* 77). In addition, Bhabha implies, "[f]or identification, identity is never an a priori, nor a finished product; it is only ever the problematic process of access to an image of totality" (*The Location of Culture* 51). Along with Lacan's argument, Bhabha argues that identity is unfinished because of lacking the other and not achieving completeness; therefore, according to Bhabha, it creates hybrid identities, not a separate self and/or other, within the postcolonial context. Referring to the mirror stage, David Huddart argues that Bhabha " […] produces a Lacanian analysis of colonialism, turning away from lost unities and looking instead toward processes of identification and negotiation between necessarily divided selves" (29). As he continues his argument, he points out that "[i]n the mirror stage, narcissism and aggressivity are entwined, and for Bhabha this entwinement also characterizes the colonial scene […]. […] The colonizer aggressively states his superiority to the colonized, but is always anxiously contemplating his own identity, which is never quite as stable as his aggression implies" (29). That is to say, the instability of the coloniser's power can be seen along with the challenges the colonised present.

While developing his terms, Bhabha also turns to Derrida's concepts: For example, "difference" and the complexity of binary oppositions, which are explored in Derrida's concept of deconstruction. Derrida's deconstructive concept touches upon the realm of possibilities regarding different meanings; that is to say, in Lois Tyson's words, "possible meanings" (258) can be seen in the realm of possibilities. Dealing with the connection between differance and identity, Peter Redman notes that differance also brings a sense of unstability into identity. He comments:

> [D]ifferance suggests that identities are not fixed […]. Instead, the concept of differance suggests that identities take their

> meaning from signifying practices […]. This suggests that identities take their definition only from that which they are not, implying, for example, that the identity of the supposedly 'civilized European' is constructed in relation to a range of 'different' others: the 'barbaric' African, the 'exotic' Oriental and so on. Disturbingly, this forces us to think of these differential identities as inherently unstable. From the perspective of difference, the identity of the 'civilized' European is constantly haunted by the liminal presence of the 'black' and 'Oriental' others against which it defines itself and into which it continually threatens to collapse. (12)

In other words, Derrida's concept of differance indicates how inseparable the self and other are, and how unstable identities are; these are the very points Bhabha uses and applies to the postcolonial circumstances in order to debate his hybrid identities. According to Bhabha, the binary oppositions construct the identity of the coloniser and the colonised, namely self and other, and their identities are inseparable; therefore, their identities create hybrid postcolonial identities.

Although groundbreaking, Bhabha's theory is not without contradictions and has regularly been the subject of criticism. Peter Childs and Patrick Williams argue that Bhabha's work is criticised for its "vagueness over the application of his concepts and theories" (143). They state that "[…] while he usually draws the examples for his theories from specific historical moments, it is not clear to several of his critics how tied to those moments the different concepts are, or whether 'paranoia', 'ambivalence', 'hybrid', and 'the stereotype as fetish' apply equally at all times" (143). Since the experience of diaspora communities in Western nations is, as John Mcleod argues, one of segregation and ghettoisation rather than border- crossings and cultural exchange, then the necessity of considering how cultures *inter*-relate becomes crucial. Thus, Bhabha's work tends to include an utopian element which has not always been welcomed by his critics. Bhabha is often regarded as a cosmopolitan because of his transnational terms of reference.

While Homi Bhabha examines hybridity as a symptom of resistance by the colonised, Paul Gilroy concentrates on narratives of the historical entanglement of Europe, Africa,

and America. Paul Gilroy sees the hybridity of postcolonial cultural identity as a state of double consciousness, "[s]triving to be both European and black requires some specific forms of double consciousness" (*The Black Atlantic* 1), in which African heritage and the black diaspora in the Western world have formed the ambivalent position of black cultural identity. W. E. B. Du Bois used the term while referring to his theory of African American "double consciousness," which challenges the potential of reconciliation between African heritage and a European education. He explored the local situation of American blacks and their history of slavery and forced exile from Africa, and his theory of double consciousness has made an impact on many critics, including Paul Gilroy. Du Bois depicts his experience of becoming aware of being a black American as follows:

> It is a peculiar sensation, this double consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness,-an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body […]. (2)

Concentrating on this book which has had an effect on the black people in America, Gilroy elaborates on double consciousness, pointing out that double consciousness comes out of the three modes which are thinking, being, and seeing. Thinking is racially particularistic; being is nationalistic which stems from the nation state where the ex-slaves who are not-yet-citizens are; seeing is diasporic which is global. Du Bois's thinking creates exquisite patterns in which these three factors are together. (*The Black Atlantic* 127)

Paul Gilroy notes that one of the results of the colonial encounter has been double consciousness, producing the capacity to exist within two or more cultures and two or more views. Naming the "Black Atlantic", Paul Gilroy focuses on the transatlantic flow of people, ideas, and culture that began with the slave trade, pointing out that it has been important for cultural renewal in Europe, Africa, the Caribbean, and America. They all cement a modern, hybrid world. As Gilroy states:

> I have settled on the image of ships in motion across the spaces between Europe, America, Africa, and the Caribbean as a central organising symbol for this enterprise and as my starting point. The image of the ship- a living, micro-cultural, micro-political system in motion- is especially important for historical and theoretical reasons that I hope will become clearer below. Ships immediately focus attention on the middle passage, on the various projects for redemptive return to an African homeland, on the circulation of ideas and activists as well as the movement of key cultural and political artefacts: tracts, books, gramophone records, and choirs. (*The Black Atlantic* 4)

While analysing double consciousness and black Atlantic culture, Paul Gilroy explores what diaspora means in the context of Britain, and how it can be employed. Thus in his *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*, Paul Gilroy states that

> Black Britain defines itself crucially as part of a diaspora. Its unique cultures draw inspiration from those developed by black populations elsewhere. In particular, the culture and politics of black America and the Caribbean have become raw materials for creative processes which redefine what it means to be black, adapting it to distinctively British experiences and meanings. (154)

Drawing on the concept of double consciousness that is "[s]triving to be both European and black," which can be regarded as hybridity, Paul Gilroy implies that his understanding of hybridity, on the whole, involves both rather than neither/nor.

In the British situation, referring to ethnicity, Stuart Hall has written on the effects of hybridisation on contemporary culture. What is the meaning of "ethnicity" in this context? Ethnicity is a term which, in Edgar and Sedgwick's words, "[…] refer[s] to different racial or national groups which identifies them in virtue of their shared practices, norms and systems of belief" (114). At this point Peter Brooker notes that ethnicity is sometimes confused with race. According to him, race is marked by phenotypical differences such as body size, skin colour and hair type. On the other hand, ethnicity defines social and cultural identities; thus ethnicity is a more flexible cultural definition than race. In fact, ethnic identity suggests a sense of belongingness based on a homeland, its belief system, language, literature, cultural heritage, history and customs.

In other words, the concept of ethnicity can be observed in the formation of borderline or hybrid identities (92- 93).

In his essay titled "New Ethnicities," Hall implies that a change is occurring in black cultural politics: "[…] the term 'Black' was coined as a way of referencing the common experience and marginalization in Britain and came to provide the organizing category of a new politics of resistance, amongst groups and communities with, in fact, very different histories, traditions, and ethnic identities" (223). Drawing on his own experience, Stuart Hall is instrumental in spreading the notion of diaspora as a "governing trope for Caribbean identities" (Castle 280). In his article titled "Negotiating Caribbean Identities," Stuart Hall points out the importance of **"**how to negotiate identity" (281). According to him, the Caribbean is the original diaspora because of being diasporised twice; in other words, they made the triangular journey, and they are back in Britain. Hall also notes that in diasporas the intricate processes of negotiation that characterise Caribbean culture can be observed (284). In "Cultural Identity and Diaspora", Stuart Hall argues that there are two kinds of identity; identity as being and identity as becoming.

> Cultural identity […] is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in mere 'recovery' of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past. (394)

Hall continues his argument, pointing out that cultural identity is not a fixed core, remaining static, which is independent of history and culture ("Cultural Identity and Diaspora" 395). In this sense, Hall perceives Derrida's idea of 'difference' helpful to depict that the supplement that the black or mulatto skin increases the refinement of

French or European culture. According to Hall, difference challenges the fixed binaries that stabilise representation, and demonstrates how meaning is not completed; in other words, it moves on to include other meanings ("Cultural Identity and Diaspora" 397).

Taking Derrida's notion of difference into consideration, Hall argues that there is a possibility to create "the positioning and repositioning of Caribbean cultural identities" through three presences ("Cultural Identity and Diaspora" 398). These three presences are *Presence Africaine*, *Presence Europeene*, and *Presence Americaine*" (398 emphasis original). Hall employs Caribbean identities, including his own, to explain how the first is necessary, and how the second one is truer to their postcolonial conditions. He accepts the idea of three cultural presences in the Caribbean: African, which refers to a history of slavery; European, which refers to exposure to colonial discourse and representations of the Other; and "New World," which refers to the Caribbean that is an "emptied" land (Childs and Williams 211). He also uses the three presences, African, European, and American in order to illustrate the idea of traces in the Caribbean identity which leads to the definition of the Caribbean identity as diaspora identity. According to Hall, a hybrid cultural identity begins with "a system where every concept or meaning is inscribed in a chain or a system within which it refers to others, to other concepts and meanings by means of the systematic play of differences" (*The Multicultural Question* 11). Therefore, the emergence of cultural identity and the foundation cultural identification mean negotiating social-cultural differences. Avoiding the generalisation that everyone is a migrant, Hall sees human identity as something that is on the move without arriving at; in other words, it is very much part of diaspora. He argues that diaspora does not relate to those disconnected clans whose identity can be protected with regard to a consecrated homeland to which they must go back at the expense of other people ("Cultural Identity and Diaspora" 401). On the contrary, Hall employs diaspora to communicate an aesthetic that highlights difference and hybridity. That is to say, Stuart Hall's notion of diasporic identity depends on difference and hybridity which is " […] defined, not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of 'identity' which lives with and through […] difference; by *hybridity*" ("Cultural Identity and Diaspora" 402). Hall therefore presents a "different way of thinking about cultural identity," theorising it "[…] as

constituted, not outside but within representation; and hence of cinema, not as a second-order mirror held up to reflect what already exists, but as that form of representation which is able to constitute us as new kinds of subjects, and thereby enable us to discover places from which to speak" ("Cultural Identity and Diaspora" 402).

Examining the ways in which representations are employed as a means of colonial power to maintain the subservience of colonised peoples, colonial discourses have been important in the development of postcolonialism. Postcolonial literature is described as a literature which critically scrutinizes the colonial relationship (Boehmer 3), resisting colonialist perspectives. Elleke Boehmer argues that "[t]o give expression to colonized experience, postcolonial writers sought to undercut thematically and formally the discourses which supported colonization-the myths of power, the race classifications, the imagery of subordination" (3). On the whole, postcolonial literature deals with self-representation. Authors who come from the former colonies are keen to express themselves, telling their stories, which at their core portray the psychological and historical pictures of the colonial encounter and its results.

While focusing on self-representation and telling their stories, the notion of borders and national identity are often redefined, and hybridity is seen as "a cultural effect of globalisation" (Guignery 5). Therefore, it is important to focus on hybridity in the light of globalisation which seems to "[…] erase and homogenise differences and local inscriptions […]" in order to cause "a return to essentialized identities, communitarian attitudes and/or religious fundamentalisms that insist on the unicity, the purity and the integrity of identities and cultivate endogamy and the rejection of the Other" (Guignery 6).

It is also important to concentrate on hybridity in terms of race and racism which causes the problem (Spencer 44); that is to say, British coloured or black racism. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin define race as "a term for the classification of human beings into physically, biologically and genetically distinct groups" (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 180). According to them, "[t]he notion of race assumes, firstly, that humanity is divided into unchanging natural types, recognizable by physical

features that are transmitted 'through the blood' and permit distinctions to be made between 'pure' and 'mixed' races" (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 180). Moreover, they argue that the term of race is relevant to the rise of colonialism, in that "the division of human society in this way is inextricable from the need of colonialist powers to establish a dominance over subject peoples and hence justify the imperial enterprise" (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 181). As a result, a binary distinction between "civilized" and "primitive" takes place *(Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 181). They argue that "[a]lthough race is not specifically an invention of imperialism, it quickly became one of imperialism's most supportive ideas, because the idea of superiority that generated the emergence of race as a concept adapted easily to both impulses of the imperial mission: dominance and enlightenment" (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 181). According to them, a hierarchy, which is based on skin colour, is constituted: white Europeans are at the top, while black Africans are at the bottom (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 181). They go on:

> [t]he most important fact about race was, as Fanon was the first to notice, that however lacking in objective reality racist ideas such as 'blackness' were, the psychological force of their construction of self meant that they acquired an objective existence in and through the behaviour of people. The self-images and self-construction that such social pressure exerted might be transmitted from generation to generation, and thus the 'fact of blackness' came to have an objective determination not only in racist behaviour and institutional practices, but more insidiously in the psychological behaviour of the peoples so constructed. (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 186)

Like Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, Peter Brooke deals with race and racism, pointing out that race is a problematic category (213). As he states: "The anthropological description of human races (note that we speak also of 'the human race' as Caucasian, Negroid and Mongoloid is based on identifiable genetic or phenotypical differences, but, given the possible genetic variation within races and the effects of migration, resettlement and intermarriage, the existence of races, as such, is itself often disputed […]" (213). In addition, he notes that "[t]he study of race therefore frequently develops as a study of racism and racist IDEOLOGY" (214 emphasis original). According to this ideology, three types of racism can be observed: "violent assault; institutionalized

racism (exercised, for example, through poor provision in education, healthcare, housing, and/or discrimination and unequal pay in the workplace); and, third, through the expression of 'COMMON SENSE' attitudes based on unexamined and prejudiced assumptions (even of the kind that appear to make a positive statement, as in 'blacks are good dancers')" (214 emphasis original).

Chris Barker also focuses on race, noting that "[t]he concept of race bears the traces of its origins in the biological discourses of social Darwinism that stress 'lines of descent' and 'types of people;'" and he emphasises skin colour by referring to pigmentation (248). Moreover, these traits are associated with intelligence and capabilities, and they are employed to classify "'racialized' groups are in a hierarchy of social and material superiority and subordination" (Barker 248). Barker also states that these categorisations, which are formed in order to keep power, take place "at the root of racism" (248). In addition, Barker notes that "[t]*he idea of 'racialization' or 'race formation' is founded on the argument that race is a social construction and not a universal or essential category of biology* (248 emphasis original). Barker continues his argument by stating that "[…] the historical formation of 'race' is one of power and subordination" (248). In other words, people of colour are given the "subordinate positions in relation to every dimension of 'life-chances;'" in consequence, "British Afro-Caribbeans […] have been disadvantaged in: the labour market; the housing market; the education system; the media and other forms of cultural representation" (Barker 248- 249). In addition, Barker points out that the situation in Britain in relation to race has changed: on the whole white character of the population was bothered in the 1950s by the advent of migrants who were from Indian sub-continent and the Caribbean. As a result, the question of national identity became a critical category; this is the very thing through which "racialization operated" (249). Barker argues that "[w]ithin the West, people of colour have often been represented as a series of *problems*, objects and victims" (264 emphasis original). As he points out:

> Black people are constructed as the object rather than subject of history. Unable to think or act for themselves, people of colour are not held to be capable of initiating activity or of controlling their own destiny. Subsequently, as objects and aliens from

> another place, black people pose a series of problems for white people, for example as a foreign contaminating cultural presence or as the perpetrators of crime. (264)

Barker points out that the representation of people of colour in Britain consists of contradictions; for instance, black people are portrayed both as criminals and middle-class success. On the other hand, race is viewed as a problem; however, racism is seen as a thing in relation to the past (270). Like Barker, Hall comments on the contradictions as follows:

> […] people who are in any way significantly different from the majority – 'them' rather than 'us' – are frequently exposed to this binary form of representation. They seem to be represented through sharply opposed, polarized, binary extremes – good/bad, civilized / primitive, ugly / excessively attractive, repelling-because-different / compelling-because-strange-and-exotic. And they are often required to be both things at the same time! ("The Spectacle of the 'Other'"229)

In addition to Hall's comments, Philomena Essed notes that racism hides prejudices and discrimination in the name of racial or ethnic group membership. What is more, she points out that everyday racism is related to continuous disrespect which leads to alienation from society (203- 204). In line with Essed, Gary Younge says that racism can be observed in employment, housing, equality, safety, education and human rights ("Given Britain's history").

Given the racism experienced by the immigrants, as can be seen above, Phillips illustrates this by referring to his own experiences as follows: "Ever since I was a kid, I had been stopped by the police on the street asking me where I was going, where I had been. If I was running, they would want to know where I was running to and what I was running from" (Bell 580).

In a word, hybridity remains complex and problematic as an in-between space where the term Third Space tends to offer a sense of inclusion. While Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* deals with the nineteenth century hybridity and hybrid identity, Caryl Phillips's *The*

Final Passage explores hybridity and hybrid identity in the 1950s; thus the changes in the concept of hybridity and hybrid identity which take place in these two different eras can be observed. This dissertation focuses on these two novels that reflect the emergence and formation of hybrid identity.

The first chapter will dwell upon *Wide Sargasso Sea* by Jean Rhys in order to explore how hybrid identity is depicted through Antoinette, a white Creole heiress, from the time of her youth in the Caribbean to her unhappy marriage with the English husband and relocation to England. Struggling with her hybrid identity, being called "white cockroach" by the blacks and "white niggers" by the English (*Wide Sargasso Sea* 63), Antoinette belongs neither to the white Europeans nor to the black Jamaicans, and finds herself in the Wide Sargasso Sea, in the Third Space. Her long and complicated name, Bertha Antoinette Cosway Mason Rochester, draws attention to the extent to which Antoinette's hybrid identity is always being redefined in perpetual motion, in relation to the men who come into her life. In this chapter her hybridity and identity transformation will be examined.

The second chapter will focus on *The Final Passage* by Caryl Phillips in order to examine the concept of hybrid identity through Leila, a 19 year-old girl with a lighter skin who is neither black Caribbean nor white European, but a passenger, in perpetual motion in the Third space. Leila in *The Final Passage* (even the title of the book carries a colonial implication) is a mulatto girl, a hybrid, who is alienated for either being too white on the Caribbean island or too coloured in England. She struggles with her feeling of unbelonging, in-betweenness, which is the core of her hybrid identity. Leila is an alien, both in the Caribbean and in Britain. While she is different as a mulatto girl or hybrid in the Caribbean, she is an alien in Britain as an in-between character. In addition, the differences between Leila in *The Final Passage* and Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea* will be explored, the differences between the two generations in these novels will be examined.

The concluding chapter of this dissertation illustrates that these novels, which use the concepts of hybridity and hybrid identities, challenge the grand narratives of the

imperial past which relate to the highly problematic and complex discourses of the politics of history, regimes of identity and the consequent formation of the Third Space. They question and challenge the naturalisation of the complexity of hybridity and hybrid identities. In other words, being inspired and offered new alternatives and prospects in the Bhabhanian Third Space, hybrid characters are prepared to negotiate and gain new ground in terms of redefining their identity while dealing with the complexities and problems of hybridity.

CHAPTER I

HYBRID IDENTITIES IN JEAN RHYS'S *WIDE SARGASSO SEA*

In this chapter four hybrid characters in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Antoinette, the English husband, Daniel and Christophine will be explored based on cultural, racial, class, economic and religious levels. While concentrating on hybridity and hybrid identity within the concepts defined by Homi Bhabha such as in-betweenness, mimicry and the Third Space, naming, creolisation, mulatto, class system, emancipated slaves and colonial assumptions will be examined.

Wide Sargasso Sea is a rewriting by Jean Rhys of Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. Set in the 1840s in the West Indies, *Wide Sargasso Sea* deals with colonialism focusing on Antoinette as a hybrid character. Teresa F. O'Connor describes the Sargasso Sea, which inspires the title of the novel, in these words:

> The Sargasso Sea, situated in the North Atlantic between the West Indies and the Azores, both divides and unites the opposite worlds of the old and the new hemispheres; in Rhys's novel it stands between the world of the whites and blacks, the colonizers and colonized, the English and the West Indian Creoles […]. (145)

She also describes the Sargasso Sea as a hybrid, being "neither land nor sea" (157). In her book titled *Letters 1931-66,* in a letter Jean Rhys details the process of choosing the title for her novel as follows:

> I have no title yet. "The First Mrs Rochester" is not right. Nor, of course is "Creole." That has a different meaning now. I hope I'll get one soon, for titles mean a lot to me. Almost half the battle. I thought of 'Sargasso Sea' or 'Wide Sargasso Sea' but nobody knew what I meant. (154)

The novel lends itself to a variety of critical approaches, including postcolonial theory which can be observed in the framework of the concept of hybridity. It is set in Jamaica

and Dominica between 1839 and 1845, and presents a world of changing power relations among the English, the Creoles, and the newly emancipated slaves. The novel portrays the West Indies after the emancipation of the slaves in 1838, depicting a society which is in a state of decay epitomised by Antoinette's family. The physical and historical setting of *Wide Sargasso Sea* is important. "*Wide Sargasso Sea* is completely West Indian," Cheryl M. L. Dash argues, "not only because of the setting but primarily because of Rhys's way of seeing the events, resulting from a knowledge of the West Indies which comes from having lived there and having absorbed the essence of the place. There is an authenticity and a sense of felt reality" (120).

Wide Sargasso Sea was a huge success, winning "the Royal Society of Literature Award and the W. H. Smith Award" (Angier 581), and has not stopped growing in popularity ever since. There are various reasons for the success *Wide Sargasso Sea* enjoyed: it deals with some of the late twentieth-century preoccupations, such as place and belonging, and spaces between cultures. It has also become a significant novel, raising questions and discussions in terms of literary theory, including postcolonialism.

For a long time Jean Rhys's writing was regarded as limited because she was a woman writer, writing mostly about her own life. When *Wide Sargasso Sea* was published, critics started to take her novels more seriously; however, she found it difficult to be treated as a woman writer, who wrote only about passive female victims. Some critics such as Walter Allen refer to Antoinette as a "passive victim" as follows: "She is a young woman […] who is hopelessly and helplessly at sea in her relations with men, a passive victim doomed to destruction" (qtd. in Mellown 106). Like Walter Allen, Coltte Lindroth states that

> [e]ven more than Rhys's other women, Antoinette is a victim's victim. Isolated from her neighbors by her white skin, increasingly estranged from her mother, she moves from alienation to paranoia. Her very identity seems to slip away from her as her name is changed to suit others' needs. When her mother remarries to improve their social and financial situation, she becomes Antoinette Mason, not Cosway; later, Rochester rejects the mother's name of Antoinette to call her by her second

> name, so that as the novel goes on Antoinette Cosway becomes Bertha Mason without so much as putting up a struggle. (88)

On the other hand, Helen Carr comments on this expression "passive victim" in these words: "'Passive victim' is, in any case, as inadequate a description for her heroines as for Jean Rhys herself, and not only because she shows them frequently as angry and as badly behaved as she was" (6).

In her book titled *The Rhys Woman*, Paula Le Gallez argues that "many critics [refer] to the 'Rhys woman', an ubiquitous creature who turns up in all the novels, 'the same woman at different stages of experience'" (2) According to her, this woman is portrayed as a "passive victim" who is regarded as "an extension of Jean Rhys's own personality" (2). For instance, Marcelle Bernstein, who interviewed Rhys, elaborates on this:

> Her life seems to have been a drifting, haphazard, emotional affair. London, Paris, Vienna, Budapest have all been her homes. Married three times, she describes herself as "passive. I'm not very much a chooser. I'm much more a being chosen. I really don't know why I've had such a restless existence." The women in her books are mirrors in which she examines herself minutely. They are passive too, soft, sad, uncertain creatures with pretty faces and a liking for liquor. Their sexual generosity is seldom repaid and their hearts and beds are left, in the end, as empty as their purses. (qtd. in Gallez 2)

On the other hand, Rhys's views on being interviewed differ from the view mentioned above. She states that "[t]he question-and-answer game goes on. I realize that I am being gently pushed into my pre-destined role, the role of victim" (qtd. in Gallez 2). In addition, she continues to argue that she was not "a passive person" as follows:

> I'm always being made into a victim… a passive person…but the fact is I was active. God knows I hardly think I should be copied in the way I lived my life and loves; but I didn't always make a mess of them, and I wasn't always the abandoned one, you know. My affairs ended mostly because I wanted them to end or I wanted to leave the place where they'd happened, or just wanted to get away. (qtd. in Gallez 2-3)

In other words, Jean Rhys points out that she was active, making her decisions, and she objects to being stereotyped as the inactive female victim. "'Rhys woman', far from being as passive as she looks," Gallez argues, "is passive only in a culturally determined way, and that underlying this attitude is an ironic awareness that the quality is actually part of the feminine condition in the society in which she lives" (4).

A "passive victim" of patriarchialism and colonialism, Antoinette is given a chance to tell her story revolving around her hybrid identity. As Helen Carr comments the "anger against injustice and hypocrisy behind Rhys's 'terrific – almost lurid! – passion for stating the case of the underdog' disappears from view" (7). The Trinidadian V. S. Naipaul implies that all her writing should be studied in the light of her colonial background. He says:

> She was outside that tradition of imperial-expatriate writing in which the metropolitan outsider is thrown into relief against an alien background. She was an expatriate, but her journey had been the other way round, from a background of nothing to an organised world with which her heroines could never come to terms. This journey, this break in a life, is the essential theme of her five novels. (54)

Naipaul also points out her honesty and courage, not her victimhood:

> Out of her fidelity to her experience and her purity as a novelist, Jean Rhys thirty or forty years ago identified many of the themes that engage us today: isolation, an absence of society or community, the sense of things falling apart, dependence, loss…What she has written about she has endured, over a long life; and what a stoic thing she makes the act of writing appear. (58)

In other words, Naipaul notes that Jean Rhys plays a significant role in writing about the themes such as isolation, dependence and loss which are still relevant; what is more, she wrote about what she experienced.

Jean Rhys (1890-1979), originally Ella Gwendolen Rees Williams, was born into a white slave-owning class in the Caribbean island of Dominica. She moved to Britain when she was sixteen years old in order to continue her education, but kept her ties with the Caribbean. Her sense of belonging to both places was complicated by the circumstances of her birth. Rhys herself experienced in-betweenness: between places and cultures, between classes and races, and not entirely belonging to either the one or the other. Thus her in-betweenness is illustrated in her heroines such as Anna in *Voyage in the Dark* and Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea*.

Inspired by Jean Rhys, Caryl Phillips writes a novel based on her life. Caryl Phillips's *A View of the Empire at Sunset* tells the story of the woman who took the pen name Jean Rhys. It describes how she was born Ella Gwendolen Rees Williams in Dominica in 1890, and then how sixteen years later moved to London, which was Edwardian, then to Paris, and then back to London again. Caryl Phillips portrays her life in these places and also depicts the past in order to illuminate the present, displaying the sense of family and alienation. He demonstrates that her experiences such as relationship, marriage, education and language were based on her hybrid identity.

He illustrates her experience at school in England where a pupil called Myrtle is chosen by the headmistress to help her find out about what behaviour is expected:

> During the course of the next few weeks this Myrtle would one day pretend to be her friend and the following day openly conspire against her with the other girls. "We don't understand what you are saying." "Do you speak English?" "Why do you wear such old-fashioned clothes?" "What do you mean you have never ridden a bicycle?" "Snow is white, stupid, and it falls from the sky. Like rain." "Do you have monkeys in your family? I mean as relatives, not pets?" "Why would you think anybody might be interested in seeing you, of all people, upon a stage?" "Truly you have no singing voice. You screech like one of your parrots." Myrtle, she suspected, was part foreign, and perhaps that was why the headmistress had chosen the girl, but although Myrtle herself was not much to consider, with her flat chest and funny little screwed-up eyes, the spiteful girl's habitual taunting made her feel as though somebody was pinching her skin. […]

> "Tell me honestly, do you even have a mother or were you hatched from an egg?" (78-9)

Phillips depicts the difficulties she experiences at school in England; she faces racism, not being regarded as a human, but likened to a monkey. As for her language experience, "English people seemed to dislike her voice and so she had long accustomed herself to speaking in a whisper, but this meant that her words were often lost in the welter of noise generated by competing conversations" (200). When it comes to marriage, she wants to show her world to her husband Leslie:

> I will show you the rivers and the mountains, and come evening, as the New World day convulses towards dusk, I will share with you a spectacular elevated view of the empire at sunset. Perhaps, my husband, if I show you the West Indies, then you will finally come to understand that I am not of your world, and maybe then you will appreciate the indignity I feel at not only having to live among you people but possibly die among you, too. (15)

This is the conclusion she comes to: "She scrutinized her husband and could see frustration giving way to anger, and so she reached out and placed a hand on his knee. She wanted Leslie to see her world, but it was already evident that the more her husband saw, the less he understood" (312). As a result, "[…] she felt sorry for poor Leslie, anchored to her earth and floundering about in his ordered mind, and she understood that never before had the void between her world and his felt so vast" (319).

In the light of her Caribbean background, Rhys was interested in Charlotte Bronte's Bertha Mason in *Jane Eyre*, with whom she shared some similarities. In her book titled *Letters 1931- 66*, Jean Rhys writes that when she read about Bertha in *Jane Eyre* she thought: "That's only one side – the English side" (297). In another letter she elaborates on this by describing her experience with *Jane Eyre* in these words: "I read then re-read 'Jane Eyre' and was rather taken aback" (153); and she expresses her desire to rewrite it: "It might be possible to unhitch the whole thing from Charlotte Bronte's novel, but I don't want to do that. It is that particular mad Creole I want to write about, not any of the other mad Creoles" (153). In addition, in her *Paris Review* interview in 1979 about

Wide Sargasso Sea, Jean Rhys expressed her resentment over Bronte's treatment of the English husband's mad West Indian wife:

> When I read *Jane Eyre* as a child, I thought, why should she think Creole women are lunatics and all that? What a shame to make Rochester's first wife, Bertha, the awful madwoman, and I immediately thought I'd write the story as it might really have been. She seemed such a poor ghost. I thought I'd try to write her a life. Charlotte Bronte must have had strong feelings about the West Indies because she brings the West Indies into a lot other books […]. (qtd. in O'Conner 144)

Born in Dominica, Jean Rhys was offended to see that Charlotte Bronte had turned Bertha, the first Mrs Rochester, who is a white Creole just like herself, into a monster. Hilary Jenkins argues that "[p]art of her reason for writing the book, therefore, was to expose what she saw as the latent racism at the heart of one of the great novels in the canon of English literature. Another reason was to examine its equally latent sexism: Charlotte Bronte allows Mr Rochester a second chance despite his many faults" ("Introduction" ix).

As can be seen above, themes about race and racism seem to underlie the story of Antoinette and the other characters in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. In Rhys's version, Bertha's father, Jonas Mason, a planter and merchant, is a member of the colonising community in Jamaica. Like Bertha's mother, Rhys's mother was a Creole. White Creole people in the West Indies are in an odd situation in that "there is often the well-grounded supposition that the Creole may have 'mixed blood' " (O'Connor 21). What is more, like Bertha, Rhys left the Caribbean for England when she was young. What was life like for families and children from Britain, living in the colonies during the colonial time? In her book titled *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset*, Philippa Levine notes that at the beginning of colonialism, men had not been encouraged to take their families to live in the colonies of the Empire; however, there was a change in terms of attitude in the mid-nineteenth century; wives began to accompany their husbands who were appointed to colonial positions. As for children, they spent their early childhood with their parents, but parents who could afford education for their children in Britain, sent

them back to Britain for a number of reasons: to guarantee that they were educated in the British way; to root out the influences of local culture on them; and to avoid unknown or uncommon diseases to which they were exposed in colonial environments (109). In his novel titled *Cambridge*, Caryl Phillips describes the education of the white children in the Caribbean:

> As to the practice of education, there is little to be done but to send the older children to Europe, for a newly arrived governess will soon marry. Either this or risk the children falling into a slothful state of ignorance. In later years the boys seldom return, and should the girls do so it is generally to enjoy the chivalry of local eligible bachelors, all intent upon marriage to any passing creature with a fair skin. (116)

With this information, *Wide Sargasso Sea* can be described as a novel in which Rhys takes her inspiration from the figure of Bertha Mason, the Jamaican mad woman locked in the attic of an English manor house, and gives her the central role, allowing her the possibility and the opportunity to tell her story, or rewrite her history from her point of view. According to Firdous Azim, Bertha Mason, in *Jane Eyre*, is a Creole, whose racial origins are vague, and "[h]er blackness, to which her madness is attributed, must be seen along with her possession of colonial wealth and fortunes, which enabled her to marry a white Englishman" (183). Azim argues "[t]he meeting between the two women is presented as a colonial encounter, highlighting and dramatising questions regarding human subjectivity, rationality and civilisation" (178). Neither black nor white, Bertha Mason gives the picture of the colonial encounter in the novel.

In *Jane Eyre*, however, Bertha is described in these words:

> In the deep shape, at the farther end of the room, a figure ran backwards and forwards. What it was, whether beast or human, one could not, at first sight tell: it grovelled, seemingly, on all fours; it snatched and growled like some strange wild animal: but it was covered with clothing, and a quantity of dark, grizzled hair, wild as a mane, hid its head and face. (321)

This is a significant moment in the novel, depicting Bertha as a degenerate, half-animal or a mixture of beast and human, a hybrid, which can be read as the extension of colonial discourses which, in McLeod words, examine, "the ways that representations and modes of perception are used as fundamental weapons of colonial power to keep colonized peoples subservient to colonial rule" (17). Defined as "the Other," savagery, sexuality and madness flesh out in Bertha Mason. Bertha's bestiality and her wild nature are related to her "mixed" Creole background in Jamaica. In McLeod's words, this assumption in colonial discourses defines the people "born of parents not from the same 'race' degenerate beings, perhaps not fully human, closer to animals. Bertha is robbed of human selfhood; she has no voice in the novel other than the demoniac laughter and the discomforting noises that Jane reports" in *Jane Eyre* (McLeod 152-3). As Frantz Fanon states in his book *The Wretched of the Earth*:

> In plain talk, [the colonized] is reduced to the state of an animal. And consequently, when the colonist speaks of the colonized he uses zoological terms. Allusion is made to the slithery movements of the yellow race, the odors from the "native" quarters, to the hordes, the stink, the swarming, the seething, and the gesticulations. In his endeavors at description and finding the right word, the colonist refers constantly to the bestiary. (7)

As a result, Bertha's function in Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre* can be seen as someone from hell between human and animal. When Rhys retells the scene from *Jane Eyre* in which Jane hears "a snarling, snatching sound, almost like a dog quarrelling," and then encounters a bleeding Richard Mason in *Wide Sargasso Sea* (*Wide Sargasso Sea* 121),[1] she shows Bertha's humanity.

In his essay titled "'The Other Side:' *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Jane Eyre*," Michael Thorpe points out the similarities between Jane and Antoinette in these words:

> Both heroines grow up fatherless and emotionally threatened by those who take charge of them; they live much within themselves and in their imaginations, made fearful by emotional

[1] From now on *WSS*.

> and physical insecurity. Jane is an orphan: Antoinette virtually one, losing her father in childhood and seeing her mother marry again, infatuated, only to become insane after the burning of their estate by the emancipated negroes (in the disturbances of the late 1830's). (181)

Antoinette and Jane have similar childhoods; there is, however, a difference in terms of their position: while Bertha is from the edge of the empire, Jane is at its centre. Antoinette's personal story and/or history is politicised. As the daughter of a former slave-owner in Jamaica, she is hated by the black and the mixed-race people, and also by the wealthier whites. In addition, as a child Antoinette experiences rejection by her mother, which causes lack of confidence, reflecting the core of the relationship between "mother country" and "her children, the colonies" (Raiskin 258). As Judith Raiskin states:

> [a]t the center of Rhys's writing is her extremely powerful deconstruction of this "family" – the mother country, England, and her children, the colonies. Rhys's Caribbean characters returning to the mother country do not find themselves nurtured in the "home" they have been so persuasively educated to expect, but rather find themselves once again in exile, this time not on the frontier, but in the heart of the metropolis. (258)

On the other hand, as a wife she is only an heiress to the English husband, who cannot see her as an equal; he keeps his distance from her, thinking that she must be mad, and so robs her of her freedom. There are some political parallels.

Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar point out that the encounter between Jane and Bertha is an important confrontation in the tradition of women's writing: "an encounter […] with her own imprisoned 'hunger, rebellion and rage', a secret dialogue of self and soul on whose outcome […] the novel's plot, Rochester's fate, and Jane's coming-of-age all depend" (339). They examine the relationship between women and madness, and see that it has layers of reasons. Being under the control of their husbands and/or male relatives, they can be imprisoned, divorced and robbed of their money if they are labelled or diagnosed with madness.

Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar also argue that the English husband's mad first wife, Bertha Mason, is an image of the suppressed anger which was experienced by many nineteenth-century women. On the other hand, in her essay titled "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism," Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak disagrees with this psychoanalytical reading of Bertha because of its failure to see the reality of colonial attitudes, and focuses on Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, which concentrates on the story told by the "madwoman." Bertha Mason is, in Spivak's words, "a figure produced by the axiomatics of imperialism." Through her, the white Jamaican Creole, Spivak argues "[…] Bronte renders the human/animal frontier as acceptably indeterminate […]" (247). Rhys renames Bertha Antoinette and denies her husband a name although readers cannot fail to identify him with Bronte's Rochester. Rhys saves Bertha from the attic in which she is imprisoned by Bronte. The madwoman in the attic is given a voice, a history, an alternative text; as a result, seeing her as a barrier to Jane's happiness or to the English husband as a hero will not be easy (Innes 54).

Jean Rhys reconstructs *Jane Eyre* from the point of view of Antoinette in Part One, from the the point of view of her husband, the English husband, in Part Two, and from the point of view of both Antoinette and Grace Poole in Part Three. Antoinette tells the first part, recounting her childhood, adolescence and marriage in Jamaica, including her relationships with Tia, the African-Caribbean friend, and Christophine, her black nurse and housekeeper, the burning of Coulibre, and her sense of alienation. In the second part her unnamed husband, namely the English husband, descibes his arrival in the West Indies, his honeymoon in Granbois, and their interactions with Amelia, a servant, Christophine, the housekeeper, and Daniel Cosway, who claims to be Antoinette's half brother. Part three concerns Antoinette's imprisonment in the attic of the Great House in England, and her fatal jump, but the end is ambiguous.

Rhys's fiction displays the sense of hybridity and hybrid identity of those who live in-between, experiencing the ambivalent and dislocated existences which have become part of the postcolonial and postmodern times. For example, like Jean Rhys who is from the Caribbean, Stuart Hall made a comment on his own situation in *The Real Me? Postmodernism and the Question of Identity*:

> Thinking about my own sense of identity, I realise that it has always depended on the fact of being a migrant, on the difference from the rest of you… Now, in this postmodern age, you all feel so dispersed, I become centred. What I thought of as dispersed and fragmented comes, paradoxically, to be the representative postmodern experience… Welcome to migranthood… Young black people in London today are marginalized, fragmented, unenfranchized, disadvantaged and dispersed. And yet they look as if they own the territory. Somehow, they too, in spite of everything, are centred, in place. (qtd. in Carr 24)

Drawing on his sense of identity, Hall describes young black people in England who are hybrids; although they experience difficulties, they seem to be centred. However, the complexity of their hybridity can be observed. Similarly, the vulnerability, multiplicity of identity and hybridity are central themes in Jean Rhys's writing: Who am I? What am I? What are they making of me? are the questions her heroines such as Anna and Antoinette ask, trying to find an answer : "I often wonder who I am and where is my country and where do I belong and why was I ever born at all," Antoinette says in *Wide Sargasso Sea* (85). Andrew Edgar and Peter Sedgwick point out that "[t]he notion of the self is invoked as soon as one asks a question like 'Who am I?' At first glance, this might not seem very difficult to answer, and you might respond by just giving your name. But giving your name does not adequately answer the 'Who am I?' question if you also take it to mean 'What am I?'" (*Cultural Theory* 302). Frantz Fanon also focuses on the "Who am I?" question in relation to colonialism in *The Wretched of the Earth*, and argues that "[…] colonialism forces the colonized to constantly ask the question: "Who am I in reality?" (182).

"The problem with the white West Indians was," Helen Carr argues, "that […] they had gone native: they were no longer quite English, nor going native even […] 'quite European'" (14). As the English husband says of Antoinette, "Long, sad, dark alien eyes. Creole of pure English descent she may be, but they are not English or European either" (WSS 56).

The crisis of identity, creolisation, in particular hybrid identity, revolving around the protagonist Antoinette, is an important theme in *Wide Sargasso Sea.* Chris Barker defines hybridity as "[t]he mixing together of different cultural elements to create new meanings and identities. Hybrids destabilize and blur established cultural boundaries in a process of fusion or creolization" (385). As was seen earlier, the term "hybridity" is associated with Homi K. Bhabha, who argues that all cultural statements are constructed in a space called the "Third Space of enunciation" (37). "Cultural identity always emerges," Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin argue, "in this contradictory and ambivalent space, which for Bhabha makes the claim to a hierarchical 'purity' of cultures untenable" (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 108). They further argue that "[i]t is the 'in-between' space that carries the burden and meaning of culture, and this is what makes the notion of hybridity so important" (108). Hybridity is employed in postcolonial discourse to imply "cross-cultural exchange" (108). They often question this expression of the term as it suggests "[…] negating and neglecting the imbalance and inequality of the power relations it references" (108).

In the novel there are different kinds of hybrid identities, presenting their own complexities on various levels such as cultural, racial, religious, class and economic. Like hybridity, the term "Creole" is generally employed to define indigenous peoples or languages. Since Antoinette's family has lived in the Caribbean for generations, Jean Rhys defines them as white Creole in order to illustrate typical racial and cultural hybridity. Coral Ann Howells argues that in *Wide Sargasso Sea* Antoinette reveals "Rhys's personal crisis of identity" while asking the question, '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?' (WSS 21).

In her works, both fiction and non-fiction, Rhys examines the complexities of the white Creole condition in the West Indies in the nineteenth century. In her unpublished book entitled *Black Exercise Book*, she states:

> I was curious about black people.They stimulated me and I felt akin to them. It added to my sadness that I couldn't help but

> realise they didn't really like or trust white people – white cockroaches they called us. Sick with shame at some of the stories of the slave days… Yet all the time knowing that there was another side to it. Sometimes seeing myself powerful… sometimes being proud of my great grandfather, the estate, and the good old days, … But the end of my thinking about them was always a sick revolt and I wanted to be identified with the other side which of course was impossible. (qtd. in Howells 21)

Rhys experiences a mixture of emotions: being "curious" and "stimulated" by black people, she faces rejection and being called names such as "cockroach." In addition, she goes through the combination of emotions such as pride and disgust regarding her heritage. In her book titled *Smile Please*, she expresses her sense of rejection by the land which reflects the separation from her mother:

> It was alive, I was sure of it. Behind the bright colours softness, the hills like clouds and the clouds like fantastic hills. There was something austere, sad, lost, all these things. I wanted to identify myself with it, to lose myself in it. (But it turned its head away, indifferent, and that broke my heart.) (81)

Rhys experienced a kind of ambivalence as a white Creole, not knowing whether she was completely white or not. This is the very thing, in Helen Carr's words, "of which she was increasingly uncertain" (16). In her childhood in Dominica, Rhys felt that " the black people were more alive, more part of the place than we were" (*Smile Please* 50), and she was envious of them. As a white Creole, Jean Rhys was a hybrid; she was, in Carr's words, "culturally mixed, marginal to the metropolitan world, hybrid, always a foreigner even in her native land. She became a migrant, unsettled, on the move, with no roots to return to, no base point, a foreigner everywhere" (22-23). Brought up in a bourgeois family, she found that in Europe her poverty and her transgressions of the sexual code meant she was an anomalous, suspect inhabitant of the interstices of the rigid British class system. As Neville Braybrooke notes, Jean Rhys writes about those "who belong to an in-between world… […] floating between the rich and poor, just as, in the West Indies, the Creole belongs neither to white nor black" (qtd. in Carr 23).

In her autobiography, *Smile Please*, Jean Rhys talks about the first time she realized she was hated because she was white, describing the experience in language strikingly reminiscent of 'The Day They Burned the Books'. She was sent to a mixed convent school (her father being unusually liberal), and early on sat next to a very pretty coloured girl; she admired her and 'long[ed] to be friendly', so, she writes,

> […]I tried, shyly at first, then more boldly, to talk to my beautiful neighbor. Finally, without speaking, she turned and looked at me. I knew irritation, bad temper, the 'Oh, go away' look; this was different. This was hatred – impersonal, implacable hatred. I recognised it at once and if you think that a child cannot recognise hatred and remember it for life you are most damnably mistaken. […] They hate us. We are hated. Not possible.Yes it is possible and it is so. (*Smile Please* 49)

Elaine Showalter argues that the racial side of Bertha's Creole background is highlighted here, noting that "Bertha comes to represent the native, the heart of darkness, the Other" (233). Here it can be helpful to give a brief history of Creole. The English word "creole" stems from the Portuguese *Criolulu* (Spanish *criollo*) which means "native" (*Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* 50 emphasis original). Ascroft, Griffiths and Tiffin point out that

> 'Creole' originally referred to a white (man) of European descent, born and raised in a tropical colony. The meaning was later extended to include indigenous natives and others of non-European origin. The term was subsequently applied to certain languages spoken by Creoles in and around the Caribbean and in West Africa, and then more generally to other languages of similar type that had arisen in similar circumstances. (50-1)

According to Edward Brathwaite, the Caribbean historian, the term "Creole" means different things for different societies:

> In Trinidad, it refers principally to the black descendants of slaves to distinguish them from East Indian immigrants. When used with reference to other native groups, an adjectival prefix-French creole, Spanish creole- is used. In Jamaica, and the old settled English colonies, the word was used in its original

> Spanish sense of criollo: born into, native, committed to the area of living, and it was used in relation to both white and black, free and slave. (*Contradictory Omens: Cultural Diversity and Integration in the Caribbean* 10)

When it comes to creolisation or a creole society, Brathwaite argues that creolisation is "a cultural process" (11) which started as a consequence of slavery

> and therefore in the first instance involving black and white European and African, in a fixed superiority/inferiority relationship, tended first to the culturation of white and black to the new Caribbean environments; and, at the same time, because of the terms and the conditions of slavery, to the acculturation of black interculturation going on between these two elements. (*The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica, 1770-1820* 11)

In the light of Brathwaite's depiction of creolisation, creolisation in the Caribbean societies can be studied and analysed historically. Kamau Brathwaite makes a point in relation to language and slavery: "[I]t was in language that the slave was perhaps most successfully imprisoned by his master, and it was in his (mis-)use of it that he perhaps most effectively rebelled" (qtd. in James 120). As Frantz Fanon discusses in *Black Skins, White Masks*, language is the crucial issue in forming a Caribbean identity; the formation of Creole, which stems from the language of the coloniser, presents a complexity regarding a new language as "a new way of being" in that "every dialect is a way of thinking" (25). Louis James elaborates on the forms of Creole which have become part of the Caribbean society: "Creole forms began to emerge by the end of the eighteenth century, enabling slaves from different tribes to communicate with each other in forms that varied from that of their masters. 'White' children learnt this Creole from their nurses and, as the language of childhood, it infiltrated West Indian society as a whole" (120). He also notes that "Creole forms vary across the Caribbean, where even today a Trinidadian may find it hard to understand demotic Jamaican" (120).

Sometimes pidgins and Creoles are used interchangeably; however, there is a difference between them which R. A. Hall explains as follows: If "two or more people use a language in a variety whose grammar and vocabulary are very much reduced in extent

and which is native to neither side" (xii) they speak a pidgin language; on the other hand, a creole " arises when a pidgin becomes the native language of a speech community, as in the Caribbean" (xii). According to Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith, the main difference between them is that 'pidgins do not have native speakers while Creoles do" (3).

In the light of the information about Creoles in the Caribbean, it can be observed that Antoinette's situation is complicated. Spivak argues that Antoinette, a white Creole, who grows up during the emancipation in Jamaica, is "caught between the imperialist and the black native" (250). Antoinette's alienation is illustrated in different crises. Moira Ferguson comments:

> She shares a history with African-Dominicans, and she wants to be one of them but they reject her. Antoinette's largesse toward indigent blacks, scathingly disparaged by Rochester, her beautiful attire imported from the 'Paris of the West Indies,' while troped as evidence of a new self-respect, specify the indelible, colonizing mentality of a family that has extorted and appropriated Caribbean land, money, and labor over centuries. (316)

With a shared history with African-Dominicans, Antoinette has a desire to be one of them; however, they do not accept her. In terms of belonging, Antoinette, in Ferguson's words, "belongs to no one and belongs nowhere," and her alienation is continual, existing "in the margins of everyone else's lives;" moreover, her dreams reveal her "inner conflicts" about her life, and they also show the English husband's plan to subsume her (317). Ferguson notes that Antoinette "never surrenders," arguing "[s]he hails, after all, from stock that had hung on to the bitter end in slave colonies and had emancipation thrust upon them" (317).

Along with a shared history, Nicole Terrien comments on Antoinette regarding her language and her relationships with Tia and Christophine:

> Antoinette's language contains traces of the language used by the black population or by Christophine, showing that her sense of self derives from multicultural influences. Afraid of being a "white nigger" or a "white cockroach", she accepts her friend Tia's contempt for the impoverished planters; as a "Beke", she fits in Christophine's categories imported from Martinique. (*WSS* 76)

Antoinette is part of the black society: she shares their life to some extent, such as in her experiences with Tia: "We boiled green bananas in an old iron pot and ate them with our fingers out of a calabash […]" (*WSS* 7-8). She also shares their superstition, believing that Christophine can help her to regain the English husband's affections.

The novel portrays people from two different worlds. Antoinette's relationship with Tia illustrates this point. While enjoying a friendship, they have a disagreement, and they say things which affect them: Antoinette tells Tia that she is "a cheating nigger," and Tia calls Antoinette a "white nigger," telling her that she is not "real white people" (*WSS* 8). Ever changing "colonial relations" caused a difficult childhood for Antoinette. She grows up "lonely and increasingly introspective - a double outsider – able to do little else than internalize the opprobrium of formerly colonized people on whose company and frienship she depended" (Ferguson 315). Interestingly, Antoinette admits that Tia, who is her close friend, and others "hated us. They called us white cockroaches…Nobody wants you" (*WSS* 23). One night Coulibri Estate is set on fire by a crowd of the ex-slaves: Pierre, her brother dies, her mother goes mad, and Antoinette is wounded in a conflict with Tia. Thus, this event reveals the complexity of the relationship between the blacks, ex-slaves, and the creolised whites. The confrontation with Tia symbolizes, in Howells words, Antoinette's "desire for self-completion, in what is also a scene of complicity and betrayal" (111). During the incident, when Antoinette leaves Coulibri, she sees Tia, and wants to run towards her, since she is part of her life:

> When I was close I saw the jagged stone in her hand but I did not see her throw it. I did not feel it either, only something wet, running down my face. I looked at her and I saw her face crumple up as she began to cry. We stared at each other, blood

> on my face, tears on hers. It was as if I saw myself. Like in a looking-glass. (*WSS* 23)

Antoinette's sense of identity is destabilised by the experience with Tia. In Gallez's words, Antoinette is troubled by "a firm identification of herself with Tia" (174) in their violent meeting: "It was as if I saw myself. Like in a looking- glass" (*WSS* 38). Gallez states that "Tia represents her alter-ego, an extension of herself, and the gesture of beckoning, together with Antoinette's jump, may therefore be seen as a positive act of establishing her own sense of self, of going forward to meet the identity which she has been deprived of in the unnatural environment imposed upon her" (174). Even at the end of the novel, seeing Tia in her dream points out "Antoinette's confused sense of identity" (Gallez 174).

Here the complexity of hybridity and hybrid identity can be observed. For Terrien, hybridity is a system in which "society and the novel are tightly organized" (77). Comparing Bertha and Jane in *Jane Eyre*, Terrien states that Antoinette becomes "a modern heroine" as follows:

> In *Jane Eyre*, Bertha is trapped in her role as the mad woman whereas Jane manages to escape from the part of the villain or the victim. In *Wide Sargasso Sea*, although restrained within a tragic plot, Antoinette achieves revenge and gains an identity as a modern heroine. To make us read an individual gesture as a political act may be another characteristic of the hybridization. (76)

In order to intensify the importance of hybridity, Terrien argues that Antoinette "becomes the heroine Bertha could never be"; in other words, while being "a secondary character [Antoinette] is turned into a heroine" (76).

As a "heroine" Antoinette looks in mirrors. Carr notes that Rhys's protagonists "spend a good deal of time looking in mirrors, sometimes at photos, even at ghosts of themselves, descending into the unknown, searching for some understanding of their being which is other than the definitions thrust upon them" (58-59). Tiffin also argues that "for the

white Creole, the impossibility of identifying either with the English or with the black Caribbeans is what makes so imperative the search in the looking-glass for an alternative image" (qtd. in Carr 59). Carr also argues that "[n]aming and mirroring are intimately connected in Rhys's fiction" (59). When the English husband renames Antoinette Bertha, she is aware of "Antoinette drifting out of the window with her scents, her pretty clothes and her looking-glass":

> There is no looking-glass here and I don't know what I am like now. I remember watching myself brush my hair and how my eyes looked back at me. The girl I saw was myself yet not quite myself. Long ago when I was a child and very lonely I tried to kiss her. But the glass was between us – hard and cold and misted over with my breath. Now they have taken every thing away. What I am doing in this place and who am I? (*WSS* 147)

"The looking-glass in Rhys's fiction does not provide an escape," Carr argues, "from the rift between the self that defines and the self defined, between the self that invents and the invented self" (59). Carr adds that the looking-glass "offers the chance to trace a tentative, approximate identity" (59).

Carr also notes that "[t]his is the process by which her protagonists recognize themselves, or something like themselves, in others. After Coulibri has been set on fire by the blacks, Antoinette wants, instead of leaving with her white family, to run back to her black childhood friend Tia" (Carr 59). In the light of "As if I saw myself" (*WSS* 38), the image in the looking-glass is not quite herself. In Carr's words, "the politics of imperialism have both made them alike and separated them for ever" (60). According to Carr, "Rhys's protagonists search for an escape from their isolation, from their unhomeliness: they look for love, for acceptance, for a chance to join" (63).

On the other hand, the English husband weakens her confidence by calling her Bertha instead of Antoinette, making her someone she is not. Thus Antoinette finds herself in a state of uncertainty: being rejected by the blacks, and not being fully accepted by the English husband. According to Terrien, Rochester regards her as "one of the native flowers he tramples because he is afraid of their alien scent" (76); even the local soil

appears not to accept her because of being a hybrid. The sense of rejection seems to be part of her lot. In other words, she is neither black nor white; she is in-betweenness, and is caught between two opposing worlds. As the English husband and Antoinette hear Amelie, a servant, singing, it is only Antoinette who understands the words, and she says: "It was a song about 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" (*WSS* 63). Antoinette's identity crisis is deep-rooted. Therefore, her passivity and inability to deal with this problem lead her to lean on the English husband who is neither helpful nor loving. Her passivity is striking: "I make no effort to save myself; if anyone were to try to save me I would refuse. This must happen" (34). Antoinette in a way belongs to no one, and what is more belongs nowhere: she is an alien, a hybrid. "At her most dehumanized, incarcerated in perpetuity," Moira Ferguson argues, "she finally defines herself by leaping decisively toward Tia and life-in-death. She bridges the wide Sargasso Sea in an effort at black-white union and positive connection" (317).

Names are vital to the sense of identity. *The New Encylopaedia Britannica* defines name as a "word or group of words used to refer to an individual entity (real or imaginary); the name singles out this entity by directly pointing to it, not by specifying it as a member of a class" ("Names" 733). According to The *Encyclopedia of Religion*, "[t]o be human is to name, and be named, and thereby to possess full being and the ability to relate to the world in meaningful ways" (300). The Bible displays the importance placed on names and naming; this can be seen in the story of Adam and Eve in the first book of the Bible called Genesis. In Genesis the creation of animals is described in these words: "Now the Lord God had formed out of the ground all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air" (2:19). Then God gives Adam, before Eve is created, the role to name all the animals: "He brought them to see what he would name them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that was its name" (2:19). In consequence, in the Bible God shows that naming is a central aspect of His action. According to God, in Joseph M. Flora's words "the great Author" (1), naming is a crucial aspect of power. The *Encyclopedia of Religion* explains that there is a

relationship between naming and power in these words:“There is power in names because they both participate in the reality named and give definition and identity to that reality. That is, name and named exist in a mutual relationship in which the power of the former is shared with the being of the latter” (300-301).

In her article titled “Katrina and Colonialism: The sins of our Forefathers perpetuated?” Amy E. Gould defines re-naming as a “[…] process of identifying what has become known by giving the accepted view a new framework” (521). In the history of slavery, renaming occurred because slave owners were determined to rename the slaves, choosing the names which were, in Gisli Pallson’s words, “not unlike those applied to pets and livestock” (624). According to Pallson, in this way “[…] the persona of the slave is deformed with the new name, torn from its former social environment […]” (624). Slaves were not in a position to reject being renamed; they had to acknowledge it. Pallson continues to explain the reason by saying that “[t]his was part of the erasure of identity and history that characterized the […] Middle Passage, between West Africa and the plantations” (624-625). What is more, in order to “humiliate” the slaves, slaveholders chose historical names for them such as “Cicero,” reminding them of their “marginal subjectivity” (625).

White owners were keen to rename their slaves; they realised that renaming is, in Trevor Burnard’s words, “part of the transformative process whereby Africans became their property” (329). Burnard states that slave owners were aware of the fact that naming was “neither a casual affair nor a matter suited to levity” (336). Burnard argues “[…] a modicum of respect for slaves’ dignity and perhaps recognition that master-slave relations were always a matter of negotiation, even if power was mostly on one side” (336). While pointing out the fact that there is room for “slaves’ dignity,” he implies that humiliating slaves can be avoided, to some extent, by treating the strained relationships in these words: “Naming to humiliate would have unnecessarily strained relationships that were already antagonistic” (336). “The act of possession by naming, or more precisely renaming,” David V. Trotman argues, “was common practice in the history of European colonisation in the Caribbean” (22). European colonisers designated their invasion of their “New World” through different formalities and actions,

including naming, which are described by the title of the book written by Patricia Seed: *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1402-1600*. In her book Seed elaborates on how important naming is in these words:

> French, Spanish, and Dutch settlers both named and claimed to possess through naming. Portuguese settlers recognised naming as a means of establishing power, but viewed it as an oppressive form of colonialism. English rulers disparaged naming as a legitimate claim, with the ironic result of retaining a considerable number of indigenous names simply because naming was not pivotal to establishing colonial authority. (190)

Europeans comprehended the significance of naming while adopting different approaches. On the other hand, in his article "World Order Models," Edward Kamau Brathwaite notes the importance of the deletion of names : "The Caribbean: […] Before the missilic intrusion of Columbus […] was a part of Amerindia: and the fact that we can find no other than this artificial name is symptomatic of what becomes the problem: no name: no man: Red Skin, Bush Negro, Aborigine" (57). In line with this, Valérie Loichot states that "the erasure of name works as a metonymy of a crossed-out identity" (1). The idea of "no name, no man" portrays how crucial naming is; in the history of colonisation "the absence of name," Loichot argues, "became symptomatic of a clearly-defined and proper identity" (11). Loichot continues his argument by bringing some clarification to the reason of the importance of naming, he says: "If the colonizers named the fellow-creatures they ruled, it was on the assumption that they were less or other than men and women" (11). In consequence, "[t]o become human" he states, "coincides with the conquest of a name of one's own" (11).

As for surnames, slaves were not given surnames; in his article titled "Names and Naming in Afro-Caribbean Cultures," Richard D.E. Burton notes that surnames "[…] betokened generational continuity and adulthood, both of which owners were anxious to deny" (41). He elaborates on how they took over the names that belonged to their masters as follows:

> So too the slaves and ex-slaves of the British Caribbean when, later, they actively and voluntarily sought to take over the names of their masters and ex-masters. To take the name of the freest and most powerful white man most of them knew was, for slaves and ex-slaves, the most dramatic way of asserting and displaying their own freedom and power, and it was freedom and power, rather than beholdenness, gratitude or love, that they were signalling when, apparently uncoerced, they took over the names Beckles, Beckford, Brathwaite, or Best. (52-53)

As a result, writers are aware of the power they use in the naming and not naming of their characters. The mastery of naming, renaming and not naming is observed in Rhys's work. For her, naming and not naming are part of power.

"Naming and addressing is an act of possession" argues Firdous Azim "to be performed by the dominant subject" (55). She continues her argument by pointing out the significance of the use of "proper names" which plays a key role in the history of the novel (71). In *Of Grammatology,* Derrida underlines their importance in these words:

> What the interdict is laid upon is the uttering of what *functions* as the proper name. And this function is *consciousness* itself… The lifting of the interdict, the great game of denunciation and the great exhibition of the 'proper'… does not consist in revealing proper names, but in tearing a veil hiding a classification and an appurtenance, the inscription within a system of linguistic and social differences. (111 emphasis original)

The "proper names" are linked to a system of classification; for example, its pronouncement is regarded in a descriptive way as: "tearing the veil." Azim notes that the use of the proper names "performs a revelatory, confessional function" (72). However, not using the proper names in literary works such as *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* is crucial, highlighting the problem of identity in terms of naming. In fact, the loss of both self and identity can be best demonstrated through the loss of name in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. For example, take Antoinette's name "Bertha Antoinette Cosway Mason Rochester" in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, which changes according to the family situations; as a result, Antoinette's identity keeps on being defined, in McLeod's words,

"in relation both *to* men and *by* men" (167). Such a long complicated name draws attention to the extent to which Antoinette's hybrid identity is always being redefined in perpetual motion, in relation to men who come into her life. In Part One, Antoinette is aware of the imposed names. When she goes to the convent, a nun asks her name and she tells her true name: "'Antoinette.'" The nun responds: "'I know. You are Antoinette Cosway, that is to say Antoinette Mason' " (28). While saying she is "Antoinette" at the convent, she faces the surnames of her father and her step-father which are uttered by the nun. However, it is the step-father's surname that is highlighted in her identity; thus she loses something about her identity which stems from the loss of her surname which belongs to her father. As a result, she is not called Antoinette Cosway, but Antoinette Mason. Later, Antoinette describes the embroidery she is doing: "Underneath, I will write my name in fire red Antoinette Mason, née Cosway, Mount Calvary Convent, Spanish Town, Jamaica, 1839" (29), drawing attention to the changes in her name.

In Part Two, Antoinette faces the three invented names: Bertha Mason Rochester; thus, Antoinette's awareness of the power related to names becomes obvious as she tells the English husband that his wish to call her by another name is "'obeah too'" (*WSS* 95), which is a kind of spiritual possession. "Bertha is not my name. You are trying to make me into someone else, calling me by another name. I know, that's obeah too" (*WSS* 95). Antoinette challenges her husband, reminding him of the fact that the name he chooses to call her is not her name; moreover, she argues that he is seeking to turn her into someone else she is not. In other words, through obeah he attempts to possess her.

Here the English husband appears to be involved in obeah by calling Antoinette Bertha "the name of Bronte's mad wife" (Howells 118); as a result of this, Antoinette starts displaying the indication of violence: "She smashed another bottle against the wall and stood with the broken glass in her hand and murder in her eyes. 'Just you touch me once. You'll soon see if I'm a dam' coward like you are"' (*WSS* 149). Behaving violently, Antoinette turns into "the mad Bertha Mason of *Jane Eyre*" (Howells 119), "this red-eyed wild-haired stranger who was my wife shouting obscenities at me" (*WSS* 96).

The English husband turns her into a mad woman and she becomes the "doll-like object" (Howells 119) for him: "*Marionette, Antoinette, Marionette, Antoinette*" (WSS 154 emphasis original). In being forced to leave Granbois, Antoinette is reduced to the "position of the colonial other" in her country where "blankness and silence are all that is allowed" (Howells 119). In his book titled *The Wretched of the Earth* , Frantz Fanon agues that "[a]t the individual level, violence is a cleansing force. It rids the colonized of their inferiority complex, of their passive and despairing attitude. It emboldens them, and restores their self-confidence" (51). Antoinette challenges the coloniser by resisting in the form of violence; in other words, she brings instability into his life. She also challenges him over his usage of her name as follows:

> 'What right have you to make promises in my name? Or to speak for me at all?'
>
> 'No, I had no right, I am sorry. I don't understand you. I know nothing about you, and I cannot speak for you.' (*WSS* 112)

As the English husband leaves for England with his "mad" wife, he is compelled to see how limited his power is, and he expresses this as follows:

> Above all I hated her. For she belonged to the magic and the loveliness. She had left me thirsty and all my life would be thirst and longing for what I had lost before I found it. (*WSS* 172)

[T]he name 'Antoinette' rhymes with 'marionetta'", argues Gallez, "and the idea of Antoinette as a doll, having no control over her own destiny, is re-evoked" (Gallez 160). The English husband's refusal not to call Antoinette by her name Antoinette challenges her identity.

In Part Three, Antoinette realises the authority of the removal of a name: When the English husband renames Antoinette as Bertha, she first says: "It doesn't matter" (*WSS* 81); however, later she says, "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" (116). Antoinette's words illustrate her comprehension that the

change of name leads to the loss of both self and identity; thus loss of power can be experienced, and this is the point Christophine personifies and wrestles with while persisting in demanding that the English husband mention and call his wife by name. The way in which Antoinette's name is changed by new names given her by British colonial men illustrates "her own identification with the black Creoles and with the colony itself" (O'Connor 196).

Here, again, the situation of women under patriarchy and of blacks is compared, and Rhys implies that identity can be "determined by the politics of imperialism" (Spivak 250). As Spivak notes, *Wide Sargasso Sea is* "a novel which rewrites a canonical English text within the European novelistic tradition in the interest of the white Creole rather than the native" (253). It depicts Antoinette/Bertha as caught between the English imperialist and the black Jamaican. Her hybridity, being both Caribbean and English while being neither Caribbean nor English, makes her "shift between the two national" "realities" requiring a lot of "energy to retain the existence of both simultaneously" (Raiskin 254). Rhys rescues Bertha Mason from the attic in which she was locked by Bronte in *Jane Eyre*. "The madwoman in the attic" is given a chance through which she can claim her name, her history, her story, her sanity. Consequently, it will not be easy any more to perceive her or her husband, the English husband, only from the perspective of Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. She no longer stands in the way of Jane's happiness, and the English husband is no longer in a position to present himself as a romantic hero.

According to Ferguson, Antoinette uses her weapon which is a "vivid memory" in order to "strike back." "No matter how Rochester tries to deaden her with a protracted, bestial existence," Ferguson argues, "she sporadically creates herself anew, resurrects parts of her old self. Like slaves of old she attempts to murder the owner of the Great House" (324). He notes that she chooses "revolutionary acts of slavery- suicide" over "fleeing" or "resisting;" in this way she attempts to reconnect with people who are close to her heart such as Tia and Christophine (324). After all, like her who is othered, they are the English husband's "designated others" (324). Ferguson argues that her choice of suicide "mimics the actions of slaves, of communities she could not join" (324). As a result of seeing the English husband's cruel inhumanity, she concedes "heinous past actions of

her family toward slaves" (324). The novel ends ambiguously. "Is Antoinette the destroyed or the destroyer as she burns down the English house?" (Carr 76).

Unlike Antoinette, the English husband has no name in the novel; Rhys deprives him of his name in her rewriting. Faced with the complexity of hybridity, the English husband, a hybrid, experiences in-betweenness on a class and economic level.

In the nineteenth century England, class and and money were important factors which determined one's position in one's society. In her essay titled "Class and Money", Julia Prewitt Brown states that in nineteenth- century England, class was particularly based on money. According to her essay, there are three classes: "upper, middle, and lower; or ruling class, bourgeoisie, and working class" (72). She comments on the upper class which "can be divided into three sections: the aristocracy, the gentry, and the squirarchy or class of independent gentlemen who did not have to work. The aristocracy were the great landed proprietors whose estates exceeded 10,000 acres [..] who, for the most part, belonged to the peerage. […] Beneath them, the gentry was made up of the smaller landed proprietors whose estates ran from 1,000 to 10,000 acres […]" (73). "Moving a step lower," notes Brown that "the much larger group of borderline gentry and independent gentlemen had less land and income; these gentlemen and their families lived on about […] 700 [pounds] to […] 1,000 [pounds] a year" (73). In addition to this information, Brown explains what these figures mean in today's world: "a member of the real aristocracy, whose income exceeded […] 10,000 [pounds] a year, would possess in today's terms a minimum fortune of $2 million. The gentry's income went from about $200,000 to $2 million a year, and the average gentleman needed today's equivalent of $200,000 a year to retain a place in the upper class and not work for a living" (74). To have the life style which upper class,in particular, aristocracy demands "one had to be of titled rank, to own an estate exceeding 10,000 acres, to have enough money in revenues to live opulently, and to own a house in London to go to during the social season" (74). Brown also notes that "[i]t took the work of several generations, as well as prosperous marriages, to put together a fortune of […] 30,000 [pounds], which would be the minimum sum necessary for maintaining a gentleman's family and

residence on interest alone" (79). Today "30,000 pounds" equivalent to "$6 million" (79).

In the light of the class system described by Brown, the English husband belongs to the upper class but he is not a member of the aristocracy because he has no title; nevertheless, he participates in upper class life. Born into a wealthy upper class family, "duty bound to the law of the father" (Ferguson 311) as a younger son without a real prospect for the future (the family fortune going to the elder son) the English husband is under pressure to maintain the family status and/or upper class life style, and goes to the Caribbean to marry a wealthy heiress. In this regard, Kenneth Ramchand states that Rhys "is building upon a type situation in island history – the marrying of Creole heiresses for their dowry by indigent, but socially well-connected younger sons" (*The West Indian Novel and Its Background* 234). Thus, the English husband is a representation of in-betweenness in terms of class and finance; in other words, he is a hybrid on the class and economic level. As a result, both in England and the Caribbean he finds himself in his Third Space - negotiating: in England with his father and the class system which is mostly based on money; in the Caribbean with Mason, Antoinette's stepbrother, and Antoinette. In line with this, Moira Ferguson argues that "Antoinette is the site of negotiations of power between Rochester and Mason […], her stepbrother [to whom] she is dispensable property that can be bartered for a respectable lineage, something resident plantocrats rarely possessed but always craved" (312). In addition to the site of negotiations of power, Antoinette is also "the site of a different version of slavery: a legally free woman is bought because she owns property" (312). In other words, a legally free woman is turned into a dispensable property, leading into a kind of slave within patriarchal and colonial discourses. As can be seen above, Antoinette reclaims her name, but is unable to reclaim her money which she loses through marriage; without her economical independence she becomes a slave. Interestingly, the English husband loses or "sells" his soul, and she loses or "sells" her freedom, economical independence and mental ability.

The economic relationship between the English husband and Bertha, born in Jamaica, is particularly crucial; for through his marriage to her, he obtains 30,000 pounds which

helps him maintain his wealthy lifestyle at Thornfield. In her essay titled '"Indian Ink," Susan Meyer notes that Jane's inheritance of twenty thousand pounds in *Jane Eyre* comes from a colonial source:

> It comes from her uncle in Madeira, who is an agent for a Jamaican wine manufacturer, Bertha's brother. The location of Jane's uncle John [Eyre] in Madeira, off Morocco, on the west African coast, where Richard Mason stops on his way home from England, also indirectly suggests, through Mason's itinerary, the triangular route of the British slave traders, and suggests that John Eyre's wealth is implicated in the slave trade. (93)

In other words, without Bertha's money, namely money from colonialism, the English husband could not keep and enjoy his lifestyle at Thornfield Hall.

What was his life like in the Caribbean? To begin with, the English husband has no name in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. "One's sympathy for Antoinette is evoked," Dash argues,"but is counterbalanced by a corresponding sympathy and understanding for Rochester, himself a victim, an outsider, brought into a society he is unable to comprehend" (125). Rhys sheds light on the English husband's alienation as well. While riding with Antoinette during their honeymoon, this is what he experiences: "Eveything is too much, I felt as I rode wearily after her. Too much blue, too much purple, too much green. The flowers too red, the mountains too high, the hills too near" (39). As a newcomer, although a coloniser, he experiences a culture shock, feeling overwhelmed and finding everything there "too much." What is more, the West Indies is regarded as Hell: the English husband describes it as hell as he speaks with Jane. This depiction appears to support some colonial assumptions: these references, uttered by the English husband, make Jamaica look like a hell on earth.

> "One night I had been awakened by her yells […] it was a fiery West Indian night […]. 'This life,' said I at last, 'is hell! - this is the air-those are the sounds of the bottomless pit! I have a right to deliver myself from it if I can […] let me break away, and go home to God! […]. "A wind fresh from Europe blew over the ocean and rushed through the open casement: the storm broke,

> streamed, thundered, blazed, and the air grew pure […]. It was true Wisdom that consoled me in that hour, and showed me the right path […].” “The sweet wind from Europe was still whispering in the refreshed leaves, and the Atlantic was still whispering in the refreshed leaves, and the Atlantic was thundering in glories liberty […].” “‘Go,’ said Hope, ‘and live again in Europe […] .You have done all that God and Humanity require of you.’” (*Jane Eyre* 358-60)

As a result, the turbulent conditions of Jamaica seem to have influenced Bertha in terms of tempestuous behavior. In some ways, Bertha symbolises what could happen to the English husband in Jamaica: madness and a barbarous life. What protects him from potential madness? The answer comes from Europe as “[a] wind fresh from Europe.” The representation of Bertha, Jamaica and the economic relations in *Jane Eyre* reflect the relationship between the novel and the assumptions of colonialism (McLeod 156). He feels everything is uncontrollable: to him everything in nature, including trees, colours, mountains, the flora and fauna in the West Indies seems strange, threatening, and uncomfortable. He explains how he feels: “It seemed to me that everything round me was hostile. The telescope drew away and said don’t touch me. The trees were threatening and the shadows of the trees moving slowly over the floor menaced me […]. There was nothing I knew, nothing to comfort me” (*WSS* 96).

In addition to the nature of the setting that frightens him and makes him uncomfortable, the English husband faces another dilemma. He has a problem with Antoinette in terms of relationship and communication. He expresses his inability to relate to her in these words: “[…] a stranger who did not think or feel as I did” (*WSS* 56). What is more, the letter from Daniel Cosway, in which he claims that he is Antoinette’s step-brother, makes an impact on the English husband; he ends up thinking that he is married to a Creole girl from a family of colour that is associated with mental illness. In consequence, the sense of alienation the English husband experiences has both physical and cultural aspects. These aspects find a new way of expression for the English husband, who sleeps with Amelie, the servant girl, and Antoinette, in her despair, hits him with a bottle. Christophine, Antoinette’s black nurse, comes and calms her down. The English husband finds himself ignored, and not accepted; he feels that both his wife and the community have rejected him, and goes through mood swings between “an

aggrieved self-importance and desire for revenge" (Ferguson 317). With these experiences and Christophine's gory tales, which are violent, the English husband's alienation increases. *Wide Sargasso Sea* presents a conflict and "[…] a struggle between old and new colonial enemies who act defensively toward African-Caribbeans and each other" (Ferguson 317).

Some critics comment that *Wide Sargasso Sea* approaches the English husband with understanding and sympathy, since it is he who narrates the second part of the novel. Rhys shows that he is a victim of the patriarchal inheritance law of entailment, going to Jamaica to find an heiress. His situation can be illustrated in the letters he attempts to write to his father: "I thought about the letter which should have been written to England a week ago. Dear Father […]" (*WSS* 39). This is the first attempt to write a letter which is not written. Later he makes an effort to write, trying to express his frustration as a younger son in these words:

> Dear Father. The thirty thousand pounds have been paid to me without question or condition. No provision made for her (that must be seen to)…I will never be a disgrace to you or to my dear brother the son you love. No begging letters, no mean requests. None of the furtive shabby manoeuvres of a younger son. I have sold my soul or you have sold it, and after all is it such a bad bargain? The girl is thought to be beautiful. And yet […]. (*WSS* 39)

Here the English husband refers to Antoinette as "the girl," avoiding the use of her name entirely; the manner in which he evades her name indicates something about his "emotional distance" (Gallez 144) from her that goes back to the way he describes her as a "stranger" (*WSS* 39), namely the other. At first, to him she is "the woman [who] is a stranger," then she becomes "the girl [who] is thought to be beautiful" (*WSS* 39). On his second attempt he writes a letter which is not sent. He says:

> Dear Father, we have arrived from Jamaica after an uncomfortable few days. This little estate in the Windward Islands is part of the family property and Antoinette is much attached to it… All is well and has gone according to your plans and wishes. I dealt of course with Richard Mason… He seemed

> to become attached to me and trusted me completely. This place is very beautiful but my illness has left me too exhausted to appreciate it fully. I will write again in a few days' time. (*WSS* 43)

The pressure from his family to fulfil the obligation is observed in his writing letters; the English husband makes an effort to write to his father, describing the situation. In her book titled *The Rhys Woman*, Paula Le Gallez comments on the English husband's cruelty:

> In Rhys's text his character is considerably fleshed out so that his cruelty becomes understandable while, at the same time, just as unacceptable. Because Rhys allows the reader an insight into Edward's make-up and motivation, his behavior is, to a certain extent, explained. Its cruelty is not ameliorated thereby, but it is, at least, observed to be a constituent element of his own human frailty – a fatal flaw in his personality. (142)

However, his cruelty – robbing Antoinette of her name, locking her up and making love to Amélie in order to hurt them both – which is "understandable" but "unacceptable," is challenged by both Antoinette and Christophine within the context of the patriarchal and colonial discourses. While Antoinette challenges him, to a certain extent, in terms of naming, Christophine challenges him, to a great extent, in terms of finance, namely money. She questions his attitude in these words:

> She is Creole girl and she have the sun in her. Tell the truth now. She don't come to your house in this place England… No, it's you come all the long way to her house – it's you who beg her to marry. And she love you and she give you all she have. Now you say you don't love her and you break her up. What you do with her money, eh? (*WSS* 101)

In other words, the English husband's superiority as a new coloniser is challenged; his image is reduced to a "violator and thief" (Howells 119).

In Part Three, the English husband almost succeeds in turning Antoinette into what he wants. In Ferguson's words, into "a madwoman who will validate a neocolonizer's

inhuman actions" (321). He takes Antoinette to England where she is "treated as his historical misfortune, a crazy wife whom he mercifully incarcerates in his own attic, not an institution; his retinue will pamper him for being a martyr. They will never know that he opted to degrade her in this way […]" (Ferguson 321). In the end "Antoinette conjures up Christophine and Tia as living presences," Ferguson argues, "before she leaps into flames that destroy his property. They inspire her and provoke her victorious yet tragic decision. […] torn between old and new worlds, alienated from both on one hand and uniting them on the other, in an eternal posture of conflict" (Ferguson 321).

In short, faced with the complexities of hybridity on class and economic levels, the English husband, a new coloniser, experiences the challenges posed by the colonised. Unlike the English husband, Daniel Cosway, Antoinette's half brother, has a name, but his father cannot remember his name, asking him the very question: "[W]hat's – your – name [?]" (WSS 77). As a mulatto Daniel encounters the complexity of hybridity; disclaiming him and not remembering his name, his father reduces Daniel to nothing.

Mulatto is a Spanish word for "young mule" (1595), which refers to the offspring of a European and a negro (*OED*). This term, mulatto, is utilised interchangeably with mestizo/mestizaje/metisse to express a mixed society and/or a culture it produces. Edward Tylor defines mulatto as follows: "The result of intermarriage of crossing of races is familiar to all English people in one of its most conspicuous examples, the cross between white and negro called mulatto (Spanish *mulato*, from *mula*, a mule) (4 emphasis original). According to Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, mulatto is "usually confined to the classifications of miscegenation employed in racist slave discourse, specifically referring to a slave who is one half white" (133). Ann Phoenix and Charlie Owen elaborate on this:

> Although people with one black and one white parent have historically been categorised as black, they have, simultaneously (and contradictorily), been identified as separate from both black and white people. The specific terms commonly used to describe people of mixed parentage, and sexual unions between black and white people, tend to pathologise those who cannot easily be fitted into the taken-for-granted racialised binary opposition.

> Thus, ‘half-caste’, ‘mixed race’, ‘bi-racial’, ‘maroon’, ‘mulatto’ (from mule) and ‘métis’ (French for mongrel dog) all demonstrate essentialism and bipolar thinking. (74)

As can be seen, mulattos show essentialism. Here it may be helpful to give some background information about mulattos and their families in terms of employment and finance. In the colonies, menial household work was largely performed by local men; for example, cooks, servants and cleaners were mainly indigenous men. The employment of colonized and/or indigenous men in household jobs was significant, showing their powerlessness and the power of British colonialism. Using men for menial work did not make women jobless: women were used as prostitutes and bearers of children. Instead of their father’s status, the children of slaves had their mother’s status, in contrast to the British law in the eighteenth century. Under this law, without explicit laws, children of slave mothers, if their fathers were white men (which often happened), and not slaves, could have eschewed enslavement, and they could be seen as white and free; the result of this would affect plantation owners. In order to keep the colonizer and colonized separate, colonial governments and the central imperial government limited marriages between local women and coloniser males in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; colonised peoples were expected to observe British behaviours and values; the other way round was regarded as contamination (Levine 127-8). In his novel titled *Cambridge*, Caryl Phillips depicts the background of the relationship between white men and black women as follows:

> Some white men, though considering negroes little more than beasts of burden, had no objection to making these negroes partners of their illicit intercourse, and then condemning the issue of such unions to shame and degradation. The female offspring invariably take the name of housekeeper and in turn become the mistresses of white men, while the male offspring merely drag out an existence as scarcely tolerated spaniels permitted to lick the feet of their masters, but just as likely to be kicked out of doors on a whim. (52)

The mothers of these mixed-race children, who are left with almost nothing, turn to prostitutions to survive; however, they end up struggling with poverty and diseases.

This is the lot they face, and again this is the very thing, namely immorality, that becomes an open secret in the Caribbean (52-53).

When it comes to the children of white men and black women, their situation is depicted in *Cambridge* in these words: "Naturally, the children of such unions receive the status of the slave mother, unless manumitted by their fathers" (75-76). These children are hardly recognised as "heirs," belonging to their slave black mother's rank; however, they are seen as hybrid people, "who are above the black, but below the white" (76).

In his book *The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica: 1770-1820*, Edward Braithwaite states that unlike the blacks working and keeping their African traditions on the plantations, the free colored and "elite blacks," the white Creole find themselves in ambivalence, "conceived of visibility through the lenses of their masters' already uncertain vision as a form of 'greyness' – an imitation of an imitation. Whenever the opportunity made it possible, they and their descendents rejected or disowned their own culture, becoming, like their masters, 'mimic-men'" (308). In the novel, the letter Daniel writes to the English husband reflects this mimicry. He begins his letter in these words: "Dear Sir. I take up my pen after long thought and meditation but in the end the truth is better than a lie. I have this to say. You have been shamefully deceived by the Mason family" (*WSS* 57). Like the English husband, Daniel turns to writing, and writes a letter, unveiling some family secrets which contain some truth and lies, but unlike the English husband, he makes sure that the English husband receives his letter; in other words, as a mimic-man he is the other of the English husband, illustrating a mirror for the English husband. Daniel Cosway spoils the English husband and Antoinette's honeymoon with accusations about madness in Antoinette's family and his connections with the family, causing conflicts which never end: "I am your wife's brother […] I am poverty stricken" (*WSS* 58). Despite claiming to be Antoinette's half brother, it is not clear that Daniel Cosway is her illegitimate half brother. In some ways Daniel proves the English husband's fears which revolve around his marriage: his wife comes from a miscegenous family; in other words, his new-found fortune is tainted. As a result, Daniel destabilises the new coloniser, the English husband, in regard to his marriage to

Antoinette by giving him some information about his wife which contains some lies or half-truths; for example, mixed-race offspring, madness and her relationship with Sandy Cosway, her cousin.

During the English husband's visit, Daniel Cosway talks about his father and refers to "'that damn devil my father' " (*WSS* 77), showing how much he is obsessed with the love he does not receive from his father and similarly the English husband suffers from the lack of parental love. Daniel Cosway reveals a similar attitude toward his father; he rejects his father, accusing him of crimes such as lack of interest and mercy. While talking about his father, Daniel Cosway shows that his love and hate for him are based on his mixed emotions due to being half black. In addition, he cannot hide the fact that he is hurt by his father's rejection, illustrated through his interest in money and his jealousy towards a brother who is loved more than he is by their father. This is how he depicts his time with his father during his last visit:

> 'Sixteen years old I was and anxious. I start very early. I walk all the way to Coulibri – five six hours it take. He don't refuse to see me; he receive me very cool and calm and first thing he tell me is I'm always pestering him for money. This because sometimes I ask help to buy a pair of shoes and such. Not to go barefoot like a nigger. Which I am not. He look at me like I was dirt and I get angry too." "I have my rights after all," I tell him and you know what he do? He laugh in my face. When he finished laughing he call me what's - your – name. "I can't remember all their names […]" he says […] "It's you yourself call me Daniel," I tell him. "I'm no slave like my mother was. (*WSS* 77)

As a hybrid, Daniel describes the complexities of being a mulatto, being regarded as "dirt." While depicting his situation, he finds himself in the Bhabhanian Third Space and challenges the coloniser who also happens to be his father: "I'm no slave."

After relating his visit to his father, Daniel talks about his brother in these words:

> 'Then there is my half brother Alexander, coloured like me but not unlucky like me, he will want to tell you all sorts of lies. He

> was the old man's favourite and he prosper right from the start. Yes, Alexander is a rich man now but he keep quiet about it. Because he prosper he is two-faced. He won't speak against white people.' (*WSS* 78)

Here his hurt can be observed: despite being a liar and a dishonest person, his brother, Alexander, manages to be a rich man and their father's favourite son. In a word, he reminds one of the English Husband's behaviour which finds an expression through Daniel.

Interestingly, Daniel unveils his hatred of his father by denouncing his sister, saying, "'Give my love to your wife – my sister' […]. 'You are not the first to kiss her pretty face. Pretty face, soft skin, pretty colour – not yellow like me. But my sister just the same…'" (WSS 79). In O'Connor's words, Daniel Cosway "gives voice to the darkest and meanest feelings that the English husband harbors" (205-6). Neither black nor white, and neither free nor slave, Daniel experiences "the same cultural perdition as does Antoinette" (O'Connor 204). However, in the Bhabhanian Third Space he challenges both his father and the English husband. In addition, with the information about Antoinette's family Daniel destabilises the English husband's confidence in his new status as a husband and coloniser. Daniel is the mirror of the English husband; somehow they understand each other in that they share an experience based on love they do not receive from their fathers.

Like Antoinette, the English husband and Daniel, Christophine is also a hybrid; she is a hybrid on a cultural and religious level. Rhys depicts her:

> She was much blacker – blue-black with a thin face and straight features. She wore a black dress, heavy gold earrings and a yellow handkerchief – carefully tied with the two high points in front. No other negro woman wore black, or tied her handkerchief Martinique fashion. She had a quiet voice and a quiet laugh (when she did laugh), and though she could speak good English if she wanted to, and French as well as patois, she took care to talk as they talked. But they would have nothing to do with her and she never saw her son who worked in Spanish

> Town. She had only one friend – a woman called Maillotte, and Maillotte was not a Jamaican. (*WSS* 6)

Despite her illiteracy, although "she could speak good English […] and French", Christophine seems to be confident about her judgement, understanding and analysis of the relationships and the situation in the West Indies: "Read and write I don't know. Other things I know.' She walked away without looking back" (*WSS* 105). Despite her love for Christophine and her dependency on her, Antoinette finds herself in an interesting position: "I stared at her, thinking, 'but how can she know the best thing for me to do, this ignorant, obstinate old negro woman, who is not certain if there is such a place as England?'" (*WSS* 69). However, the things she knows enable her to deal with the complexity of life in the West Indies.

In Nicole Terrien's words, hybridity allows the minorities to have a voice because the hybrid, "becomes a perfect representation of heritage. Each person, period, culture may choose what to keep from the past and what to reject" (80). African Caribbean people are also given voices, in particular, through Christophine, who has the dignity and independence of mind that Antoinette does not possess. Christophine is not from Jamaica; she comes from Martinique. As Spivak comments, "[t]axonomically, she belongs to the category of the good servant rather than that of the pure native" (252). In Christophine, "[…] within these borders," argues Spivak, "Rhys creates a powerfully suggestive figure" (252). Christophine is the first character who speaks in the opening paragraph of the novel: "The Jamaican ladies had never approved of my mother, 'because she pretty like pretty self' Christophine said" (*WSS* 3). Rhys uses Christophine in some crucial incidents in the novel. "'She was your father's wedding present to me'" explains Antoinette's mother, "'one of his presents'" (*WSS* 6). Slaves were forced to be called by names given by their owners, doing any work imposed on them by their masters. On the whole converts were given "Christian" names, like Christophine, which highlighted their social and cultural differences from the non-converted; they could not maintain their connection with their families and communities; and they faced missionary disapproval of local customs such as superstition. Black ritual practices, however, were significant. By the eighteenth century, Jamaican Baptists had formed a hybrid religion, combining Christian belief with West African myalism which involved

speaking with the spirits of the dead and ritual sacrifice. In other words, religious practices, as seen in Jamaica, showed some local flavour in a syncreticism, and therefore these practices were not approved by missionaries and white colonists (Levine 139). "There is one moment during the fire which is emblematic of this hybridized colonial culture," Howells argues, "as Antoinette recounts an incident as bizarre as any of those Providential interventions in *Jane Eyre*." When Mr Mason prays, 'May God Almighty defend us,' Antoinette says:

> 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. (*WSS* 42)

However, the answer to the prayer of "imperialist Christianity" is blended with the manners of black superstition which can be illustrated by the death of Coco, which speaks in French patois. Coco's death disturbs and intimidates the people: "It was very unlucky to kill a parrot, or even to see a parrot die. They began to go then, quickly, silently, and those who were left drew aside" (*WSS* 43).

Christophine is associated with "an older and purer African past;" and moreover, in O'Connor's words, her link to Africa is part of her power as an obeah priestess" (209). In a similar fashion, writing about the same geography in his novel *Cambridge*, Philipps offers a description of obeah as

> […] the negro belief […] [which] involves the possession of a variety of strange objects which are used for incantations: cats' ears, the feet of various animals, human hair, fish bones, etc., all of which make their vital contribution to the practice of the magical art. (74)

This is an effective custom in the black community. As a result, experienced practicians have a big influence over their black people, selling "medicines and charms" (74). As for the background of obeah, it "[…] was brought by the negroes from Africa, where open and devoted worship of the devil is still encouraged, and temples erected in his

honour" (89-90). "[T]he obeah man or woman," O'Connor argues, was "[t]he greatest religious obstacle" (211) for the blacks to be converted to Christianity. As Braithwaite states that

> [t]o achieve this [the conversion of the blacks], it was necessary for the missionaries to pluck out, root and branch, all vestiges of heathen (i.e., African) practices from those over whom they had acquired influence. The drum had to go. The dance had to go. A plurality of wives or women had to be put out of mind. Above all, obeah had to be confronted and defeated. (qtd. in O'Connor 211)

As can be seen, obeah is a hurdle which needs to be conquered. O'Connor argues that "[…] the conflict between Rochester and Christophine […]" is bigger than its appearance; in other words, the conflict between them emphasizes the "principles and aspects of their two societies, represented by their respective religions" (211). Christophine knows this because of having been harassed for obeah by English law. Moreover, the English husband tries to control Christophine through English law which is against obeah, while arguing about religion which throws light on this fact. Christophine says to the English husband: "'This is free country and I am free woman'" (*WSS* 104); here what she says to the English husband shows that her courage challenges the English husband's confidence in his God and English law which he uses against her.

Rhys describes the importance of the forces of law and order by allowing Christophine to see their power. Christophine expresses herself as a "free" woman by pointing out the emancipation of slaves in Jamaica: "No chain gang, no tread machine, no dark jail either" (*WSS* 104). She sees herself as a free woman in a free country, but it was feared in the colonies that ex-slaves had envisaged that emancipation implied equality with the white man. As Philippa Levine notes "[e]quality remained more a theological principle in the missionary world than a social practice" (121). In other words, the sense of equality remained as a theological teaching, but not a social practice.

In the novel Christophine is the character with the ability of recognising the humanity of black and white; this can be illustrated by what she says while talking with Antoinette about the English husband: "' Ask him pretty for some of your own money, the man not a bad-hearted, he give it'" (*WSS* 68) and "'The man not a bad man, even if he love money…'" (*WSS* 71). Christophine also challenges Antoinette in these words: "Get up, girl, and dress yourself. Woman must have spunks to live in this wicked world" (*WSS* 62).

Christophine describes herself as self-supporting and independent, and she makes a comment on women: "All women, all colours, nothing but fools. Three children I have. One living in this world, each one a different father, but no husband, I thank my God. I keep my money. I don't give it to no worthless man" (*WSS* 68). In addition, she advises Antoinette to be courageous instead of turning to obeah. O'Connor depicts Christophine's role in Antoinette's life in these words: "Christophine, whose name suggests St. Christopher – the bearer of the infant Christ, sees the care and survival of Antoinette as her own mission. Rochester's struggle with Christophine becomes a struggle over who will have power over Antoinette" (213).

It is Christophine who notes that black ritual practices are specific practices, and whites cannot regard them as cheap remedies for problems like the English husband's lack of love for Antoinette. While asking for understanding on Antoinette's behalf, Christophine displays a deep awareness of Antoinette and her Creole background in saying: "She is Creole girl, and she have the sun in her," (*WSS* 102). However, Christophine's plea does not move the English husband to show mercy; with the ambition to control Antoinette and her wealth, the English husband makes a statement: "'[This house] belongs to me'" (*WSS* 103). In the end the English husband asserts his role as a husband, saying "'there must be some law and order even in this God-forsaken island'" (*WSS* 104). Furthermore, he resorts to the the Spanish Town doctors in that Antoinette is "'not well'" (*WSS* 104). Fearing that Antoinette might share her mother's fate, Christophine dares to pluck up courage to challenge the English husband with these words: "'The doctors say what you tell them to say […] she will be like her mother. You do that for money? But you wicked like Satan self' " (*WSS* 104).

Her understanding of the situation is strong enough for him, the white man, not to be unaffected and indifferent: “I no longer felt dazed, tired, half hypnotized, but alert and wary, ready to defend myself” (*WSS* 103). Challenging and questioning the English husband’s power, Christophine destabilises and subverts his power; moreover, by doing that she empowers her place in the Third Space where she is entitled to negotiate. In Ferguson’s words, “Christophine’s challenge to white hegemony increases the chance of cultural autonomy. The English husband empowers her by treating her as dire threat. Attempts to discipline her engender opposite results” (320). In addition to this statement, Ferguson notes that “the African-Caribbeans inexorably negotiate their way toward new freedoms” (320).

In conclusion, in the novel it is not easy to say who is successful and who is not since success is a relative concept; however, it is not difficult to say that there are small victories in the lives of the hybrid characters, who challenge, question, distort, subvert and destabilise in order to negotiate and gain new possibilities in the Third Space.

As a hybrid, Antoinette experiences the complexities of hybridity on racial, cultural and social levels. Born into a white slave-owning family in the Caribbean, used as a site of negotiations of power, faced invented names, regarded as a passive victim, a hybrid, Antoinette is given the opportunity to tell her story in this book. In her story, she reclaims her name, arguing that “names matter” (*WSS* 116), and resists the oppression while locked in the attic in the form of violence, destabilising the power of her husband, a new coloniser, in his own territory maintained by her fortune.

Like Gwen, who “[…] understood that never before had the void between her world and [her husband’s] felt so vast” (*A View of the Empire at Sunset* 319), Antoinette experiences the complexities of hybridity, facing the challenges of the vastness of the “void” between her world and her husband’s.

The English husband, Antoinette’s husband, goes to the Caribbean from the motherland as a new coloniser, trying to colonise the old coloniser or colonial and the freed colonised. With the new-found freedom, although limited, the colonised challenges the

new coloniser, whereas the old coloniser ends up as a mad woman and slave, giving the opportunity to the new coloniser to justify his actions. However, through her slavery and madness she challenges and disrupts the wealth of the new coloniser in the motherland. The new coloniser is not secure in his own territory. The efforts to secure a position in the upper class are no longer secure without the complexity of challenges based on colonial wealth.

Neither black nor white, neither free nor slave, in the Bhabhanian Third Space Daniel, Antoinette's mulatto half brother, challenges his father, a coloniser, saying "I'm no slave" (*WSS* 77). In addition, by revealing some information about Antoinette's family, he destabilises the confidence of the English husband who finds himself in a new position as a husband and coloniser.

Christophine, Antoinette's black nurse who is a hybrid on cultural and religious levels, is a bridge between Antoinette and her husband. Being neither slave nor free, understanding both, and being both, Christophine has an understanding about what a coloniser is and what a Creole is. With that understanding, she finds herself in a position in the Third Space to challenge them: she challenges the English husband about Antoinette, saying "She is a Creole girl!" She also challenges Antoinette, urging her to pull herself together, and not let her alienation stand in her way.

CHAPTER II
HYBRID IDENTITIES IN CARYL PHILLIPS'S *THE FINAL PASSAGE*

In this chapter four hybrid characters in Caryl Phillips' *The Final Passage*, Leila, Michael, Millie and Mrs Franks will be examined based on cultural, racial, class and economic levels. While focusing on hybridity and hybrid identity within the concepts defined by Homi Bhahba such as in-betweenness, mimicry and the Third Space, immigration, norms, masculinity, motherhood will be explored in relation to racism which is manifested in terms of employment and housing.

The first chapter analyses hybridity in the former period and concentrates on white Creoles such as Antoinette who marries the English husband, and black Creoles who are emancipated slaves such as Christophine. It also examines names and naming, in-betweenness, mulattos and class. The second chapter focuses on the hybrids who go to the mother country where they encounter discrimination and racism in employment and housing. The second chapter also analyses the reactions and approaches the hybrids display in their Third Space in England in the 1950s. The writer of *The Final Passage* is also from the West Indies and he himself is a hybrid.

Born in St. Kitts in the Caribbean in 1958, Caryl Phillips was taken to England by his parents in the same year. In an interview with Maya Jaggi, Caryl Phillips describes his family in these words:

> […] my parents left a small Caribbean island. But my father had a job – he worked on the railways before he became a social worker – and my mother worked occasionally as an accounts clerk, then taught at Bradford College of Further Education. My parents didn't split up as soon as they came here. They had three other kids then split up in the mid – to late 1960s. I used to go and stay with my father in the school holidays, and I lived with him between the ages of fourteen and eighteen – split between both parents. (Jaggi 173)

When asked where he is from, Phillips states that people want to know his story because of his birthplace, St. Kitts, and his English accent. Moreover, he points out that people who want to know his story "make [him] choose" (Bell 593). Referring to his birthplace and its effects on his sanity, Phillips notes that when he had difficult times at school fighting against prejudice, he found it helpful to remember that he "did have somewhere else," keeping him "sane" although he "hadn't visited" St. Kitts as an adult (Phillips and Birbalsingh 43 - 4).

When asked about his parents' efforts to retain Caribbean influence in his life, Philips first refers to immigrants, who " […] want to forget [the Caribbean] because they are so concerned with their kids becoming a part of the New World" (Bell 578). They hope that their children will adjust to the new society without knowing where they were from in order not to be "confused" in England (Bell 578). While pointing out their approach to their children, he shares his experience with his own family as follows: "My parents didn't talk about it, and it wasn't something that was taught in school. We weren't reminded that we were West Indian; we were reminded that we were black" (Bell 578).

As for his upbringing in Leeds, Phillips went to school there, growing up with the English as a "northern working-class kid" (Jaggi 177). As a result he was "[…] privy to the paranoia and anxieties of white people about the Other" (Jaggi 177). At Oxford, Phillips first started studying psychology, but later took up English Literature because of his interest in theatre and films. During a visit to the United States, Phillips read Richard Wright's *Native Son*, and when he finished reading it, he knew that he wanted to be a writer (Bell 582-3). When he started writing, he tried to write about issues such as the dilemma of being a West Indian in Britain for the first generation, namely his parents' generation, and the dilemma of the second generation relating or failing to relate to the Caribbean, Britain and their parents. For example, he tackled these issues in *Strange Fruit*, a play about a black family that is caught between two different cultures (Bell 587-8).

Looking back on his childhood and facing the complexity of hybridity in Britain, Phillips notes that growing up in a society which did not make it easy for him to live

has given him some aims to write: "[…] one of the reasons to write is to try to make sure that the society changes its attitude so that kids don't have to go through that any more" (Clingman and Phillips 118). In addition, Phillips writes because of not wanting to see "another generation" or "another individual to experience the suffering which revolves around identity; in other words, he does not want anyone "to be ashamed of the question, 'Where am I from?' to feel panicked when somebody says, 'Well, who are you?' I don't want to live in a world in which the idea of a complex cultural and historical, racial, religious identity is something to be ashamed of" (Clingman and Phillips 135).

As a hybrid writer himself, Phillips claims that he is in a position in which he can look at both societies and deal with them, while especially being a voice for hybrids. As he argues:

> […] my uniqueness places a special responsibility on me. Both Caribbean and British societies have many things wrong with them that need to be examined and exposed. I can see historical connections between the two societies, and I can see contemporary reverberations between them. I also feel very comfortable, culturally, in both societies. I can build bridges, and help to cross-fertilize the two. Given the history of slavery, of colonialism, and of modern day neo-colonialism, there's a whole range of explosive, political and social subjects which I think I am probably in a good position to explore. (Phillips and Birbalsingh 46)

Holding a British passport and a St. Kitts passport, Phillips points out his hybrid position in which he uses both passports and writes concerning the Caribbean and Britain; as a result, he can "build bridges" between these places (Bell 593).

Phillips, who is West Indian in origin, is a prolific novelist, essayist, playwright and television scriptwriter. Drawing on Phillips's background linked to his parents' generation, Frank Birbalsingh points out in his essay "The West Indies" that

> […] if people of the generation of Phillips's parents encountered poverty, exploitation and lack of opportunity which forced them to emigrate from the West Indies, the characters in his works, who are of his own generation, encounter discrimination in education, employment, housing and social intercourse which alienates them from life in England, and encourages thoughts of returning to the West Indies. (173-4)

In contrast to the characters in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Phillips shifts to the next era in which hybrids take action and demand more in their Third Space. His Caribbean background and keeping his ties with the West Indies are shown in *The Final Passage*. *The Final Passage* is Caryl Phillips's first novel which was published in 1985; it depicts a young family from an unnamed, small island of the Caribbean who take the decision to go to England, the mother country, in the 1950s. They reach London with great expectations, which are then dashed while facing new challenges which take place in the forms of in-betweenness and unbelongingness. In his essay entitled "Home is always elsewhere", Fred D'Aguiar defines unbelongingness as "[a] condition: a nervous disposition coupled with a psychic tremulousness or sense of inadequacy in relation to time and place" (213). "[U]nbelongingness, in-betweenness," D'Aguiar argues, "cannot be resolved. It is too complex. It has to be endured or embraced as a way of life" (220).

In an interview with C. Rosalind Bell, Phillips discusses the questions of identity, belonging and home; he argues that anybody with his background will question their identity because of not knowing "if this was home" (Bell 599). Phillips continues: "The question of home is a very serious thing because you don't feel at home in this place which is the only thing you know" (Bell 599). When asked about his sense of belonging by Stephen Clingman, Phillips remarks that "it's still in flux;" in other words, "[…] there's no real resolution" (Clingman and Phillips 114).

Birbalsingh argues that homelessness is "[…] an essential aspect of West Indian experience, one that is considered by all West Indian writers […]" (175). According to him, people who are uprooted "[…] from original homes in Africa, Asia and Europe, and their transplantation in the New World" (175) forge a significant aspect of the history of the West Indies. "The title 'The Final Passage,'" Birbalsingh argues, "echoes

the historical term 'the middle passage' which was given to the first passage made by slaves from their African homeland to the West Indies during earlier centuries" (175).

Louis James, who writes about Caribbean literature in English, comments on the title of the novel as follows: "As the title suggests, the voyage completes the triangle of the 'middle passage' of the slave trade, the ships returning to Britain with a reprocessed cargo of cheap black labour" (212). Like James, Bénédicte Ledent also refers to the title of the novel, and says "The 'Final Passage' is a direct reference to the 'Middle Passage', i.e. the crossing of slaves from Africa to the New World plantations" (33).

In *The Final Passage*, Phillips deals with the experience of migration, illustrating that it is, in Ledent's words, "a painful starting point," which "[…] [leads] to a better grasp on one's multiple identity, though it is not *per se* a means of 'salvation'" (25). Pointing out the double losses, Ledent argues:

> The death of Leila's mother in a London hospital, which can be equated with the loss of the homeland, seems to illustrate this point, for in spite of its negative connotations, it sows some embryonic awareness in her daughter. In the same way, a journey to Britain does not magically cure the malaise inherited from colonialism. On the contrary, it only seems to make it worse in the short term. Exile only proves a means securing moorings when imaginatively assessed by going 'backward, then forward again' (FP, 20), but the act of migrating in itself never provides ready-made solutions to the woes of Caribbean societies, neither in reality nor in fiction. (25)

In Ledent's words, "although it would be pointless to track its biographical genesis" *The Final Passage* is, to some extent, autobiographical (18). Unlike the other "earlier migration novels," Phillips's novel focuses on the story of a woman, Leila. Ledent states: "Apart from Jean Rhys's *Voyage in the Dark* written in the 1930s, no Caribbean novel of exile in Britain had centred on a female character" (30). Thus the significance of the novel and the crucial role Leila plays can be observed. Phillips presents another outlook in order to complete the picture which is left incomplete by the male point of view. In line with this, Ledent argues: "Clearly, *The Final Passage* modifies the reading

of essentially male-centered novels, such as Salkey's or Selvon's. Leila has often been described by reviewers as an irritatingly passive character (31). In her argument Ledent refers to some reviewers who regard Leila as "an irritatingly passive character;" and yet in the novel she has some significant moments when she takes the initiative that changes her future. For example, to the surprise of her friends, Leila says: "I'm going to England" (*FP* 91)[2]; she is unsatisfied with her life on the small island and goes to England "[…] feeling sorry for those satisfied enough to stay" (*FP* 20). In addition, she even challenges British culture regarding its burial system: when she sees the other coffins in her mother's grave in England, she immediately questions the priest who tries to give her an "understanding smile:"

> 'The other coffins,' she pointed. 'What are they doing in my mother's grave?'
>
> 'Later,' whispered the priest, his face adopting a sepulchral but understanding smile. He turned over a page of his Bible and adjusted the sheet of plastic.
>
> 'Now!' she shouted. 'I want to know now!' (*FP* 182)

Leila's reaction and challenge show that it is not fair to write her off as a passive character without analysing her character in detail. Unlike Antoinette, who is not quick to take a stand against the things that matter to her, Leila objects to the understanding smile, and demands an answer right away.

Caryl Phillips, whose parents emigrated to England, taking him with them while he was a baby, visited his island as an adult, tells the story of the West Indians' immigration to the motherland, England, in the 1950s. To a certain extent he illustrates this experience of the immigration to England in *The Final Passage*; through Leila's story one can see what it is like to live as immigrants in Britain where some signs such as "No coloureds [or 'blacks']. No dogs" could be displayed; according to Sarvan and Marhama "[…] at that time it was normal and legal to display [these] signs […]" (35).

---

[2] From now on *FP*.

V. S. Naipaul published *The Middle Passage* (1962), which included his essays, pointing out that the term "the middle passage" stems from the time of slavery. "The 'first passage,'" Sarvan and Marhama note, "was when a ship left England for Africa, carrying baubles, cheap industrial products that were bartered for slaves" (35). As Sarvan and Marhama state:

> Then began the dreadful 'middle passage,' to the American and Caribbean plantations, during which voyage many died and were thrown overboard. (It is estimated that as many as twenty million Africans were abducted from the continent.) The survivors were sold at auction; with the money realized, raw materials were purchased to feed the voracious industrial machines back home, and the ship began 'the final passage,' so much richer for the 'enterprise.' (35)

When it comes to the final passage Leila considers making, she might find herself confined and/or imprisoned, in Sarvan and Marhama's words, "marooned and captive for the rest of her life" (35). According to Sarvan and Marhama, "[…] the first section of the novel bears the subtitle "The End," describing Leila's departure from the Caribbean: the end may also be the beginning of a return after all" (35).

The Final Passage consists of five chapters entitled "The End," "Home," "England," "The Passage," and "Winter." On the whole the novel is chronologically narrated, with flashbacks referring to Leila's past life which took place on a small island of the Caribbean. "Past and present," Ledent argues, "intermingle in a crisscross pattern that includes many flashbacks" (22).

In 1958 Leila, a hybrid, is a young girl, who has lighter skin than most of the islanders, an offspring of a black mother and white father. While Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea* is a white Creole, Leila is a mulatto, who was born into in-betweenness or unbelonging. Like Antoinette, she lacks a father, and feels the responsibility of looking after her sick mother. Interestingly, both Antoinette and Leila have sick mothers, although their illnesses are different; one is mental, the other is physical. Her mother does not inform Leila about her father; therefore, she has the notion that her mother does not trust white

people. In other words, this is the very distrust she attempts to ingrain in her daughter Leila. Leila has a close friend called Millie who is sensible, knowing what she desires to accomplish in her life. Michael, Leila's boyfriend, is an irresponsible man in his early twenties, with two interests: sex and drink. He does delivery jobs, using his scooter. As his parents are not alive, Michael lives with his grandparents, rather than moving in with Brenda, the mother of his illegitimate child. Instead of waiting for Arthur, who said that he would return to her because of his love for her, Leila marries Michael; however, their marriage does not have a good beginning. Like Antoinette, Leila does not make a wise marriage. Michael does not even visit their son Calvin when he is born.

One day a letter from her mother shocks her: In it she writes that she has gone to England to get medical treatment. With an unendurable life on the small island, Leila decides to emigrate to England and be with her mother there. In other words, she desires "to escape the life she was trapped in" (*FP* 95). Michael does not oppose her decision; thus, Leila begins to organize everything for her family's voyage, which can be seen as a passage or final passage as the title of the novel suggests. People emigrate en masse, leaving their homes in the hope of getting a better life in the mother country. The information they obtain about England is based on the things they learned at school and from stories narrated by the ones who come back. For instance, Michael finds himself wanting to have sex with white women, having heard that "about one coloured man out there who writing home saying he be having at least three or four different white girls a week" (*FP* 104).

When Leila, Michael and Calvin arrive in England after a two week voyage, they have "nothing to declare except their accents," (*FP* 143). They head to Victoria with Leila's mother's address and some money for a new challenge in their "mother country." They go to Quaxley Street by taxi and find a run – down, crowded house which is divided into a number of bedsits. Moreover, her mother is not there; she has gone. Leila finds out that her mother is in hospital, and she begins to visit her frequently; despite the regular visits, she does not experience the closeness she has always desired, as her mother's health gets worse.

Meanwhile Michael gets into his usual habit of doing as he wants without taking any responsibilities. He leaves the housework to Leila, does not talk to her, drinks and resigns from his job. In addition, she sees a blond hair on his jacket and understands that he is involved with a white woman. As she realises that they need money, she begins to work on the buses; however, she has a breakdown on the day she starts working, and finds out that she is expecting her second child. In the end, Leila understands that she has no future with Michael. At the end of the novel, her mother dies, and she is left expecting her second child in a run-down house in London. Exhausted emotionally and physically, Leila considers returning to her island and her friend Millie.

Here it can be necessary to give some historical background for immigration within the context of the novel. Ian R. G. Spencer, who writes about British immigration policy, points out that in 1939 "the permanent Asian and black population of the United Kingdom was officially estimated at about 7,000 people" (3). While mentioning the number of Asian and black people in the mother country, he continues his argument:

> In the early 1950s half of Britain's population had never even met a black person. Until the mid-1950s the large majority of cities in Britain remained almost entirely white, as did most parts of the few major cities in which Asian and black settlement was a feature. In the leafier suburbs of London in the late 1950s, non-white people were still such a curiosity that it was not unusual for them to be stopped by local people curious to know about their background. (3- 4)

On the other hand, Claudia Jones, who writes about the Caribbean community in Britain, states that "[o]ver a quarter of a million West Indians, the overwhelming majority of them from Jamaica, have now settled in Britain in less than a decade. Britain has become, in the mid-1960s, the centre of the largest overseas population of West Indians […]" (50).

Here it can be helpful to take a look at the background of the immigrants called the "Windrush generation" who came to Britain in the 1950's. In their article titled "Windrush: Who exactly was on board?", Lucy Rodgers and Maryam Ahmed deal with

Windrush and the people who emigrated to Britain in 1948 as follows: "The British troopship HMT Empire Windrush anchored at Tillbury Docks, Essex, on 21 June 1948 carrying hundreds of passengers from the Caribbean hoping for a new life in Britain – alongside hundreds from elsewhere." They note that "[…] a wave of Caribbean migration between 1948 and 1971 known as the 'Windrush generation'" took place. "Many were enticed to cross the Atlantic," Rogers and Maryam remark, "by job opportunities amid the UK's post-war labour shortage." "Many then moved into rented houses and rooms […]," they note, "working for employers such as the National Health Service or London Transport " ("Windrush").

With the Windrush generation comes the crisis of identity, in particular hybrid identity. This is the very theme which is explored through the protagonist Leila in *The Final Passage.* As mentioned earlier, Chris Barker defines hybridity as "[t]he mixing together of different cultural elements to create new meanings and identities. Hybrids destabilize and blur established cultural boundaries in a process of fusion or creolization" (385). Also, the term "hybridity" is associated with Homi K. Bhabha, who argues that all cultural statements are constructed in a space called the "Third Space of enunciation" (37). "Cultural identity always emerges," Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin argue, "in this contradictory and ambivalent space, which for Bhabha makes the claim to a hierarchical 'purity' of cultures untenable" (108). They further argue that "[i]t is the 'in-between' space that carries the burden and meaning of culture, and this is what makes the notion of hybridity so important" (108).

Meeting the coloniser, coming from Africa to the Caribbean and going to England from the Caribbean, black people experience hybridity on various levels such as racial, class and cultural. In the novel there are different kinds of hybrid identities that display their own complexities on varied levels such as cultural, racial and class levels. Four characters in the novel will be studied in terms of hybridity and hybrid identity: Leila, Michael, Millie and Mrs Franks. Leila, the protagonist of the novel, is the offspring of a black mother and white father, a hybrid and a mulatto with a lighter skin than most of the islanders. She faces the complexity of hybridity on a racial, cultural and social level.

Percy C. Hintzen, who writes about race and Creole ethnicity, refers to mulattos and argues:

> Coloreds or "mulattos" serve as an intermediary racial and cultural bridge between the European and African poles in Caribbean social construction. They are historical products of an imposed rationality of difference in colonial racial representation and practice. White males institutionalized this rationality through the exercise of gender and racial privilege over black female slaves. In turn, the offspring of these miscegenous unions were assigned positions of privilege over the black Creoles in the color/class hierarchy of colonial society. (482)

In her black society, Leila experiences in-betweenness due to her mixed parentage, which seems to elevate her social status. As a mulatto, Leila is hated by the black children at school, but she is regarded as a white person by the black adults such as Michael's grandmother. Michael's grandmother refers to her "white girl" (*FP* 47) which confirms this sense of superiority. She explains what she thinks of their marriage while talking with Michael as follows: "I think you is better off with the white girl for she going look after you right if you look after she, you hear me?" (*FP* 47). On the other hand, Leila encounters rejection at school because of her mixed parentage. "'Mulatto girl,' 'Mulatto girl,' was what her friends at school used to sing at her, and Leila used to run away and hide and wish that her mother would tell her it was not true. But her mother never said anything, and Leila used to look at her and wonder if her mother had ever been in love with her father, whoever he was" (*FP* 65). "[…] [Leila] seems to be excluded by the predominantly black community," Ledent argues, "because of her mixed parentage and her alleged social superiority" (32). While facing the complexities of hybridity because of being "white" in the Caribbean, Leila and her husband, who are already culturaly hybrids, face racism while trying to find accommodation and jobs in London, which seems full of dark-skinned "foreigners" (*FP* 122).

Given the racism faced by the immigrants, it would be useful to explore briefly the importance of racism. In their essay titled "The 1951-1955 Conservative Government and The Racialization of Black Immigration," Bob Carter, Clive Harris and Shirley Josh

deal with racism in the '50s revolving around the racialization of black immigration, noting that "[I]n the discussion of postwar racism the role of the state is often ignored or treated as insignificant" (23). "[…] [T] he state took a major role," they argue, "in constructing black immigration as a 'problem' and in so doing reinforced a conception of Britishness grounded in colour and culture (as expressive of colour)" (23). They remark that the state formed a policy for black immigration before 1955, which included "[…] direct intervention on some issues and an apparent inactivity on others" (24). They illustrate this policy by referring to the actions of government such as "[…] collecting information about black people to support a draft immigration bill prepared in 1954," and "[…] opposing measures such as Fenner Brockway's bill prohibiting racist discrimination, despite growing evidence that discrimination was widespread" (24). "Successive governments […] constructed an ideological framework in which black people were to be seen as threatening, alien and unassimilable," they argue, "but also developed policies to discourage and control black immigration" (24). They also point out how some "[…] senior Conservative politicians in the Churchill government" saw that "black immigration raised the prospect of a permanent black presence" with "'deleterious effects' on the 'racial character of the English people […]'" (24). Like the Conservative government, Clement Attlee's Labour government experienced something similar in 1948 when the *Empire Windrush* arrived; "eleven Labour MPs" sent a letter to the prime minister, revealing their concern as follows: "An influx of coloured people domiciled here is likely to impair the harmony, strength and cohesion of our public and social life and to cause discord and unhappiness among all concerned" (qtd. in Carter, Harris and Josh 24). In 1950 the Labour government analysed "the further means which might be adopted to check the immigration into this country of coloured people from the British Colonial Territories" (qtd. in Carter, Harris and Josh 24). While "these administrative measures" were passed on to the conservative government in 1951, they point out that "[a] 'strong case' was built around a racialized reconstruction of 'Britishness' in which to be 'white' was to 'belong' and to be 'black' was to be excluded" (24). They comment that "the 1948 Nationality Act conferred on colonial subjects rights of entry and settlement that did not previously exist." "Those who expound the laissez faire argument present the Act," they argue, "as a device to

facilitate the free movement of labour from the Caribbean and the Indian subcontinent to meet Britain's 'labour shortage'" (25).

While meeting the need of labour shortage through West Indians, another dilemma, namely "public opinion" emerges. When asked about the state's response to "public opinion," A. Sivanandan said: "It's a process. Public opinion gives a fillip to policy, and policy, in turn, reinforces public opinion by the institutionalization of racism – in immigration laws, judicial decisions, administrative edicts" (Owusu 456).

In the light of "public opinion" which leads to "the institutionalization of racism", some problems such as housing and employment emerge. Ian R. G. Spencer, who writes about immigration policy, explains the problems of housing and employment as follows:

> Problems of housing, employment, relief of distress and racial violence […] associated with the 'continuing influx' had led the interdepartmental committee of officials, whose first meeting had been held in February 1949, to recommend the adoption of new approaches to reduce the flow of immigrants. (56-57)

"Prospective migrants to the United Kingdom were issued," Carter, Harris and Josh state, "with a document entitled 'Warnings to Intending Migrants' in which the problems of accommodation featured prominently." They note that "[..] an acute housing shortage in Britain during the 1950s […]" took place, which was "a product of government policies and market forces, not of levels of immigration" (29). In addition, they point out that "[m]any local authorities 'on variety of pretexts but mostly via residence requirements' refused to house black people yet were not penalized by the minister of housing" (29). In order to confirm this, they refer to Macmillan who declared as Housing Minister in 1954 "a reduction in council-house building for the following year from 235,000 to 160,000" (29). "For black people the alternative to council housing was the private sector," Carter, Harris and Josh state, " and here discrimination, made easier by the relaxation of rent controls in 1954, ensured that only areas designated for slum clearance and/or areas with short-lease properties were generally available" (29). The trouble of "finding accommodation" was underlined by

the unwillingness of "local authorities to implement redevelopment programmes which might involve rehousing black tenants for fear of antagonizing white tenants who were on long waiting lists" (29). This reluctance of local authorities was explained by the "Birmingham City Council town clerk […] at Westminster in early 1955" as follows :

> One of the areas scheduled for redevelopment happened to be where a section of the immigrant population had settled. Although there was very serious overcrowding in this area it was virtually impossible to proceed with redevelopment plans because of the difficulty of finding alternative accommodation. There was the additional risk that if alternative accommodation was found, ill feeling might be engendered among the white population at this apparent preferential treatment of coloured people while there were still 'local' inhabitants waiting for houses. (qtd. in Carter, Harris and Josh 29)

Carter, Harris and Josh argue that "[…] the common interpretation of the role of the state in the 1940s and 1950s needs to be revised," in that the "[…] measures to discourage and restrict black immigration rested firmly on a policy of preserving the homogeneous 'racial character' of British society". "The passing of the 1948 Nationality Act," they state, "intensified the contradiction between a formal definition of 'Britishness' which embraced black British subjects abroad and an increasingly racialized notion of belonging in which 'racial types' were constructed around colour" (35). The result of this strong case was an "extension of the control and surveillance of the black population in the UK" (35). According to them, black immigration would cause some unsolvable complications, which were racial, because of their birthplaces. The reason of their unemployment stemmed from their "irresponsibility, quarrelsomeness and lack of discipline," not from discrimination; thus, the core of the problem was their disposition which was prone to criminality (35).

In other words, black people were a "threat" to the "British way of life;" "[…] this racialized construction" was so strong that "anti-discrimination legislation" was regarded as unconnected and irrelevant to the "'social problems' of housing and employment" (35-6). The state "[…] reconstructed an image of a national community that was homogeneous in its 'whiteness' […]" (36). They point out that there is a "need

to recover the history of the state's central role in the construction of postwar British racism" (36); black people were regarded as "'a problem' whose solution lay in further and more restrictive control and surveillance" (36).

Samuel Earle, who writes about the "Rivers of Blood speech," summarizes some "racist tactics" which were used for political advantage in the '50s and '60s as follows:

> In 1955, when Winston Churchill declared his intention to "Keep England White," transport workers in central England went on strike after the local transport authority hired its first Indian immigrant as a conductor. "I believe," Powell said, giving the workers his backing, "the strikers …have apprehended the dangers for this country of any appreciable coloured population domiciled here." In 1964, Conservatives campaigned in an election in Smethwick with the slogan "if you want a nigger for a neighbour, vote Labour." ("'Rivers of Blood'")

Earle argues that the fear which was used was "[…] not that immigrants wouldn't integrate: the fear was that they would." When asked about Enoch Powell's "Rivers of Blood" speech and his real political legacy on race and race relations, he answered: "Enoch Powell was a racist, an out-and-out racist" (Owusu 458). Pointing out that although Powell was portrayed as a principled and educated man in his obituaries, he was a racist man, calling black children "piccaninnies" and viewing black people as inferior (458).

Gary Younge, who writes about racism and politics, argues that "slavery and colonialism" were significant elements through which the nation in Britain was formed. He displays his point by referring to some leading politicians in different political parties since 1950s. He states:

> As Labour foreign secretary in 1951, Herbert Morrison described independence for African colonies as comparable to giving a child of 10 "a latchkey, a bank account and a shotgun." In 1955, Winston Churchill told his cabinet he wanted to fight the general election on the slogan: "Keep England White." In

> 1964, in Smethwick, West Midlands, a Tory candidate bucked the national trend to win with a campaign slogan: "If you want a nigger for a neighbour vote Labour." In 1968, Enoch Powell warned there would [be] "rivers of blood" if non-white immigration were not halted. ("Given Britain's history")

Racism can be illustrated through "othering." According to Elleke Boehmer, the process of othering which stems from colonialism depends on two factors: the differentiation of the colonised and the validation of the coloniser's supremacy. She argues that "[i]mages of the native, alien or other, reflected *by contrast* Western conceptions of selfhood – of mastery and control, of rationality and cultural superiority, of energy, thrift, technological skilfulness" (78 emphasis original). She continues her argument by saying that "Europe ceaselessly reconfirmed its own identity and individuality by finding for itself around the globe subterranean or reverse selves, dark mirror-images […]" (78). As a result, the Black man, in Bhabha's words, is "forced to inhabit an alienating and fragmented reality as soon as 'the white man's eyes' calls forth this 'other' being who is 'battered down by tom-toms, cannibalism, intellectual deficiency, fetichism, racial defects…'" ("Foreword: Framing Fanon" xix).

With this background information about racism, othering and housing, it can be observed how this very problem is illustrated in Leila's situation. When Leila and her family arrive in London, Leila and her son Calvin spend their first night in the bath, which is, in Ledent's words, "ironically the ultimate symbol of Western comfort," and Michael and Earl sleep in the same bed, "'head to foot' very much as slaves used to aboard slave ships" (Ledent 20). Later Leila finds a derelict house, which is "dead into a brick wall" (*FP* 161) in London; this is the very house that illustrates her life which does not have hope and prospect for the present and future.

> Two of the upstairs window panes were broken in, and the door looked like it had been put together from the remains of a dozen forgotten doors…
>
> The light switch did not work. The house was dark and smelled of neglect, and there were no curtains to open to let the light in, there were no doors to prop open to let the air circulate. (*FP* 161)

On the other hand, Leila thinks that they have a place to live "despite the state of the property, it had a roof and four walls, and for a while, at least, was theirs" (*FP* 162). As for employment, Carter, Harris and Josh state that in 1947 in the Caribbean there was a campaign about job advertisements which tried to convince people that "these were not 'real jobs' but 'paper vacancies' and it was 'not in their interests' to migrate to the United Kingdom" (27). Through the "strong case," which was formed in 1953, the Conservative Party tried to demonstrate that "black migrants who did come were unemployable and represented a burden on public funds," and in order to do that they "collected evidence from the Ministry of Labour and National Service and from the Ministry of Pensions and National Assistance" (27).

In relation to employment, particularly women's employment, another issue comes up: motherhood. In terms of motherhood there are different norms in England and in the Caribbean; however, these norms can be combined, and other approaches such as a hybrid one can be created.

Leila, who needs to work in order to make both ends meet in London, finds a job; as a result Mary, her neighbour, and Miss Gordon, a social worker, question Leila's motherhood. For instance, Mary asks Leila: "'Is it that bad, love? I mean is it definite that you have to go out to work?'" (*FP* 183). During her visits Miss Gordon keeps asking the same questions about Michael and money: "'Has he got a job, Mrs Preston?'" (*FP* 191); "'Have you seen your husband, Mrs Preston?'" (*FP* 197); "'Do you have any money, Mrs Preston?'" (*FP* 197).

Here it can be helpful to take a look at the views of motherhood both in Britain and the West Indies. In her essay entitled "Mothers of America and the Diaspora," Aminatta Forna states:

> For African Caribbean and African American mothers, responsibility and reciprocity – the ability to share child-rearing duties with others who are willing to accept responsibility for a wide range of kin – are the core values which have enabled and still enable them to raise their children, even without a male

> breadwinner or in adverse circumstances. These traits have enabled the Black family to survive everywhere. It is only in recent years, in the face of a concerted effort by government welfare and social policies in Britain and America to impose the ideology and standards of the Western, nuclear family, that Black families have been faced with a crisis. (394)

While the black mother "[…] raises her child in a network of support and mutual reliance," (Forna 395) the white mother experiences it in a different way. "[…] [I]t was the Industrial Revolution," Forna argues, "that ushered in gendered divisions of labour and saw the emergence of the nuclear family" (394). Forna continues her argument by focusing on "a period crucial to the creation of the modern institution of motherhood in the years following the Second World War in Britain and America" (394-95). "In Britain, African Caribbean mothers are blamed," Forna states, " for the problems of young black men and portrayed as irresponsible, sponging and overly fertile" (397). Describing motherhood in terms of Anglo-European culture, Forna explains the relationship between mother and child as follows:

> The Anglo-European cultural script for good mothering ascribes great importance to an *exclusive* mother/child relationship; regards *the mother as the best caretaker* and places a strong degree of *emphasis on her skills* as a parent. As a result, only *one role for mothers* can be practically envisioned, leading to a conflict with work or other interests outside the home. It is a limiting and exacting style of mothering, and women who can't or don't mother in the prescribed way suffer a high degree of *guilt*. (398 emphasis original)

When it comes to the relationship between a black mother and her child, black mothers "[…] place comparatively less emphasis on the mother/child dyad;" while the relationship is "central," it is "*non-exclusive"* (Forna 398). There are other people in the life of the child who are like "*co-parents"* (Forna 398). "The most important element," Forna argues, "is the *child's place in the community."* According to Forna, "[t]his support system operates to minimize any conflict with work, and the mother sees herself as occupying *flexible* roles" (398). Referring to a study at Manchester University, Forna points out that "[i]n Britain, African and African Caribbean mothers are more likely to work full-time than white mothers […]" (399). Referring to another study which took

place in 1996, Forna notes "[…] the same finding: 'the employed mother has long been the norm for African American women'" (399). According to Forna, since black men find it difficult to find a job through which he can provide for his family, black women have not had the option to be stay-at-home mothers. While being working mothers, black women try to find solution by turning to the women who can be relatives, close friends or neighbours. (399-400)

In a word, "[t]o the child she is another mother" (Forna 400). "The ability to divide duties among other people is thought to be one of the reasons," Forna argues, "why African Caribbean mothers in Britain have such high rates of economic participation" (401). "When the day-to-day care of an infant is routinely shared among different people, including parents and non-parents," Forna points out, "the child is free to share affections, and the notion of to whom that child is seen as belonging becomes fluid" (403). On the other hand, "[i]n Western maternal thinking, the boundaries of ownership are fixed. The child belongs to the mother, not even the father who is rarely awarded custody" (Forna 403).

In other words, a white, middle-class woman's main responsibility is her children; thus, she has no time to work. In truth, she "'shouldn't' work, because it's better for her children if she is at home;" here "the ideology justifies the practice" (Forna 404). On the other hand, women who decide to "send their children to day care" hear that their children need their mother's undivided attention; here "the ideology becomes dogma" (Forna 404). When it comes to black mothers, who are "[c]astigated as defective mothers, many try to fit the square peg of 'ideal' motherhood into the round hole of reality" (Forna 404). What is more, black women have not had the chance to raise their children like white middle-class women raise their children due to the ideology that orders fixed gender roles. The ideology mentioned above is formed through the notions of femininity; this is the very thing that does not include black women (Forna 404-5).

In the light of the different norms between white middle class women and black women in terms of employment mentioned above, Leila's situation can be understood. As a mulatto, she works as a clerk in the Caribbean belonging to the lower middle class;

however, in London she finds herself working on the bus taking fares with her ticket machine as part of the working class (*FP* 184). Here she can be seen caught between two classes and two norms; in her Bhabhanian Space she challenges the norms of white middle class women by finding a job, an alternative way, and not depending on an irresponsible husband.

While challenging the norms of white middle class women, Leila is confused about her own story/history. However, Leila, a mulatto, a hybrid, is given a voice, to express the confusion of her story/history. Unlike Michael's grandfather, who seems to have an understanding of history, Leila's comprehension of history, both on a personal level and at a national level, appears to be vague. While talking about her Caribbean island with Mary, her neighbour in London, she realises that the history of her country is "too complicated, even for her" (*FP* 172). "In the same way as the wider diasporic phenomenon is reflected in her own migration," Ledent argues, "the West Indian historical inarticulateness is echoed in Leila's domestic history" (28). Since her mother is reluctant to talk with Leila about her father, Leila has no information about her white father, and the nature of her mother's relationship with him. "This ambivalent equation of the mother with the colonial power," Ledent argues, "is a measure of the predicament of the colonial migrant who feels attracted by the Mother Country with whom s(he) entertains the dream of a symbiotic relationship" (28). "At the level of the unconscious, therefore, colonialism was not seeking to be perceived as a sweet, kind-hearted mother, " Bhabha argues, "who protects her child from a hostile environment, but rather a mother who constantly prevents her basically perverse child from committing suicide or giving free rein to its malevolent instincts". He continues his argument in these words: "The colonial mother is protecting the child from itself, from its ego, its physiology, its biology, and its ontological misfortune" ("Foreword: Framing Fanon" xxiv). In England, Leila observes how the mother country treats its step-children as follows:

> She noticed that in some areas there were many coloured people and in other areas there were very few. She noticed that coloured people did not drive big cars or wear suits or carry briefcases, that they seemed to look sad and cold. (*FP* 121)

As for Leila's biological mother, "[t]he pain of illness, the pain of marriage, the pain of a journey across the world and the happiness of a small boy for them both to share, nothing seemed to be able to bring them together and this first exchange had been more interview than conversation" (*FP* 124). Determined to get to know her better in England, Leila finds that "[h]er mother was almost a stranger […]"' (*FP* 132). She ends up having an interview with a stranger without experiencing a heart to heart talk between mother and daughter.

In consequence, Leila experiences rejection by her mother that causes lack of confidence and loneliness, reflecting the nature of her relationship with her mother; in other words, her "mother" and her "mother country" are both strangers. Without the mother of motherland and her mother she is left only with a land, and she entertains the idea of returning to her island, that is to say her land, without her husband Michael.

Despite her mother's disapproval of Michael, Leila tells her mother that she "loves Michael" (*FP* 33) and marries him; however, she does not get an answer when she asks him "[d]o you love me, Michael?" (FP 54). Later she sees him "as both a destroyer and a partner" (*FP* 95). In England she faces the realities of her marriage as follows:

> She imagined that day-to-day life was probably as frustrating for him as it was for her, and though she could forgive him for taking temporary refuge in the arms of another woman, and though she could forgive him his drunkenness and abusiveness, she could not forgive him all of these things at once, and she could not forgive him all of these things at once, and she could never hope to understand them if he could not see her, or talk to her even. Her marriage was dead […]. (*FP* 197)

At the end of the novel she sees both the death of her mother and of her marriage, feeling lonely and alienated. As a result, her mother and Michael weaken her confidence; thus she finds herself in a state of uncertainty: being not fully accepted by them. To some extent Leila's loneliness and isolation can be illustrated through the lack of communication: for example, not knowing what Michael really wants and being unable

to communicate with her mother. Ironically, as a result of these two losses, she is liberated; these losses signal a new beginning, a new definition of her identity and life.

As a hybrid, Leila is an isolated and alienated character both in the Caribbean and Britain: in the West Indies, Leila is introverted and reticent; even at her own wedding she feels "like a spectator" (*FP* 50). Leila and Millie, who are culturally hybrids, are close friends; there is, however, a difference in terms of their position: while Leila is a mulatto, Millie is a black hybrid. Leila's relationship with Millie is close, but not conflict free. As Ledent points out: "Millie is the only person she is really close to, though she never confides in her. On the ship, she does not mix with the other emigrants, and in London she has hardly any contact with her fellow West Indians apart from her mother and husband with whom she has unsatisfactory relationships" (32). Surprisingly, Leila befriends her neighbour, Mary, who is helpful, and in Ledent's words, "[…] at one point, comes short of being a mother substitute for her" (32). However, this friendship does not last "[…] because of Leila's paranoid distrust of all white women, their friendship aborts and so do all hopes of meaningful contacts with the outside world" (32). Leila only feels close to her son, carrying him in her arms almost all the time, particularly in her moments of emotional need, "to comfort herself" (*FP* 122). "This nearly schizophrenic relationship with her baby," Ledent argues, "who is often seen as a mirror image or alter ego of his mother, clearly functions as a symbol for Leila's inner exile, a result of her migrant condition" (32-3). While talking about Leila's village called St Patrick's, Mary asks her some questions about it such as "'You mean some Irish people used to live in your village?'" (*FP* 171) and "'Were they eaten?'" (*FP* 172). Here Leila, a hybrid, a mulatto, illustrates the colonial encounter in the novel. As Azim argues "[the conversation] is presented as a colonial encounter, highlighting and dramatising questions regarding human subjectivity, rationality and civilisation" (178). In response to Mary's questions, Leila says: "'I don't think anybody ever ate anybody whatever they did, but they used to kill each other'" (*FP* 172). In her Bhabhanian Third Space Leila does not let Mary simplify the story of her village by correcting her. Here the colonial discourse can be observed: According to Fanon, the Negro, who "is the link between monkey and man- meaning, of course, white man" (*BSWM* 30), "has no culture, no civilization, no 'long historical past'" (*Black Skin, White Masks* 34).

Although Mary's friendliness surprises Leila, she can understand why as follows: "[…] Leila thought of home, and what would happen if Mary had moved into St Patrick's with her family, or into Sandy Bay, or any place on the island, and suddenly it did not seem strange" (*FP* 173). As a hybrid Leila has the ability to understand both black and white cultures because of having the combination of both cultures. However, the friendship does not last because "[…] the differences between them were becoming more obvious" (*FP* 197). Leila feels "cheated by Mary's clandestine meetings" with Miss Gordon, wondering if Miss Gordon "asked [Mary] how she felt about living next to coloured people" (*FP* 199). Here Leila's internalised emotions about whites can be observed; she feels betrayed; as a result, in her Third Space she challenges their white supremacy by not opening the door, resisting the ways that make her feel humiliated. In *The Wretched of the Earth* , Frantz Fanon argues that "[a]t the individual level, violence is a cleansing force. It rids the colonized of their inferiority complex, of their passive and despairing attitude. It emboldens them, and restores their self-confidence" (51). In burning the objects and garments that remind her of England (*FP* 200), Leila challenges the coloniser in the motherland by resisting in the form of violence; in other words, she causes instability in the motherland which is treating her as a step- child.

While keeping an eye on Leila in the novel, it is also important to take a look at another Leila in the screenplay. Caryl Phillips also wrote a script for a television serial based on *The Final Passage*. In an interview with him, Maya Jaggi asks questions regarding *The Final Passage*, and "a two-part serial for Channel 4 television" based on the novel and "screened on Channel 4 […] in July 1996" (174). When asked about adult Calvin, Leila's son, in the screenplay "as a lawyer" (174), Caryl Phillips says: "I wanted it to connect to now […]. Episode two should be a jolt to the system" (Jaggi 174). When asked about the novel which "seems bleaker than the screenplay," and whether he "deliberately lighten[ed] it" (Jaggi 174), Phillips states:

> I don't think the novel is bleaker than the screenplay, except in the ending; it should be at least as painful. But I didn't want to leave it as a downbeat ending. You can't really do that in television, you have to offer some slightly positive – not glossy or romantic – sense of the future. The screenplay shows it wasn't just a tragedy, that Leila survived, she endured and to

> some extent she thrived. She managed to do what she had in her mind all the time: make a life for her kid, and by extension all sons and daughters of that generation. At the end of the novel you don't know that. (Jaggi 174)

In the novel Leila considers returning to the Caribbean while in the screenplay she makes "a conscious choice to stay" (Jaggi 175). "Some people did go back," Phillips notes, "a lot of my family left." Phillips also says: "My great-uncle, who still to this day lives and works in the shop I was born in, left in the 1960s" (Jaggi 175). Pointing out that some people including some members of his family returned to the Caribbean, Phillips argues that going back to the West Indies is a choice.

During the interview Jaggi points out: "In the screenplay Leila's dying mother says to her: 'You're a West Indian. You've only got one home, and one home is all you'll ever have.' But thirty-five years on, Leila tells her son Calvin: 'This England is your home, and as long as it's your home, it's my home too.' How do you see that shift?" (181). In response to the question put by Jaggi, Phillips states:

> Throughout the text, the word *home* is played time and time again. Home, and different conceptions of it, is really what this screenplay - and all my work – is about. That's crucial in my conception of what happened between 1985, when the novel was published, and 1995, when I wrote the film. For that generation, we weren't sure how many would go home. We didn't have any Black MPs back then, no Black footballers in the England team, barely one or two in the cricket team. But it became clear in those ten years that this is becoming a permanent home for those West Indians of that older generation – because they're now beginning to witness their children making inroads into society. (Jaggi 181-2 emphasis original)

With his background, Caryl Phillips is familiar with, in Michael Dash's words, "double diasporic condition" (221). *The Final Passage* and *A State of Independence*, which are the first two novels, deal with his parents' generation that emigrated to Britain. In *The Final Passage*, Leila tries to get away from a life in which she is trapped on her island by moving to England with her husband and son. "Forced into an even unhappier life as the victim of racism, poverty, and domestic and personal disappointments in the West

Indian immigrant community of London," Dash argues, "she plans at the end of the novel to return to her Caribbean home" (221).

In *The Final Passage* Leila considers going back to her "small island:"

> One day Leila knew she would meet her (her mother) again and be able to tell her that. If they could not be equals as mothers then maybe they might find equality of some kind in their death. But first Leila would take a boat and leave Michael in this country among the people who seemed to keep him warm in mind and body. England, in whom she had placed so much of her hope, no longer held for her the attraction of her mother and new challenges. At least the small island she had left behind had safety and two friends, and if the price to be paid for this was a stern predictability from one day to the next then she was ready to pay it. (203)

Losing her mother and being left by her husband while expecting her second child, feeling alienated and having not much hope in England, Leila cannot help thinking that, in Birbalsingh's words, "she has jumped from the West Indian frying pan into an English fire" (174). As a result, she seriously thinks of returning to her "small island." "[…] [Leila's] return journey becomes her final passage," Burçin Erol argues, "however it may still be accepted as an initiation rite as she gains a higher level of awareness and displays the strength of making decisions on her own" (598). Unlike Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, who is a white Creole, married to the English husband, goes to England where she is locked in the attic, losing her name, fortune, freedom and sanity, Leila plans to go to England with or without her husband, names her baby, and thinks of going back to her small island without her husband.

At this point, it is important to look at the question asked by Birbalsingh: "Is Leila's return final, as the title of the novel suggests?" (174). One can observe a pattern of journey which takes place in the novel; however, the crucial journey is the one Leila and her family make from the Caribbean to England: the "two-week passage." "Since there is no definite answer to the question of whether the return journey is final" Birbalsingh argues, "he title of the novel must be regarded as ironic. Leila may, in fact, never find her 'final' passage. […] she may be doomed to perpetual voyaging" (174). Birbalsingh

continues by pointing out Leila's quest for a final passage as follows: "Descended from voyagers of 'the middle passage', Leila now seeks a final passage that would put an end to centuries of voyaging and homelessness for her people" (175). However, the novel ends ambiguously, not showing whether Leila's journey from England to her small island will be the final passage.

Similarly, after living in England for twenty years, Bertham Francis, the protagonist in *A State of Independence* by Caryl Phillips, decides to go back to his Caribbean island and makes the final passage. One of his friends says this to him:

> You English West Indians should just come back to retire and sit in the sun. Don't waste your time trying to get into the fabric of the society for you you're made of the wrong material for the modern Caribbean. You all do think too fast and too crazy, like we should welcome you back as lost brothers alright, but you lost for true for you let the Englishman fuck up your heads. (136)

As Birbalsingh argues "[h]ere the irony of Leila's 'final passage' is taken a step further by the strong hint that Bertham's return to his 'small island' is unlikely to be his 'final' passage" (181).

In an interview, Birbalsingh makes a statement regarding the characters such as Albert in "Where There is Darkness", Alvin in "Strange Fruit," and Leila in *The Final Passage* in terms of returning home (Phillips and Birbalsingh 41). In response, Phillips comments:

> My novel *A State of Independence* concerns a man who has spent 20 years in England, and also decides to go back to the Caribbean. The novel actually begins with him on a plane circling over an island. It's about the first three days he lands back there, and his reflections on how he's spent 20 years in England. He's not kept in touch with anybody. He feels some bitterness about England, and a kind of romantic love towards the Caribbean. In him I have pulled together all the strands in my plays, and really tried to examine that question of what happens to the man who tries to go back. I have never really felt that it is possible to go back. I think that the bleakness perhaps

> in some of my work comes from the fact that if you do reconcile yourself to the fact that it is not possible to go back, then you are there, and the situation that you are in is, unfortunately, an unhappy one. (41)

"West Indians in Britain who have a memory of the Caribbean," Phillips argues, "most West Indians, anyway have the idea at the back of their minds that perhaps one day they can go back." On the other hand, Phillips points out that " [t]he problem is when you don't have any memory of the Caribbean, and you have been told that's where you are from." As a result, he explains Alvin's experience in "Strange Fruit" as follows:

> […] Alvin in "Strange Fruit" goes back to the Caribbean, returns to England, and actually discovers that the Caribbean is not for him. So it's a real problem to have no memory of the Caribbean, and it's problem to have a memory of the Caribbean. If you seek to discover the Caribbean as somebody growing up in North America or Britain, then nine times out of ten you will be disappointed. (42)

In the end Leila considers returning to her "small island" in the Caribbean, which is relatively reassuring and predictable, knowing that this is the consequence of her experience in England. Leila finds the reassurance in the predictability of her children going to England and returning to the West Indies "with the next tide" (*FP* 204). "[…] [E]ven if life on the island points to the continuance of abusive attitudes," Ledent argues, "Phillips does leave some hope of change within the cyclical framework" (23). According to Ledent, there is a "cyclical vision" in relation to "[t]he symbolism of Leila's nameless island" (22). "Its circularity is to some extent a protection from the outside world," Ledent argues, "and it can be a cocoon where Leila enjoys Millie's friendship" (22).

While living in London, Leila experiences a breakdown, unemployment, loneliness and alienation. It is not life in England which makes her see the positive sides of her island; her small island in the Caribbean seems to offer, in Sarvan and Marhama's words, "the lesser of two unattractive alternatives" (35).

Michael and her mother weaken her confidence; thus she finds herself in a state of uncertainty: being not fully accepted by them. Michael's accusation of her lack of ambition challenges her. Leila is caught between the English way and the West Indian way in terms of norms. Her hybridity, being mixed-race while being neither white enough nor black enough, makes an her alien, trying to exist by moving on.

Here Phillips illustrates that identity is "determined by the politics of imperialism" (Spivak 250). *The Final Passage* portrays Leila as caught between the imperialist English and the black West Indian. Her hybridity, a mulatto, being both Caribbean and English, being both black and white while being neither Caribbean nor English, being neither black nor white makes her make a journey throughout her life.

In terms of hybridity, Michael is the second most important character in the novel; unlike Leila, who is a mulatto, he is not racially hybrid; however, he experiences the complexity of hybridity within the context of in-betweenness on a class and cultural level.

Michael is attracted to Leila because of her beauty and determination; however, he struggles with a sense of inferiority, bitterness and irritation. In other words, he experiences in-betweenness of attraction and resentment and/or inferiority and irresponsibility. His self-knowledge is limited by not comprehending the aspects of his life which shaped him; Michael is, in Sarvan and Marhama's words, "[…] an unthinking victim: his situation is all vague and confused but, nevertheless, real and damaging" (36).

Michael finds himself in-between on a class level; he is between the superiority of Leila as a mulatto, a high school graduate working as a clerk and his inferiority as a "poor boy from this village" (*FP* 48) with "[…] no qualifications. Aged thirteen when his grandfather had died, he had little choice but to leave school. The few pennies he could scratch selling country fruit in the town or, when the time came, weeding the fields, had made more sense to his grandmother than money spent on his books and uniform" (*FP* 39). In addition to this, Leila's mother's thoughts about him intensifies his sense of

inferiority as he hears what she says to Leila regarding their future marrriage: "[…] the boy from Sandy Bay is no good. He loves himself too much and he will use you. He don't even have a job. […] I mean, why a girl like you want to marry to such a man? I just don't understand!" As a result " [m]ost people thought Leila too good for Michael. But he felt that to talk of this with anyone, including Bradeth, was admission to his alleged inferiority. Therefore he kept his anger locked up" (*FP* 48).

With his lack of education or training, Michael belongs to the working class, and he marries Leila, who belongs to the lower middle class because of being a high school graduate and working as a clerk. As a result he experiences in-betweenness on a class level. Being in-between working class and lower middle class brings some conflicts such as not being approved by Leila's mother (*FP* 48). In his Third Space he resists the rejection by Leila's mother, and he changes his attitude; thus he "no longer appeared to be trying" (*FP* 35) to make efforts to be polite, bringing flowers or making good comments.

His sense of inferiority, namely his sense of in-betweenness, affects his relationships with both his wife Leila and his friend Bradeth as follows:

> He always found himself caught between giving to her, and thinking if he was ever going to make anything of his life he would need every last ounce of energy to spend where he chose and when he chose. Sometimes he chose to spend it on her, sometimes not. He had explained this so many times to Bradeth that he began to wonder if his friend was going deaf. It was nothing to do with Beverley, he would say, it was just Leila whom one minute he could like, and the next minute he could look at her filled with horror that she might betray him in some unknown way. Bradeth usually shrugged, unable to comprehend his friend's slick logic; Michael, however, told him only half the truth. (*FP* 48)

By telling half the truth and not giving Leila the attention and love she needs Michael brings a sense of uncertainty into the relationship, and destabilises Leila's confidence.

In order to understand Michael, a black man, a hybrid, it can be helpful to take a look at black masculinity. In her essay titled "Black Masculinity," Claire Alexander argues that "[t]he black peer group […] constitutes a recoil from the forces of racism into a negative and hostile structure, which is oppositional in both form and intent. It also becomes inevitably associated with deviance and criminality" (407). Alexander continues her argument by pointing out that "the concept of power is central to any discussion of black masculinity" (409). In the light of power "[m]achismo becomes a symbol of, and substitute for, the lack of power, rather than constituting an aspect of that power" (Alexander 409). As bell hooks [sic] states:

> The portrait of black masculinity that emerges in this work perpetually constructs men as 'failures', who are psychologically 'fucked up', dangerous, violent sex maniacs whose insanity is informed by their inability to fulfil their phallocentric masculine destiny in a racist context. (89)

While bell hooks describes how the black men are constructed as "failures," Alexander notes that the concept of "manliness" (409) is defined by white society in which "the origins of black macho" (409) are found. As a result, it can be seen that there is a conflict or, in Kobena Mercer's words, "contradiction" between white men and black men in terms of masculinity. She states:

> There is a further contradiction, another turn of the screw of oppression, which occurs when Black men subjectively internalise and incorporate aspects of the dominant definitions of masculinity in order to contest the definitions of dependency and powerlessness which racism and racial oppression enforce. (qtd. in Alexander 409)

While Kobena Mercer focuses on black men's dependency and powerlessness which stem from racism, Michel Foucault concentrates on sexuality in relation to power. In his book titled *The History of Sexuality*, Michel Foucault writes:

> Sexuality […] appears rather as an especially dense transfer point for relations of power […]. Sexuality is not the most intractable element in power relations, but rather one of those

> endowed with the greatest instrumentality: useful for the greatest number of manoeuvres and capable of serving as a point of support, as a lynchpin, for the most varied strategies. (103)

As for black masculinity, Foucault points out that sexuality is convenient for negotiations and policies. Alexander argues that "[b]lack masculinity is […] best understood as an articulated response to structural inequality, enacting and subverting dominant definitions of power and control, rather than standing in for them" (410). In consequence, "[…] the black peer group can be seen as a base for interaction and negotiation with the wider society" (Alexander 410).

According to Alexander, the relationships between black men and white women were expected to be seen in financial and sexual exploitation. He states that black men's situation is empowered through white women (413-414). Moreover, white women were regarded as a symbol of success (Alexander 416). As for the relationship between black women and white men, these women were no longer viewed as black; they were also not seen as part of the black community (Alexander 415).

In addition to Alexander's argument in terms of black masculinity, it would be illuminating to take a look at Fanon who refers to Veneuse in *Black Skin, White Masks*. Born in the Antilles, Jean Veneuse, who lives in Bordeaux, is a Negro (64). He is aware of the fact that mulattoes and Negroes want to "gratify their appetite for white women" when they arrive in Europe (qtd. in *Black Skin, White Masks* 69). Most of them are inclined to marry white women in order to be the master of white women in Europe. They want to take their revenge by marrying white women because of what their ancestors have done to their ancestors (*Black Skin, White Masks* 69-70).

In some ways Phillips portrays Michael as a victim of the patriarchal norms which stem from colonialism by which black men, and of course Michael, are deprived of their masculinity. His situation is illustrated in the vagueness of his life in these words: "This frustrated him, but it also made him more determined to prove something to himself and everyone. What exactly it was he was trying to prove he was still unsure. And how he would prove it he had no idea" (*FP* 48).

In the interview with Jaggi Maya, Caryl Phillips is asked if Michael is "the picture of the irresponsible male, with his two women in the Caribbean, then a third in London?" Phillips replies: "In the Caribbean context that's not a big deal. I wouldn't criticize him at all for that" (178). According to Phillips, there are "different set[s] of rules" in the Caribbean and England. In the Caribbean, "[t]here's a certain honesty to island societies where the place is so small everybody knows what's going on – but nobody wants to know. In a society like that, if you're going to have a mistress, or another woman, there's no point trying to be clandestine about it. Leila knew; she still married him. Beverly knew about Leila; she still had Michael back" (178). Interestingly, Phillips explains that in the Caribbean context "Michael's behaviour […] would have been unquestioned. […] The nature of those 'outside women' and 'outside children' would be acceptable […]" (178). However, in the context of England, in his words, "[t]here is anonymity, but paradoxically, that means you've got to come clean; because there's the potential to hide, there's more pressure on you to be open" (178). As a result, in England "Michael makes a clean break, packs his bag and goes, because he can't do the same, 'here I am, there I am', thing that worked in the Caribbean" (178).

In the light of the different set of rules, it can be helpful to take a look at the definition of norm. Andrew Edgar and Peter Sedgwick define norm as "[…] a rule that governs a pattern of social behaviour" (231). They state that "[e]xamples of norms include laws, moral principles and guidelines, customs and the rules of etiquette, but also may express desirable values and goals". According to them there are "two meanings" for norm. As they argue:

> On the one hand, a norm may encapsulate the usual behaviour within a society (and is thus a norm in the sense of being statistically normal behaviour). On the other hand, the norm is a pattern of behaviour that is desired or prescribed, whether or not actual behaviour complies with this ideal. (231).

"The idea that individual human beings learn the norms of their society through early upbringing," Edgar and Sedgwick note, "[…] helps to explain how individuals become competent social agents, who, by and large, conform with the expectations of their

culture" (231). In addition, Edgar and Sedgwick state that acceptance of a norm"should be examined according to the power structures within society (232).

In the light of the definition of norm and Phillips's explanation, Michael's attitude towards women is the accepted norm in the Caribbean; however, in England, this attitude is challenged and judged as irresponsibility. His irresponsibility – leaving Leila alone on their wedding night (*FP* 57), on the day their son is born (*FP* 84), on the day her mother dies (*FP* 131) and not providing for his family, which is unacceptable, is challenged by Leila, Millie, Bradeth, Mary and Miss Gordon within the context of the patriarchal and colonial discourses.

Culturally being neither black nor white, Michael experiences in-betweenness on a cultural level; he is caught in-between the norms of matriarchal system, which is the Caribbean system, and the norms of patriarchal system, which is the English system. According to Philips, the Caribbean society is a matriarchal one while the English society is a patriarchal one (Phillips and Birbalsingh 43). In the novel, Leila is the decision maker; she takes the initiative and she is the one with money. In addition, Michael's grandmother plays an important role in his life, encouraging him to marry Leila and go to England. On the other hand, he faces the norms of the patriarchal society in England in terms of responsibility. Consequently, the sense of alienation Michael feels has physical and cultural sides which lead to his invading white women and the white colonial mother.

Since irresponsibility is associated with Michael, Caryl Phillips throws light on the irresponsibility of men from the West Indies by saying that "[s]tudies of West Indian marriages show there was an unbelievable fatality rate of marriages, largely centred on the irresponsibility of the man" (Jaggi 178). According to Phillips, one of the priorities of people who emigrate from the Caribbeans to England is to give their children a better future through a good education; however, they get lost in the world of glamour at the expense of their children who lose contact with their grandparents. As a result, they find themselves without the stabilising effect of the extended family. While indulging in

irresponsibility, they deprive their children of "the benefits of this migration" (Jaggi 178).

Not taking the responsibility of his family in England, Michael blames Leila for not having ambition and for not encouraging him to accomplish his ambitions: "You see, you don't got no ambition, girl. You come to this country just to sit in this house and play with the child? Well? You come here to push pram around London with the old woman next door?" (*FP* 177). In addition, he says: "Why you can't say back me up like any wife should do? Why you can't say, Michael, I think it's a good idea, or Michael, I'm proud of you showing some ambition and spark even though I know it's a risk, or something like that? Other fellers have wives who help them, why I must be different?" (*FP* 177).

Phillips notes that "[t]he Caribbean doesn't have the same social, cultural patterns as Britain" (Jaggi 179). He argues:

> There's a certain arrogance to assume that you can just import without any refining thought a pattern of behaviour that works in Kingston or Port of Spain, dump it in London and say, what is your problem? Those social, cultural or marital patterns are not going to work here. And even if you, as a male, think they are, there's no way the women who arrive here from Kingston or Karachi will think so. They're going to absorb the ideas of the dominant culture. (Jaggi 179)

Leila, who comes from the Caribbean, finds it difficult to accept what Michael does in London, although she was able to tolerate some of his irresponsible behaviour in the Caribbean.

Phillips states:

> I do think it's naïve to come into a society and, along with your cardboard suitcase, bring a set of values you think society must somehow accommodate. Every migrant into a country thinks about that country's patterns of behaviour, social mores. You

> have to think, okay these are the things that matter to this society and these are the benefits it can offer me; I'm going to challenge it to this point. (Jaggi 179)

In the light of the information given by Phillips, it can be observed that the English way of life challenges Michael in terms of irresponsibility; both Mary and Miss Gordon ask Leila whether her husband has got a job. As Phillips points out, Michael challenges the English norms at first, but at the same time finds himself between two different norms. As for Michael's ambitions, Phillips says:

> Michael's driven by ambition, and ambition is founded on some primary wound, some sense of rupture in your life; it's certainly not limited to the West Indian community. Michael thinks he's got something to prove. He's got more talent than the community he was born and brought up in would ever allow him to develop. (Jaggi 179)

Phillips's explanation sheds light on Michael's ambitions; Michael describes his ambitions as follows:

> "It's just that I don't want to spend the rest of my life looking for small work when I know I can get big work if I wants it. Me, I want a car and a big house and a bit of power under my belt, like any man does want. This country breed too many people who just cut cane in season and happy to be rum-jumbie out of it." (*FP* 103).

In the novel, Michael expresses this like his grandfather: "There's nothing here for me to do, nothing! […] Nothing, man!" (*FP* 53). This is the ambition Michael has; this is the very thing which he wants to achieve in England. However, while living in the Caribbean he displays his frustration through drinking and his motorcycle. Michael often gets drunk. On the whole the men on the Caribbean island seem to drink day and night: it is a kind of drinking which stems from, in Sarvan and Marhama's words, "boredom and hopelessness to a state of stupor" (35). Sarvan and Marhama argue that "[t]he island is a place where the sound of a motorcycle starting up is a sufficient event to attract adult spectators" (35). "Michael falls back on physical vanity: great care is

taken over the length of his shirt sleeves and trousers," Sarvan and Marhama note, "the motorcycle gives him the illusion of power, and he possesses the 'freedom' that is a total denial of responsibility" (35).

With limited education or training, Michael faces racial prejudice revolving around limited employment and accommodation. Given the situation in Britain for people like Michael, Sarvan and Marhama state that "[…] individuals like Michael are unaware of the impersonal forces that have damaged their lives, they continue the pattern: irresponsible, violent, fantasizing, trying to find temporary escape from a reality they do not comprehend and cannot combat. It is the reader who reaches an understanding" (36).

Ledent argues "[…] if the transmission of ancestral societal patterns is an element of continuity, it is also a factor of backwardness that partly accounts for the machismo of some Caribbean men" (22). Ledent illustrates this by referring to Leila as follows: "Although a victim of her husband's male chauvinism, Leila unwittingly contributes to its perpetuation by assessing her son's needs for a paternal presence as stemming from the simple fact that ' he [is] a boy'" (22), while she endured the pain of being fatherless as a girl. Michael also seems to be keen on teaching his son about how to treat women in terms of marriage: "I tell him not to bother at all [to get married], for why a man should buy cow if he can get milk free?" (*FP* 53).

Focusing on exploitation in the Caribbean, Ledent notes that "[s]exism and bondage, the main manifestations of human exploitation on the island, allegorically merge since men-women relationships display overtones reminiscent of slavery, especially of the absentee landlords who came and went between their home and their plantations as they fancied" (23). Ledent states that "[l]ike the plantation owners of the past Michael lives out his parasitic existence in different places" (23) such as his grandmother's house, which he calls home, Leila's house and Beverly's house. The economic relationship between Michael and Leila is important; through Leila's initiative and her money, Michael goes to England thinking there is "work" and there is "opportunity" there (*FP* 95). Without Leila it would not be easy for Michael to go because it is his initial

thoughts that throw light on his emotions: "'Leaving this place going make me feel old, you know, like leaving the safety of your family to go live with strangers"' (*FP* 11).

With Leila's initiative, they come to England, hoping to have a better life; however, they face racism in terms of employment and housing. Similarly, in an interview with Kwesi Owusu, A. Sivanandan talks about his experience about racism in finding employment and accommodation in London in the late 1950s: "I came alone first, before my family, to scout around for a job. I had an economics degree and was an associate of the Institute of Bankers, but I could not find a job easily. Even though I had some money, I could not find a house […] and I went to live with two other Ceylonese families in Notting Hill" (Owusu 453). In addition, "I tried for other jobs that went with my qualifications, but to no avail. And I finally ended up as a teaboy in a library in Kingsbury"(Owusu 454- 455). Unlike A. Sivanandan, Michael and Leila, with no qualifications or skills, first stay in a boardinghouse in which men sleep "head to toe" due to the smallness of the house in London. Although Michael sees the signs such as "Rooms to let." "No vacancies for coloureds." "No blacks." "No coloureds," (*FP* 156), he fails to appreciate the house Leila rents; when he sees the house, which Leila finds through a nurse in the hospital where her mother is, he expresses his disappointment as follows:

> Well, when you done take a good look at your terraced property I think you better think again about whether decent people can be expected to live in a place like this.' Michael pushed his fingertips into one of the damp patches on the wall. 'We don't travel halfway around the world to live in a place like this. (*FP* 162)

Unlike Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, who is stuck in the attic room in England, Michael demands more in terms of housing. While being interviewed, Michael expresses the humiliation he feels: "'You saw the job in the paper? Michael nods. […] 'Well, go on. Go on in or are you waiting for something?' Michael sat […] and felt the silent mockery" (*FP* 166). Mr Jeffries, whose "name was on a plaque," continues to ask more questions:

> "'Have you ever been to prison or to a courtroom in front of a judge?' Michael shook his head.'How many wives, one or two?'
>
> 'One.' […] 'You're ready to start straight away, are you?' Michael nodded […]" (*FP* 166).

Then Michael gets the job. At work Michael meets Edwin who shows him around and who tells him in these words about Mr Jeffries who hires him and white people in general:

> 'Well, all you need to remember is they treat us worse than their dogs.' […]. 'Well, you better know. He's a cunt and he's going to call you names, man, and you going to behave like a kettle for without knowing it you going to boil. It's how the white man in this country kills off the coloured man. He makes you heat up and blow yourself away.' (*FP* 168)

The way Michael is treated can be understood better by Fanon's observations in *Black Skin, White Masks*: "I am not at all exaggerating: A white man addressing a Negro behaves exactly like an adult with a child and starts smirking, whispering, patronizing, cozening. […] I have made a point of observing such behaviour in physicians, policemen, employers" (31). As newcomers to England, although they are culturally hybrids, they experience a culture shock; feeling unwelcomed and facing racism are the things for which they are not well prepared. In *The Final Passage,* Phillips points out that the " […] confrontation of West Indians with their former colonial power cannot but be a shattering experience because they are cognitively ill-equipped to understand their ambivalent relation to England, and hence to fend for themselves" (qtd. in Ledent 27).

Cutting off his connections with his past after arriving in England, Michael, unlike Leila, chooses to look to the future without thinking of the significance of the past as told by his grandfather. Michael's grandfather, a skilful negotiator in the Bhabhanian Third Space, has a "man talk" (*FP* 40) with Michael, sharing his experiences about the complexities of hybridity. He begins with the hybridity of their island in terms of trees as follows: "Michael, who plant the trees?' Michael shook his head, but his grandfather

did not seem to be expecting an answer. […] Yam is Africa man tree, Mango is India man tree, Coconut is Pacific man tree, so who plant the trees, Michael?' (*FP* 40). Then he refers to the way he was conceived: "Among the cane my own father did sire me with neither love nor law, you hear me? Neither love nor law?" (*FP* 40). He might be a mulatto, although there is not much evidence apart from this hint. Later he talks about the emotions such as hatred and anger with which Michael struggles, and advises him to find a middle way in order not to destroy himself:

> You must hate enough, and you must be angry enough to get just what you want but no more! No more! For, if you do, you just going end up hating yourself. Too much laughing is bad for the coloured man, too much sadness is bad for the coloured man, but too much hating is the baddest of them all and can destroy a coloured man for true. (*FP* 41)

And finally he mentions the result of negotiation in the Bhabhanian Third Space: "In Costa Rica I never did talk to a white man with my hands in my pockets. Now?Always" (*FP* 41). In the Third Space he can talk with a white man with his hands in his pockets, destabilising his sense of superiority; in other words, he gains some freedom and equality in terms of behaviour. Moreover, he reveals his understanding of Michael's ambitions and the limits of their island:

> 'Ambition going teach you that you going has to flee from beauty, Michael. Panama? Costa Rica? Brazil? America? England? Canada, maybe? West Indian man always have to leave his islands for there don't be nothing here for him, but when you leave, boy, don't be like we. Bring back a piece of the place with you.' ' Remember me.' (*FP* 42)

His grandfather knows that Michael will eventually go somewhere else, but he wants him not to be someone who has "no history". Initially Michael fails to remember his grandfather's advice. However, at the end of the novel Michael does remember his grandparents' aspirations: "On the threshold of a new life, he could not afford to fail in fulfilling the wishes of his grandparents" (*FP* 170).

The representation of Michael, the Caribbean and the economic relations in the novel displays the assumptions of colonialism. In addition to the racism he faces in England, Michael has a problem with Leila in terms of relationship and communication. Leila describes his inability to relate to her as follows: "[…] his silence baffling and hurtful, his moods unpredictable, his distrust obvious and murdering any chance of a durable base to their relationship" (*FP* 163). In one word their marriage was "to be tolerated" (*FP* 164). As a result, Michael sees no future with Leila in these words:

> […] as the days slipped by, and ship edged its way towards England, [he] came to admit that his future might not include Leila, in the same way that his present did not include Beverley. If England was the place that Alphonse Walters had led him to believe it was, then how much energy could he afford to waste continually patching up this newly repaired but still leaky marriage? The more he thought about it, the more he realized the nurturing and pretence would have to stop. (*FP* 169- 170)

While in the Caribbean, Michael could get away with his ways which are part of the acceptable norms in society, but in England he finds himself between the two different norms. He has two alternatives: either to adopt the English norms and become a responsible husband and father, or leave his family and imitate his former coloniser as a mimic man: invading England and white women. He seems to choose the latter one. As a freed colonised, and new citizen/subject, Michael wants to be master or "coloniser" of white women; in addition, if possible, the master of his colonial mother: the land, namely England. He plays with the ring on his finger his grandmother gave him before leaving for England; it was his grandmother who encouraged him to go with the hope that he would not fail there, saying "You been like a son to me since your parents die and I have a lot of hope invested in you, boy. I don't want you to fail" (*FP* 110). While spinning the ring "around on his finger" (*FP* 170), he thinks of his grandfather, thinking that " [t]here was no chance of his leaving this country with nothing, that was certain. How much he left with seemed to depend totally upon how much he wanted, and how hard he was prepared to try" (*FP* 170).

In order to comprehend Michael's situation, it is important to see how Phillips sees the relationship between men and women from the West Indies. When asked about the West Indian women who "take an excess of blows, both emotionally and physically in their relationships with men" (Phillips and Birbalsingh 42) in their society, Phillips responded:

> I don't know enough about West Indians domestically in the islands. In the case of West Indians in Britain, it seems to me that the women have taken more blows than the men. In the Caribbean it is a matriarchal society. When you come to Europe it is a patriarchal society. I think that quite vicious shift from one form of behaviour between men and women to a different form in Europe produced, in a lot of West Indian minds, an irresponsibility which no generation could afford to endure. After all, when you are going through problems of adjusting to a society which in many ways and forms is rejecting you, it doesn't really help if your father, for whatever reasons, decides to leave the family. (Phillips and Birbalsingh 43)

Phillips gives an example from his family in these words: "[…] it happened in my family. But that's not why I am concerned with examining it. I am concerned because there are very few of my West Indian contemporaries in England, who actually grew up in a stable family background" (Phillips and Birbalsingh 43). Here one can see that the complexity of the hybridity faced by Phillips sheds light on Michael's life.

Ledent comments on the lack of details of what happens to Michael and his life at the end of the novel, saying "[i]t is not clear whether Michael's vanishing from the narrative at the end of the novel results from an authorial refocusing on Leila or an inability on Phillips's part to conclude Michael's portrait convincingly" (26). In some ways Phillips's explanation about black masculinity and Michael's frustrations throws light on this matter; the vagueness of his life can be illustrated in these words: His frustrations "[…] made him more determined to prove something to himself and everyone. What exactly it was he was trying to prove he was still unsure. And how he would prove it he had no idea" (*FP* 48). Interestingly, Michael's in-betweenness in terms of inferiority and superiority is challenged; he is reduced to a "destroyer" (*FP* 95).

Michael's attitude and unacceptable behaviour such as his drinking habit, his irresponsibility, his giving up his job without finding another one, his having a child by Beverley before marrying Leila, his continuing his relationship with Beverley, and his sleeping with white women in England, are challenged within the context of the patriarchal and colonial discourses. While Leila challenges him in terms of employment and responsibility, love and communication, Bradeth challenges him in terms of responsibility and friendship. While being challenged, Michael faces the complexity of hybridity and experiences in-betweenness; he is caught between the Caribbean norms and the English norms; in other words, between the norms of the colonised and the norms of the coloniser.

Millie, Leila's close friend, is the third character to be explored in terms of hybridity and hybrid identity. Encountering the coloniser and experiencing the coloniser's culture, Millie becomes culturally hybrid; in other words, she is part of a culturally hybrid island. Like Michael, Millie is a colonised black hybrid; she is a representation of in-betweenness in terms of culture; she is a hybrid, facing the complexities of hybridity on cultural and class levels. Hence, she finds herself in her Third Space, negotiating with Bradeth, Leila, Michael and her aunt.

In the novel Millie is depicted as "[a] small black girl-woman, who is "more attractive than pretty "(*FP* 23). Millie appears to be confident about her understanding and judgment concerning the relationships and the situation in the Caribbean. What is more, she has an independent mind. As a colonised subject, Millie is aware of the funny ways of the white people on the island; and yet she says sees them, but she does not know why as follows: "'Why is it that white people do behave so funny? […] But I don't know for real though, do I? It's just what I seeing around these parts'" (*FP* 14). Interestingly, Michael also has funny ways (*FP* 98). In consequence, as a hybrid and a colonised subject, Millie is in a position to know the ways of both the white and black people, including their funny ways, on the island. With this understanding, in her Third Space she questions, challenges and reasons.

Millie moves in with Leila when Leila's mother is in England; she helps Leila with her baby in Michael's absence, and keeps her distance from her aunt who disapproves of Millie in that she has a baby out of wedlock. Leila and Millie are close friends, and they are both culturally hybrids. Millie tries to be there for Leila whenever she needs her; for example, she talks with Leila about Michael and Beverly, and challenges Leila over Beverly and the child, saying "[…] 'don't pretend, don't be coward with me' […]" (*FP* 60); she helps the white nurse who helps Leila to give birth to her son (*FP* 72); she asks Bradeth, her boyfriend who becomes her husband later, to go and find Michael because Leila needs him (*FP* 74). Bradeth even challenges Michael over his behaviour towards Leila as follows: "'I telling you I going break every bone in your damn body if you don't start treating she right. Every last bone'" (*FP* 93). In addition, Millie is not only confident, but she also helps Leila to gain and /or regain confidence in times of adversity; for instance, "[…] with [Millie's] help Leila had been slowly trying to regain some confidence" (*FP* 83). When Leila cried "Millie hugged her. Then […] wiped away a tear of her own" (*FP* 84). After all, "[t]hey were learning to live with each other as friends, as women, as mothers" (*FP* 77).

Although their relationship is close, it is not conflict free. The conflict between her and Leila is bigger than it appears; in other words, the conflict between them highlights how they see their island and the future they want to have. Choosing different ways that will not enable them to share a future, makes them experience some kind of strangeness before saying farewell in these words: "Best friends, closer than sisters for all of their nineteen years, this final afternoon they had almost become strangers" (*FP* 15) .

When Leila talks with Millie about going to England, she asks her some questions:

> 'So you not planning on ever coming out there?' Millie sucked her teeth. 'I already done tell you so.' 'But what about Bradeth?'
>
> 'What about him? You know I sure he and Michael thinking up some cock and bull plan about all of us going out there together but he must think I stupid.' (*FP* 114)

Here it can be seen that Millie is aware of the desire Bradeth might have and the plans the two friends might make. In fact, these two fiends do have a conversation about England. When Michael says that their island does not have much to offer, Bradeth agrees with him saying: "[…] 'but what you think if say next year Millie and myself decide we going come to England?'" (*FP* 103) In response, "Michael laughed and opened his eyes. 'I don't see nothing wrong but you must first ask Millie'" (*FP* 103). Interestingly, Bradeth says: "'Well, I don't know what she thinking, but if we come it means she going have to sell up the shop and I somehow don't think she going want to do that'" (*FP* 103). The talk they have shows some facts about the dynamics of the relationship between Millie and Bradeth: first of all, Millie seems to be the one who makes decisions regarding their finance; after all, Millie is the shop owner; in other words, this is a kind of matriarchal society.

In the novel Phillips uses Millie in some key events; for instance, staying in the Caribbean:

> […] Millie was adamant. "Too many people beginning to act like it's a sinful thing to want to stay on this island but there don't be no law which say you must go to England, you know. People here too much follow fashion." (*FP* 106)

In response, Michael explains that there are opportunities for young families like themselves in England. What is more, they can come back after retiring from their work and saving some money (*FP* 106). Millie responds to this reasoning in these words: "So just tell me how many people you see coming back from England with anything except the clothes they standing up in?" (*FP* 106). Millie also asks about the length of time: "'So how long you think it going take them before they coming back?'" asked Millie. "'Well, for those that really want to come back maybe five years,' suggested Michael. 'Maybe ten'" (*FP* 107). However, Millie disagrees with Michael and says: "'More like five hundred years' […] Maybe longer'" (*FP* 107). By challenging and questioning whether it is a crime or not to go to England, Millie weakens the reason of finding a better future and/or "home" in the motherland, while strengthening her position in the Third Space where she finds herself "at home" as a negotiator.

Unlike Leila, who decides to go to England with or without Michael, and while in England, entertains the idea of returning to her small island with her children without him, Millie makes up her mind to stay on her island which is, in her own words, her "home." Millie describes her island, her home as follows: "[…] it's here I belong. You maybe don't see it but me, I love this island with every bone in my body. It's small and poor, and all the rest of the things that you and Michael probably think is wrong with it, but for all of that I still love it. It's my home and home is where you feel a welcome" (*FP* 115). She is associated with the concept of home; moreover, her link to today's and tomorrow's island is part of her confidence.

In her Bhabhanian Third Space, Millie challenges her friends and her husband, while accepting certain challenges and avoiding the one related to her husband. While talking about England with Leila, Millie speculates about what she knows regarding white women in relation to coloured men as follows: "[…]I hear the white women [in England] do anything to get their hands on a piece of coloured man. […] Don't look so surprised, for I sure you know what I telling you, but that don't be to say that you going have any trouble with Michael. It's just to say that I not prepared to take the risk of that happening between me and Bradeth" (*FP* 114).

She chooses not to go to England where she might find herself in the sphere of white women colonisers to whom she might lose her husband. In addition, she does not want to be reduced to the position of the colonised other in the realm of the citizenship in the mother country. This incident illustrates her self-understanding regarding what she can take and what she cannot take. In short, Millie creates her third space in which she is relatively happy; in other words, her husband and her island belong to her.

Last but not least, Leila's mother, Mrs Franks, like her island (*FP* 147-8) is nameless; she is a colonised black hybrid in the Caribbean; she is also a black hybrid who happens to be a citizen or subject in England. Mrs Franks is a representation of in-betweenness in terms of culture, experiencing the complexities of hybridity on a cultural level. While being nameless and being referred to as "Leila's mother" in the Caribbean, she is called Mrs Franks as a citizen in England.

The loss of self and identity is illustrated through the absence of name in *The Final Passage*. When it comes to citizenship, *OED* defines citizenship as "[t]he position or status of being a citizen of a particular country." It defines citizen "[a] legally recognized subject or national of a state or commonwealth, either native or naturalized." *Cambridge Dictionary* defines citizenship as "the state of being a member of a particular country and having rights because of it". It defines citizen as "[a] person who is a member of a particular country and who has rights because of being born there or because of being given rights, or a person who lives in a particular town or city." Chris Barker elaborates on the idea and on a similar line, and defines citizenship as "[a] form of identity by which individuals are granted a sense of belonging, social rights and obligations within political communities. Citizenship articulates civil society and the state" (436). Barker notes that "[…] citizenship is understood to be a form of identity that provides the grounds for a shared polity" (431). In keeping with the definition of citizenship above Dahlgren argues that "citizenship is a form of identity and one aspect of our multiple selves." In addition, in his essay entitled "Forward: Framing Fanon," Homi Bhabha points out that "[c]itizenship becomes the unstable, unsustainable psycho-affective site in the conflict between political and legal assimilation […]" (xxii). Bhabha also asks this question, which speaks volumes: "Without the rights of representation and participation, in the public sphere, can the subject ever be a citizen in the true sense of the term?" What happens, in Bhabha's words, "[i]f the colonized citizen is prevented from exercising his or her collective and communal agency as a full and equal member of civil society […]?" (xxiv). When the colonised citizen finds it difficult to rent a house and get a job in order to lead a normal life as a citizen, it is not easy to feel at home without participating in the country where one is a citizen. In other words, it is difficult to be a citizen while not benefiting from the rights of citizenship.

In the light of the significance of naming and citizenship through Mrs Franks can be seen since she is deprived of her name and identity in the novel. Hence in *The Final Passage* this is illustrated in the life of "Leila's mother." Knowing the importance of naming, Leila's mother asks her daughter about the name of her grandson:" 'Who call the boy Calvin?' 'I did,' said Leila nervously" (*FP* 124). It is important to see that she shows her power and assertion by naming her baby. In *The Final Passage* Mrs Franks is portrayed as

> […] a dark, almost black woman and spoke with a deep voice. She could no longer shout, her body having been steadily eroded by an illness which left her looking much older than her forty years. Though her high cheekbones suggested the skeletal, in her proud voice one could detect the lost joy of a voluptuous past. For her this was no longer life as she just stumbled from day to day. (*FP* 32)

Abused as a child by a great-uncle and feeling used by white men, in other words invaded and doubly colonised by black men and white men, "Leila's mother" does not trust white people. In addition, she teaches Leila, whose father is white and yet who does not even know which of the three men is her father, not to trust white people, saying "You think you can trust them? You can't. And if you think the white woman was sleeping you were wrong. White women never sleep with both eyes closed if a coloured woman is around, and they never see a coloured man without something moving inside of them" (*FP* 129). Here it can be observed that Leila's mother, who is a hybrid culturally, seems to have an understanding about both sides.

In terms of bonding with her baby, Mrs Franks "[…] learned to love her more each day, not because she would be her only child, not even because she was her constant and only companion, but because of Leila's sharp intelligence, which always made her think twice as quickly as any adult had ever made her" (*FP* 126). Unknown to Leila, her mother was not a natural mother, who learned how to love her baby because of her "sharp intelligence;" in truth she "[…] had never wanted a child. In fact she had never wanted a man, for when she saw her first penis hanging with arrogance before her, its owner at least fifty years older than her, a great-uncle […]"(*FP* 125). It was her great-uncle who "[…] conjured a stiffness into himself and climbed on her, grunting loudly as he did so […]" (*FP* 125). She is abused and traumatised as a child, and misused as an adult. This is seen at the bottom of her problem in terms of warming to her baby. In other words, she experiences double colonisation. "There followed a swift volley of lovers […]" (*FP* 125). "But then, as the final man sliced into her body, a young man of almost her own age, she was overcome with the horror of the fact that in less than six months' time her first child, not his child, a child that belonged to all of them and none

of them, would be breaking its way out of her body" (*FP* 126). Later this is what she experiences:

> The three men from whom she demanded money, accusing them all of being the father and threatening to expose them as molesters if they even so much as looked at Leila, these white men eyed their daughter from afar and happily paid the money safe in the knowledge that they had a relationship with the island that would live on after they left. Leila's mother barely spoke to them: she took their money and put it in the bank. She hoped that she would have no need to spend it so that her daughter might one day have it. (*FP* 126)

Here it can be seen that Leila is racially hybrid; in other words, she is fathered by one of these white men. With a colonising attitude, these white men want to invade this island and a black woman through whom they desire to keep on living there, namely making their mark there. Mrs Franks finds it difficult to understand her intelligent daughter Leila when she wants to marry Michael who is "no good." Being used by men, Mrs Franks does not want her clever daughter to be used by a selfish man who does not have a job; in addition, she does not want her to be treated with violence. While in hospital in England, Leila's mother asks Leila about her relationship with Michael, wanting to know whether he is violent or not. "'Michael beat you yet girl?' she had asked, as if asking for a glass of water. […] 'Well, don't sound so shocked, for I'm sure you realize that men beat women. But no man ever beat me.' She paused, then went on" (*FP* 130.) She tells Leila about an incident that "[o]nce a man get so mad with me over some fruit […] he tried to beat me with a long piece of cane […] and I took the stick and broke it in half […] " (*FP* 130) "[…] I just kept my head high […] and walked […]" (*FP* 131). Here it can be observed that Mrs Franks resists in a form of violence through which she protects herself. She also informs Leila about the importance of self-protection.

In her Bhabhanian Third Space, Leila's mother challenges and questions her daughter and the people who challenged her, while accepting some challenges such as not feeling at home in England: "'Leila, child, London is not my home. […] And I don't want you to forget that either'" (*FP* 124). As a mother in a patriarchal society she does not feel at

home with her colonial mother, who deprives her of her name; thus she says England is not home for her, feeling no sense of belonging. Due to her illness, she can no longer use her deep voice; eventually she dies and loses her voice altogether in England, where she is buried. In urging Leila to remember that London is not her home, she implies that Leila should continue to journey in search of a home. Unlike Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, who loses her name, fortune and sanity in the attic room in England, Mrs Franks, who has no name, and does not feel at home in England, keeps on questioning home and belonging until she dies.

In conclusion, in *The Final Passage* Leila, Michael, Millie and Mrs Franks display the complexities and challenges of hybridity and hybrid identities. They experience in-betweenness; however, in their Bhabhanian Third Space they challenge, question, negotiate and win small victories which are important in redefining their hybrid identities.

Neither black nor white, Leila, a mulatto, knows both black and white cultures. Despite the complexities and difficulties of hybridity, in her Bhabhanian Third Space she manages to be a decision maker, taking initiatives and moving on. Michael, who is culturally hybrid, goes to England from the colonised Caribbean with the hope of becoming a citizen, trying to be the "master" of white women and the colonial mother. In his Third Space he challenges the patriarchal norms through his irresponsibility, while being challenged by the patriarchal and colonial discourses. Millie, who is culturally hybrid, is the character who creates her Third Space in the Caribbean where she is at home with herself, knowing her island and her husband belong to her. Mrs Franks, a cultural hybrid, challenges and questions naming, the behaviour of black and white men, belonging and home in her Bhabhanian Space; in other words, she is determined to question in the way Fanon says: "O my body, make of me always a [woman] who questions!" (*Black Skin, White Masks* 232).

In short, unlike Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, these hybrids travel to the mother country and do what they decide. With the new-found roles and freedom, although limited, the freed colonised and the citizen challenge and subvert the norms of the

motherland. The old colonisers are no longer secure in their own motherland due to their step siblings who come to display their way of life; and the step siblings take part in their way of life by disrupting it.

CONCLUSION

Jean Rhys in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Caryl Phillips in *The Final Passage* illustrate the concepts of hybridity and hybrid identities to challenge and resist the colonial discourses in relation to the structures of identity and the consequent birth of the Third Space. While questioning and challenging the naturalisation of the complexity of hybridity and hybrid identities, they reveal the sense of in-betweenness and being neither/nor through their protagonists, Antoinette Cosway and Leila, who are constantly on the move. The question of hybridity in both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *The Final Passage* depicts that neither the colonial nor the colonised cultures and languages can be fixed, being indivisible, and bringing about the concepts of postcolonial hybridity and hybrid identity based on racial, cultural, social, class, economic and religious levels. In consequence, hybridity and hybrid identities keep on seeking the Third Space with new possibilities and alternatives.

Both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *The Final Passage* are postcolonial novels, which resist and subvert colonialist perspectives; they are both written by hybrid writers, who picture the situations in which hybrid characters find themselves in the Third Space. In other words, both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *The Final Passage* focus on self-representation regarding hybridity and hybrid identities.

Jean Rhys's and Caryl Phillips's characters are representations of postcolonial hybrids who are in quest of an alternative identity, seeking to propose alternative solutions in order to live together in the Third Space. Born in the Caribbean as a descendant of the coloniser, Rhys experienced in-betweenness, not completely belonging to the either the one or the other; hence, her in-betweenness is depicted in her heroine Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Caryl Phillips's *A View of the Empire at Sunset* is the story of Jean Rhys based on her hybrid identity, showing her experiences such as relationship, marriage, education and language. As a hybrid writer of the generation settled in England, Caryl Phillips is in a position in which he can look at both the Caribbean and Britain in terms of slavery, colonialism and neocolonialism and tackle them, while being a voice for hybrids.

Wide Sargasso Sea is a rewriting by Jean Rhys of Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. Set in the 1840s in the West Indies, *Wide Sargasso Sea* tackles colonialism, concentrating focusing on Antoinette as a hybrid character, and showing a changing wold in relation to power among the English, the Creoles, and the newly emancipated slaves. On the other hand, Caryl Phillips's *The Final Passage* portrays a young family who go to England in the 1950s from an unnamed small island of the Caribbean. They arrive in London, hoping to have a better life; however, they experience new challenges within the context of in-betweenness and unbelongingness; they encounter discrimination in employment, housing and social relationships which alienates them, urging the thoughts of returning to the Caribbean.

Wide Sargasso Sea and *The Final Passage* have some similarities and differences. There are some similarities such as race and racism which are associated with whites, blacks, mixed-races, mulattos, mixed backgrounds, in-betweenness, names and naming. There is also a significant similarity between Antoinette and Leila, who are regarded as "passive" due to patriarchalism and colonialism. With regard to differences, there are some differences such as racism, revolving around employment and housing in England, motherhood, norms of patriarchal and matriarchal societies and citizenship.

Although both novels depict the Caribbean, they are placed in different time settings; therefore, they deal with the same issues. They give us a chance to see the development of the situation before and after the migration to England, and to discover the changes that take place.

Both Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Leila in *The Final Passage* are regarded as passive characters by some critics. While Antoinette is seen as a "passive victim," Leila is viewed as "an irritatingly passive character;" however, they both prove the critics, who see them as passive characters, wrong. Antoinette, who is given a chance to tell her story regarding her hybrid identity, turns the view of being a passive victim into a modern heroine. As for Leila, as has already been observed, she has some important moments when she can be active in terms of taking the initiative that affects her future. For

example, deciding to go to England with or without Michael, and thinking of going back to her small island without her husband.

While race and racism, which are relevant to the rise of colonialism, can be seen in the background of Antoinette's story and the story of the other characters in *Wide Sargasso Sea* in the 1840s, it can be observed in the background of the story of Leila and other characters in *The Final Passage* in the 1950s as well. Portrayed as the "Other," savagery, sexuality and madness are illustrated through Bertha Mason. Bertha's wild nature is associated with her "mixed" Creole background in Jamaica. Rhys renames Bertha Antoinette and denies the English husband a name although it is not difficult to identify him with Bronte's Rochester. Antoinette belongs neither to the white Europeans nor to the black Jamaicans, and finds herself in the Wide Sargossa Sea, in the Third Space. The loss of both self and identity is shown through the loss of name in *Wide Sargasso Sea*; Antoinette's words "names matter" demonstrate her comprehension that the change of name creates the loss of self and identity; thus the loss of power can be experienced, and this is the problem Christophine brings forward and demands the English husband call his wife by name. Daniel, who is a mulatto, faces the complexity of hybridity; not remembering his name, his father reduces Daniel to nothing. Unlike Antoinette, the English husband has no name in the novel; Jean Rhys deprives him of his name in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. In *The Final Passage,* Leila's mother Mrs Franks, like her island, has no name. The loss of self and identity is depicted through the absence of name in *The Final Passage*.

In *Wide Sargasso Sea* Christophine, Antoinette's black nurse, is the character with the capability of understanding the humanity of black and white, challenges and questions the English husband's power, destabilising and subverting his power. By doing that she empowers her place in the Third Space where she is entitled to negotiate. Christophine, a hybrid on cultural and religious levels, becomes a bridge between Antoinette and her husband. Being neither slave nor free, but being both, Christophine has an ability of understanding about what a coloniser is and what a Creole is. As a result, she finds herself in the Third Space, to negotiate with them, and to challenge them in her own environment.

Similar to Christophine, in *The Final Passage* Millie is a hybrid character who understands both the white and black people, and comprehends the situation both in the Caribbean and England; as a result, she challenges and questions her friends in terms of home and belongingness in her Third Space. She decides not to go to England, at least, for two reasons: firstly, she does not want to lose her husband to white women; secondly she does not want to be reduced to the position of the colonised other in the mother country. This gives a picture of her self-understanding concerning what she can take and what she cannot take.

In *The Final Passage*, being neither black nor white, Michael experiences in-betweenness on a cultural level; he finds himself caught between the norms of the Caribbean matriarchal system and the norms of the English patriarchal system. As a result, Michael suffers from alienation which leads to his invading white women and the white colonial mother. Michael, who is a freed colonised and new subject/citizen, wants to be master or "coloniser" of white women; what is more, he desires to be the master of his colonial mother: the land, namely England.

Mrs Franks is another hyrid character who experiences in-betweenness on a cultural level. While being nameless and being referred to as "Leila's mother" in the Caribbean, she is called Mrs Franks as a subject/citizen in England. The consequence of naming and citizenship is observed through Mrs Franks who is deprived of her name and identity in *The Final Passage*; in her Bhabhanian Third Space Leila's mother challenges and questions her daughter and the people who challenged her, while accepting some challenges such as not feeling at home in England. She does not feel at home with her colonial mother, who robs her of her name, in the English patriarchal society; hence she says England is not home for her, not feeling a sense of belonging.

When asked about his sense of belonging by Stephen Clingman, Phillips remarks that "it's still in flux;" in other words, "[…] there's no real resolution" (Clingman and Phillips 114).

In terms of belonging, Phillips points out the significance of the West Indian carnival, which turned into a riot in London:

> Paradoxically, this happened on what was supposed to be the biggest day for multi-racial harmony. It turned into a riot. But it was not blacks against whites, it was blacks against police. The police were the symbols of the state oppression. The black people were saying, "We don't have any jobs. We get the lousy schools. We get the worst housing. We are sick of being picked up on the street by police and being arrested and searched for nothing. (Bell 580)

Being seen as the object of history, being regarded as a problem in England, namely in the mother country, and not being seen to be capable of controlling their lives, hybrid characters challenge the mother who happens to be a step-mother of the motherland and their step siblings in the Third Space. It has already been observed that according to the policies that relate to them, unemployment and housing shortages immigrants face are not a result of "racism, but of their "irresponsibility."

Facing racism and prejudices in terms of employment and housing, the Windrush generation plays a crucial role in challenging, questioning and resisting the colonial assumptions in their Third Space. For instance, the generation in the 1950s is more assertive than the one in the 1840s. When Antoinette comes to England with the English husband in the 1840s, she finds herself locked in the attic, losing her name, fortune, freedom, health and sanity. Like Antoinette, Mrs Franks loses her name without feeling at home and without feeling a sense of belonging in England; nevertheless, she keeps on questioning her sense of home and belonging until she dies. However, Leila and Michael, unlike Antoinette, resist and challenge the assumptions; for instance, Leila resists the white ideology of the mother at home who takes care of the children, and she comes up with her hybrid solution and balances work and child care. On the other hand, Michael demands better housing and employment, wanting to set up his own business. In other words, in the Third Space each generation is more demanding in their desire for a better life so as to feel more at "home."

While dealing with the question of home, Phillips makes a comment on what kind of home he prefers: “Water seems to me to be something which binds us together. […]. I’m interested in what brings us together and what allows us to meet each other, and water, to me, is a pathway along which we continue to meet and encounter each other. I’d rather be on the path than at ‘home’ at the beginning or at the end of the journey” (Clingman and Phillips 117). “The journey involves loss,” Phillips argues, “it always involves loss. You’ve left a place; you’ve left people behind you, left memories behind you. But there seems to me to be a process of reinvention that can happen during the journey” (Clingman and Phillips 117).

In *The Final Passage*, the main character, Leila, discovers her place of in-betweenness or unbelongingness both in the Caribbean and England. Leila’s in-betweenness or unbelongingness comes to be a constant position, in Fred D’Aguiar’s words, “a brand of destabilized stability” (211.) As a hybrid, a mulatto, Leila experiences unbelongingness and/or in-betweenness. Her life is depicted by being on the move, in D’Aguiar’s words, “ by leaving and never really arriving to a place where she can relax” (219). According to D’Aguiar, “[t]here is no end to the voyage, no port to offer respite;” in addition, he notes that in-betweenness is” a way of life” (219). In the light of D’Aguiar’s description, experiencing in-betweenness is Leila’s way of life, she does not belong anywhere in the Caribbean and in England; as a result, unbelongingness becomes a continuous condition.

In conclusion, the hybrid characters both in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *The Final Passage* display the complexities and challenges of hybridity and hybrid identities on racial, cultural, class, religious and economic levels. They experience in-betweenness; however, in their Bhabhanian Third Space they challenge, question, negotiate, offer alternative solutions and win small victories which are important in redefining their hybrid identities. What is more, new generations are more prepared to protest and get what they ask for, while questioning and challenging power holders. As a result, the motherland and its children are no longer in a position to maintain their way of life and their norms without the complexity of the challenges of hybrids and hybridity.

As it has been seen, there are some differences between the earlier generation and the Windrush generation; the Windrush generation demands more and becomes more assertive about their rights as citizens. The work of Phillips sheds light on the changing nature of hybridity and how it keeps on evolving.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

Phillips, Caryl. *The Final Passage*. London: Penguin, 1985. Print.

Rhys, Jean. *Wide Sargasso Sea*. London: Penguin, 2001. Print.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Alexander, Claire. "Black Masculinity." *Black British Culture and Society: A Text Reader*. Ed. Kwesi Owusu. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Ang, Ien. *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living Between Asia and the West*. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Angier, Carole. *Jean Rhys*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1991. Print.

Arends, Jacques, Muysken, Pieter and Smith, Norval, eds. *Pidgins and Creoles: An Introduction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. Print.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts.* London: Routledge, 2007. Print.

---. *The Empire Writes Back*. London: Routledge, 1989. Print.

---,eds. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Ashcroft, Bill and Pal Ahluwalia. *Edward Said*. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Azim, Firdous. *The Colonial Rise of the Novel*. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.

Bakhtin, M.M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications, 2003. Print.

Becker, Bastian Balthazar. " 'An Everblooming Flower': Caribbean Antidote to a European Disease in the Works of Caryl Phillips." *South Atlantic Review*. 75. 2 (2010): 113-134. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Bell, C. Rosalind. "An Interview with Caryl Phillips." *Callaloo*. 14. 3 (1991): 578-606. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Bewes, Timothy. "Shame, Ventriloquy, and the Problem of the Cliché in Caryl Phillips." *Cultural Critique*. 63 (2006): 33-60. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

---. "Forward: Framing Fanon." *The Wretched of the Earth*. Frantz Fanon. New York: Grove Press, 1963. Print.

---, ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.

Birat, Kathie. "Delegated Dominion: Language and Displacement in 'Cambridge' by Caryl Phillips." *Revu française diétudes américaines*. 72 (1997): 26-36. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Birbalsingh, Frank. "The West Indies." *The Commonwealth Novel Since 1960*. Ed.

Bruce King. London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1991. Print.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 200. Print.

Brah, Avtar and Annie E. Coombes, eds. *Hybridity and its Discontents*. London:Routledge, 2000. Print.

Braithwaite, Edward. *The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica: 1770-1820*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971. Print.

Brathwaite, E. K. *Contradictory Omens: Cultural Diversity and Integration in the Caribbean*. Mona: Savacou Publications, 1974. Print.

Bronte, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. New York: Barnes & Noble Classics, 2005. Print.

Brooker, Peter. *A Glossary of Cultural Theory*. London: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

Brown, Julia Prewitt, "Class and Money." *The Victorian Novel*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 2004. Print.

Brydon, Diana and Helen Tiffin. *Decolonising Fictions*. West Yorkshire: Dangaroo Press, 1993. Print.

Burnard, Trevor. "Slave Naming Patterns Onomastics and the Taxonomy of Race in Eighteenth-Century Jamaica." *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*. 31.3 (2001): 325-346. JSTOR. Web. 11.01.2019.

Burton, Richard D.E.. "Names and Naming in Afro-Caribbean Cultures." *NWIG: New West Indian Guide / Nieuwe West – Indische Gids*. 73.1/2 (1999): 35-58. JSTOR. Web. 11.01.2019.

Calbi, Maurizio. "'The Ghost of Strangers': Hospitality, Identity and Temporality in Caryl Phillips's 'The Nature of Blood'. " *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*. 6. 2 (2006): 38-54. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Carr, Helen. *Jean Rhys*. Plymouth: Northcote House Publishers, 1996. Print.

Carter, Bob, Clive Harris and Shirley Josh. "The 1951-1955 Conservative Government and The Racialization of Black Immigration." *Black British Culture and Society: A Text Reader*. Ed. Kwesi Owusu. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Casas, Bartoloméo de las. *Yerlilerin Gözyaşları*. İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2011. Print.

Castle, Gregory, ed. *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. London: Blackwell, 2001. Print.

Childs, Peter and Patrick Williams. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*. London: Longman, 1997. Print.

---, and Roger Fowler. *Literary Terms*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print.

"Citizen".*Cambridge Dictionary*. https:dictionary.cambridge.org

"Citizenship".*Cambridge Dictionary*. https:dictionary.cambridge.org

Clingman, Stephen and Carly Phillips. "Other Voices: An Interview with Caryl Phillips." *Salmagundi*. 143 (2004): 112-140. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

D'Aguiar, Fred. "Home is always elsewhere: individual and communal regenerative capacities of loss." *Black British Culture and Society: A Text Reader*. Ed. Kwesi Owusu. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Dash, Cheryl M. L. “Jean Rhys.” *West Indian Literature*. Ed. Bruce King. London: Macmillan Education Ltd, 1995. 117-126. Print.

Dash, Michael.“Psychology, Creolization, and Hybridization.” *New National and Post-colonial Literatures: An Introduction*. Ed. Bruce King. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Demaegd, Marijke. “The British Immigrant Experience in *A Distant Shore* and Other Works by Caryl Phillips.” MA Thesis. Ghent University, 2007-2008. Web.

Denny, Frederick Mathewson. “Names and Naming.” *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Ed. Mircea Eliade. Vol. 10. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987. 300-307. Print.

Du Bois, W.E.B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Dover Publications, 1994. Print.

Earle, Samuel. “ ‘Rivers of Blood:’ The Legacy of a Speech That Divided Britain.” *The Atlantic* April 20 2018. Web. 30 Nov 2019.

Edgar, Andrew and Peter Pedgwick, eds. *Cultural Theory: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Emery, Mary Lou. *Jean Rhys at “World’s End*.” Austin:University of Texas Press, 1990. Print.

Erol, Burçin. “Destination England: Buchi Emecheta’s *Second Class Citizen* and Caryl Philips’s *The Final Passage*.” *Neohelicon* (2019) 46: 591-599. Web. 08.08.2019.

Essed, Philomena. “Everyday Racism.” *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*. Eds. David Theo Goldberg and John Solomos. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002. Print.

Esther, Beula. “Socio-Psychological Alienation and Power Relation- A post structuralist reading of the Blacks, Browns and Whites in the Novels of Toni Morrison’s *The Bluest Eye*, Caryl Phillips’s *The Final Passage*, Mulk Raj Anand’s *Untouchable*.” *IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS*). 19. 1 (2014): 26-28. Web. 15.01.2019.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967. Print.

---. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1963. Print.

Ferguson, Moira. “Sending the Younger Son Across the Wide Sea: The New Colonizer Arrives.” *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Ed. Gregory Castle. London: Blackwell, 2001. 309-327. Print.

Ferguson, Niall. *Civilization*. London: Penguin Books, 2012. Print.

Flora, Joseph M.. “ Names and Naming in Hewingway’s Short Stories.” *South Atlantic Review*. 69.1 (2004): 1-8. JSTOR. Web. 11.01.2019.

Forna, Aminatta. “ Mothers of Africa and the diaspora: shared maternal values among Black women.” *Black British Culture and Society: A Text Reader*. Ed. Kwesi Owusu. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheo Books, 1978. Print.

Frickey, Pierrette M., ed. *Critical Perspectives on Jean Rhys*. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press, 1990. Print.

Gallez, Paulo Le. *The Rhys Woman*. London: The Macmillan Press, 1990. Print.

Gendzier, Irene L.. *Frantz Fanon: A Critical Study*. New York: Pantheon, 1973. Print.

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. Print.

Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1993. Print.

---. *'There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack.'* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991. Print.

Gould, Amy E.. "The Sins of Our Forefathers Perpetuated?" *Administrative Theory and Praxis*. 29.4 (2007): 513-533. JSTOR. Web. 11.01.2019.

Guignery, Vanessa, Catherine Pesso-Miquel and Francois Specq, eds. *Hybridity: Forms and Figures in Literature and the Visual Arts*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011. Print.

Hall Jnr, R. A. *Pigin and Creole Languages*. London and New york: Longman Linguistics Library, 1988. Print.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*. Eds. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. 392-403. Print.

---. "Negotiating Caribbean Identities." *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Ed. Gregory Castle. London: Blackwell, 2001. 280-292. Print.

---. "New Ethnicities." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 223-227. Print.

---. *The Multicultural Question*. Milton Keynes: Pavis Centre for Social and Cultural Research, Faculty of Social Sciences, 2001. Print.

---, and Paul du Gay, eds. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage, 1996. Print.

---, ed. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, 1997. Print.

---. "Who Needs Identity." *Questions of Cultural Identity*. Eds. Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay. London: Sage, 1996. Print.

Harrison, Nancy R.. *Jean Rhys*. London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988. Print.

Hintzen, Percy C. "The Caribbean: Race and Creole Ethnicity." *Racial and Ethnic Studies*. Eds. David Theo Goldberg and John Solomos. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002. Print.

hooks, bell. *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Boston: South End Press, 1992. Print.

Howells, Coral Ann. *Jean Rhys*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991. Print.

*"*Hybridity*"Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary

Innes, C. L. *Postcolonial Literature in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Jaggi, Maya. "The Final Passage: An Interview with Writer Caryl Phillips." *Black Britis Culture and Society: A Text Reader*. Ed. Kwesi Owusu. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

James, Lawrence. *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*. London: Little, Brown and Company, 1998. Print.

James, Louis. *Caribbean Literature in English*. London: Longman, 1999. Print.

Jenkins, Hilary. "Introduction." *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Jean Rhys. Ed. Hilary Jenkins. London: Penguin, 2001. Print.

Jones, Claudia. "The Caribbean Community in Britain." *Black British Culture and Society: A Text Reader*. Ed. Kwesi Owusu. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Jussawalla, Feroza and Reed Way Dasenbrock, eds. I*nterviews With Writers of the Post-Colonial World*. London: University Press of Mississipi, 1992. Print.

Karaca, Ebru. "The burden of Caribbean immigrants in Caryl Phillips' *Strange Fruit* And *Where There is Darkness*." Hacettepe Üniversitesi 2007. Unpublished.

King, Bruce. "Reviewed Work(s): Caryl Phillips by Benedicte Ledent." *World Literature Today*. 77. 1 (2003): 87-88. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

---, ed. *The Commonwealth Novel Since 1960*. London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1991. Print.

---, ed. *New National and Post-Colonial Literatures*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

---, ed. *West Indian Literature*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd, 1995. Print.

Kraidy, Marwan M. *Hybridity, or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2005. Print.

Kureishi, Hanif. *Dreaming and Scheming: Reflections on Writing and Politics*. London: Faber, 2002. Print.

Ledent, Bénédicte. *Caryl Phillips*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002. Print.

Levine, Philippa. *The British Empire*. London: Pearson Longman, 2007. Print.

Low, Gail. "'A Chorus of Common Memory': Slavery and Redemption in Caryl Phillips's 'Cambridge' and 'Crossing the River.'" *Research in African Literatures*. 29. 4 (1998): 122-141. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Maier, Anca-Ioana. "Home and Exile in Caryl Phillips' *The Final Passage*." *Studia UBB Philologi*a. LVIII. 3 (2013): 127-139. Web. 15.01.2019.

Malcolm, Cheryl Alexander and David Malcolm. *Jean Rhys*. London: Twayne Publishers, 1996. Print.

Maurel, Sylvie. *Jean Rhys*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998. Print.

McLeod, John. *Beginning postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000. Print.

Mellown, Elgin. "Characters and Themes in the Novels of Jean Rhys." *Critical Perspective on Jean Rhys*. Ed. Pierrette M. Frickey. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press, 1990. Print.

Mills, Sara. *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Morton, Stephen. *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Muysken, Pieter and Norval Smith. “The Study of Pidgin and Creole Languages.” *Pidgins and Creoles: An Introduction*. Eds. Jacques Arends, Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. Print.

Naipaul, V.S. “Without a Dog’s Chance.” *Critical Perspectives on Jean Rhys*. Ed. Pierrette M. Frickey. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press, 1990. Print.

“Names.” *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Vol. 24. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1995. 733-738. Print.

“Names, peronal.” *The Macmillan Family Encyclopedi*a. London: Macmillan Press, 1993. 9-10. Print.

Ngugi, Wa Thiong’o. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1986. Print.

O’Connor, Teresa F. *Jean Rhys: The West Indian Novels.* New York: New York UP, 1986.Print.

Okazaki, Hank. “Dis/location and ‘Connectedness’ in Caryl Phillips.” *Journal of West Indian Literature*. 6. 2 (1994): 88-96. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. Oxford: OUP, 1990. Print.

OED. https://www.oed.com

Owusu, Kwesi. “The struggle for a radical political culture: An interview with A. Sivanandan.” *Black British Culture and Society: A Text Reader*. Ed. Kwesi Owusu. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Phillips, Caryl. *A View of the Empire at Sunset*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018. Print.

---. *Cambridge*. London: Pan Books, 1992. Print.

--- and Biralsingh, F.. " Interview with Caryl Phillips." *Caribbean Quarterly*. 37. 4 (1991): 40-46. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

---, ed. *Extravagant Strangers: A Literature of Belonging*. New York: Vintage Books, 1997. Print.

---. *The European Tribe*. New York: Vintage Books, 2000. Print.

---. *A State of Independence*. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. Print.

---. *Where There is Darkness*. Ambergate: Amber Lane Press, 1982. Print.

---. *Strange Fruit*. Ambergate: Amber Lane Press, 1981. Print.

---. and Abigail Ward. "An interview with Caryl Phillips." *Contemporary Literature*. 53. 4 (2012): 628-645. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Phillips, Caryl and F. Biralsingh. " Interview with Caryl Phillips." *Caribbean Quarterly*. 37. 4(1991): 40-46. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

--- and Abigail Ward. "An interview with Caryl Phillips." *Contemporary Literature*. 53. 4 (2012): 628-645. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Procter, James. *Stuart Hall*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Raiskin, Judith L.,ed. *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Jean Rhys. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999. Print.

---. "England: Dream and Nightmare." *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Jean Rhys. Ed. Judith Raiskin. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999. 250-258. Print.

Ramchand, Kenneth. "Wide Sargasso Sea." *Critical Perspectives on Jean Rhys*. Ed. Pierrette M. Frickey. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press, 1990. Print.

---. *The West Indian Novel and Its Background*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970. Print.

Rhys, Jean. *Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları, 1989. Print.

---. *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları, 1989. Print.

Rhys, Jean. *The Collected Short Stories*. New York: W.W.Norton and Company, 1987. Print.

---. *Letters 1931 – 66*. Eds. Francis Wyndham and Diana Melly. New York: Penguin, 1985. Print.

---. *Voyage in the Dark*. New York: W.W.Norton, 1982. Print.

---. *Smile Please*. London: Penguin, 1981. Print.

Rodgers, Lucy and Maryam Ahme. "Windrush: Who exactly was on board?" BBC News 21 June 2019. Web. 30 Nov. 2019

Rojek, Chris. *Cultural Studies*. Cambridge: Polity, 2007. Print.

Ropero, Maria Lourdes Lopez. “Travel Writing and Postcoloniality: Caryl Phillips’s ‘The Atlantic Sound’.” *Atlantis*. 25. 1 (2003): 51-62. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Royle, Nicholas. *Jacques Derrida*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Penguin, 1991. Print.

Rutherford, Jonathan. *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990. Print.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1994. Print.

---. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 2003.

Sarvan, Charles P. and Hasan Marhama. “The Fictional Works of Caryl Phillips: An Introduction.” *World Literature Today*. 65. 1 (1991): 35-40. JSTOR. Web. 08.02.2018.

Seed, Patricia. *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe’s Conquest of the New World,1402-1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.

Showalter, Elaine. “Feminine Heroines: Charlotte Bronte and George Eliot.” The Victorian Novel. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 2004. Print.

Silku, Rezzan Kocaoner. “Postcolonial routes and diasporic identities: Belonging and displacement in Caryl Phillips’s *The Final Passage* and *A Distant Shore*.” *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*. 45. 2 (2009): 163-170. Web. 15.01.2019.

Smith, Roger. “Names.” *Encyclopedia of Family Life*. Ed. Carl L. Banston. Vol. 4. Pasadena: Salem Press, 1999. 981-984. Print.

Spencer, Ian R. G. *British Immigration Policy Since 1939*. London: Routledge, 1997. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *Critical Inquiry*. 12. 1. (1985): 243-261. Print.

Showalter, Elaine. "Feminine Heroines: Charlotte Bronte and George Eliot." *The Victorian Novel.* Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 2004. Print.

Terrien, Nicole. "The Neo-Victorian Novel: Hybrid or Intertextual Mosaic?" *Hybridity: Form and Figures in Literature and the Visual Arts*. Eds. Vanessa Guignery, Catherine Pesso-Miquel and François Specq. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011. Print.

The Holy Bible, New International Version. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984. Print.

Thomas, Nicholas. *Colonialism's Culture*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1994. Print.

Thomas, Sue. *The Worlding of Jean Rhys*. London: Greenwood Press, 1999. Print.

Thorpe, Michael. "The Other Side: Wide Sargasso Sea and Jane Eyre." *Critical Perspectives on Jean Rhys*. Ed. Pierrette M. Frickey. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press, 1990. Print.

Trotman, David V.. "Acts of Possession and Symbolic Decolonisation in Trinidad and Tobago." *Caribbean Quarterly*. 58.1 (2012): 21-43. JSTOR. Web. 11.01.2019.

Tyson, Lois. *critical theory today*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.

West, Cornel. *Keeping Faith*. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.

Williams, Patick and Laura Chrisman. *Colonial Discourse and Post- Colonial Theory*. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. Print.

Yıldız, Nazan. "Hybridity in Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* "Hybridity in Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*: Reconstructing Estate." Diss. Hacettepe Üniversitesi 2015. Unpublished.

Younge, Gary. "Given Britain's history it's no surprise that racism still infects our politics." *Guardian* 29 Nov. 2019. Web. 30 Nov. 2019

Young, Robert J. C. *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

---. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001. Print.

---. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in theory, culture and race*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.

---. *White Mythologies*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
DOKTORA TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORİJİNALLİK RAPORU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 15/06/2021

Tez Başlığı : Jean Rhys'in *Wide Sargasso Sea* ve Caryl Phillips'in *The Final Passage* Adlı Romanlarındaki Melez Kimliklerin Bhabha'nın Bakış Açısı ile İncelenmesi

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 148 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 15/06/2021 tarihinde şahsım/tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda işaretlenmiş filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı % 8 'dir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1- ☒ Kabul/Onay ve Bildirim sayfaları hariç
2- ☒ Kaynakça hariç
3- ☒ Alıntılar hariç
4- ☒ Alıntılar dâhil
5- ☒ 5 kelimeden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Uygulama Esasları'nı inceledim ve bu Uygulama Esasları'nda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Tarih ve İmza

Adı Soyadı:	Hatice Çelikdoğan
Öğrenci No:	N10144288
Anabilim Dalı:	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Programı:	İngiliz Kültür Araştırmaları
Statüsü:	☒ Doktora ☐ Bütünleşik Dr.

DANIŞMAN ONAYI

UYGUNDUR.

(Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol, İmza)

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ETİK KOMİSYON MUAFİYETİ FORMU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 21/05/2021

Tez Başlığı: Jean Rhys'in *Wide Sargasso Sea* ve Caryl Phillips'in *The Final Passage* Adlı Romanlarındaki Melez Kimliklerin Bhabha'nın Bakış Açısı ile İncelenmesi

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmam:

1. İnsan ve hayvan üzerinde deney niteliği taşımamaktadır,
2. Biyolojik materyal (kan, idrar vb. biyolojik sıvılar ve numuneler) kullanılmasını gerektirmemektedir.
3. Beden bütünlüğüne müdahale içermemektedir.
4. Gözlemsel ve betimsel araştırma (anket, mülakat, ölçek/skala çalışmaları, dosya taramaları, veri kaynakları taraması, sistem-model geliştirme çalışmaları) niteliğinde değildir.

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Etik Kurullar ve Komisyonlarının Yönergelerini inceledim ve bunlara göre tez çalışmamın yürütülebilmesi için herhangi bir Etik Kurul/Komisyon'dan izin alınmasına gerek olmadığını; aksi durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Tarih ve İmza

Adı Soyadı:	Hatice Çelikdoğan
Öğrenci No:	N10144288
Anabilim Dalı:	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Programı:	İngiliz Kültür Araştırmaları
Statüsü:	☐ Yüksek Lisans ☒ Doktora ☐ Bütünleşik Doktora

DANIŞMAN GÖRÜŞÜ VE ONAYI

(Prof. Dr. Burçin EROL, İmza)

Detaylı Bilgi: http://www.sosyalbilimler.hacettepe.edu.tr
Telefon: 0-312-2976860 **Faks:** 0-3122992147 E**-posta**: sosyalbilimler@hacettepe.edu.tr

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ETHICS COMMISSION FORM FOR THESIS

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

Date: 21/05/2021

Thesis Title: A Bhabhaesque Approach to Hybridity in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Caryl Phillips's *The Final Passage*

My thesis work related to the title above:

1. Does not perform experimentation on animals or people.
2. Does not necessitate the use of biological material (blood, urine, biological fluids and samples, etc.).
3. Does not involve any interference of the body's integrity.
4. Is not based on observational and descriptive research (survey, interview, measures/scales, data scanning, system-model development).

I declare, I have carefully read Hacettepe University's Ethics Regulations and the Commission's Guidelines, and in order to proceed with my thesis according to these regulations I do not have to get permission from the Ethics Board/Commission for anything; in any infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility and I declare that all the information I have provided is true.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

Date and Signature

Name Surname:	Hatice Çelikdoğan
Student No:	N10144288
Department:	English Language and Literature
Program:	British Cultural Studies
Status:	☐ MA ☒ Ph.D. ☐ Combined MA/ Ph.D.

ADVISER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL

(Prof. Dr. Burçin EROL, Signature)

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Ph.D. DISSERTATION ORIGINALITY REPORT

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

Date: 15/06/2021

Thesis Title : A Bhabhaesque Approach to Hybridity in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Caryl Phillips's *The Final Passage*

According to the originality report obtained by myself/my thesis advisor by using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software and by applying the filtering options checked below on 15/06/2021 for the total of 148 pages including the a) Title Page, b) Introduction, c) Main Chapters, and d) Conclusion sections of my thesis entitled as above, the similarity index of my thesis is 8 %.

Filtering options applied:

1. ☒ Approval and Decleration sections excluded
2. ☒ Bibliography/Works Cited excluded
3. ☒ Quotes excluded
4. ☒ Quotes included
5. ☒ Match size up to 5 words excluded

I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

Date and Signature

Name Surname:	Hatice Çelikdoğan
Student No:	N10144288
Department:	English Language and Literature
Program:	British Cultural Studies
Status:	☒ Ph.D. ☐ Combined MA/ Ph.D.

ADVISOR APPROVAL

APPROVED.

(Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol, Signature)