Postfeminist Discourse in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Warner's *Indigo*

Postfeminist Discourse in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Warner's *Indigo*: Ambivalence, Liminality and Plurality

By

Natali Boğosyan

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS

PUBLISHING

Postfeminist Discourse in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Warner's *Indigo*:
Ambivalence, Liminality and Plurality,
by Natali Boğosyan

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4116-1, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4116-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This book is the unchanged version of my Ph.D. dissertation written in the summer of 2008. The time I spent here in Istanbul with Ms. Marina Warner was decisive for me in attempting to have my dissertation published as a book. My voluntary accompaniment to her may not have been nearly as potent as she, in the guise of the implied author, had been during my journey into her novel *Indigo, or Mapping the Waters*. Both modes of encounters with her proved invaluable for me in their own ways. I am grateful to her.

Undertaking any kind of analysis of Shakespeare's play *The Tempest*, similarly with his other major plays, is quite a feat today, considering the extensive amount of studies already carried out on it. This fact notwithstanding, studying the play through a postfeminist and post-colonialist lens, as this work aims to do, has proven highly rewarding. This stems as much from the subtleties and ambiguities underlying *The Tempest* as from the fact that despite the ever-burgeoning interest in the play, examples of postfeminist reading into it are relatively few, and that, as its corollary, the nature of the relationship between female or feminised figures, and the lack thereof, has remained largely underexplored.

Marina Warner's novel *Indigo, or Mapping the Waters* fleshes out the characters and themes from *The Tempest*, which still retains its power that derives from a subtle exploration of the issues of exploitation, slavery and racism. The significance of *Indigo* primarily lies in the fact that it is one of the most comprehensive rewritings of the play from a postfeminist and post-colonialist angle, 'reconstructing' the geography-specific experiences of colonisation as experienced by both offenders and victims, in search of both poetic and political justice, as one may would call it. The novel contests the possibility of reconciliation between both 'ends', which is an ethical concern. *Indigo* is also the only rewriting penned by a 'white' British woman writer. Within this respect, the idea of eliciting what a writer 'from the centre' had to say about the very centre she closely belonged to was admittedly seductive: Warner is the great-grand-grand-daughter of Sir Thomas Warner, who established the first British colony in the Caribbean in 1624.

Diverse forms of ambivalence, liminality and plurality have been employed as the central axes upon which to centre this work in so far as

they lie within the scope of the conjunctures between postfeminism and post-colonialism. These three elements are addressed in terms of politics and poetics, the latter of which is informed by the ontological status of these texts, the poetics of *Indigo* being more accentuated. Any exploration that concerns itself with these terms within the framework of postfeminist discourse inevitably takes symbolic or non-symbolic representations of femininity and the feminised other into its scope, and so does this book.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my happiness for having had the privilege to complete my dissertation at a department which fostered my appreciation of literature itself, and to thank quite a few people who have contributed to the completion of this study throughout what seemed to be a never-ending process. Above all, I owe a great debt to my advisor and chair Professor Esra Melikoğlu at Istanbul University. In marathon correspondence, she provided appreciative and tough-minded feedback, which enriched my study. I must express my gratitude also for the time she allocated. I am likewise indebted to Professor Zeynep Ergun for her belief in my work crowned by her generous and encouraging words. It is mainly thanks to her that I developed a better insight into literature. Associate Professor Murat Seçkin has always been there for me for the last twenty years without always making it apparent. I am grateful for that. I also wish to thank Assistant Professor Yıldız Tuncer Kılıç for her incisive comments during classes.

A time came when I needed the encouragement to send a copy of my work to a publishing house. Arda Ardaşes Agoşyan was there for me.

My parents, Ani and Karekin Boğosyan, have always actively supported my academic and non-academic endeavours. I am deeply grateful to both. Not least, Cudig, my pet name for my then four-year-old niece, deserves a special thank-you for trying hard to understand my long absences. She has already learnt to ‘wait’.

INTRODUCTION

Reality is a question of perspective; the further you get from the past,
the more concrete and plausible it seems -
but as you approach the present,
it inevitably seems
more and more
incredible.[1]

The poetic and political paradigms ingrained in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611) and its postfeminist rewriting Marina Warner's *Indigo, or Mapping the Waters* (1992) expose, by and large, the ways in which the economies of patriarchy and colonialism inimically and surreptitiously ally against women and colonised subjects. Such interweaving merits a postfeminist and post-colonialist reading into the ideological correlatives of these works' relationship to the concurrent operations of the two modes of domination in terms of both poetics and politics. This book undertakes such an analysis by pivoting it around the textualisation of the umbrella concepts of ambivalence, liminality and plurality, which, in crude terms, lend the works a magnanimous degree of diversity and fluidity, providing an antidote to and a foil for attempts at intransigently monolithic and univocal configurations by patriarchy and colonialism.

Feminist historian and scholar Joan W. Scott's proposition that gender is "a primary way of signifying relationships of power… a crucial part of the organisation of equality or inequality"[2] serves as a heuristic tool for understanding the unswerving and tacit alliance between the dynamics of patriarchy and colonialism. Gender is summoned as testimony to construct and legitimise all sorts of social relationships and meaning, which "typically take the form of a fixed binary opposition, categorically and unequivocally asserting the meaning of male and female, masculine and feminine."[3] Helen Carr succinctly elucidates the straight jacket of the symbolic space women and colonised subjects, or non-Europeans, are caught in:

---

[1] Rushdie, *Midnight's Children*, 165.
[2] Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History*, 42.
[3] Ibid., 43.

> Both are seen as part of nature, not culture, and with the same ambivalence: either they are ripe for government, passive, child-like, unsophisticated, needing leadership and guidance always *in terms of lack* – no initiative, no intellectual powers, no perseverance; or, on the other hand, they are outside society, dangerous, treacherous, emotional, inconstant, wild, threatening, fickle, sexually aberrant, irrational, near animal, lascivious, disruptive, evil, unpredictable.[4]

The insistent establishment of and 'naturalisation' involved in such gendered coding[5] index how patriarchal ideology readily provides a model for colonial domination, resulting in the legitimation of the minor status of both women and colonial subjects in all arenas. It is this consummate union of significations of gender and power which stem from "the same deep structure"[6] that affords the solid basis for why postfeminism allies with post-colonialism[7] as well as postmodernism in order to undercut earlier epistemologies which, on a very broad front, "presupposed a foundation of undislocatable binaries – centre/margin, self/other, coloniser/colonised," according to Bill Ashcroft et al., whilst they all have distinct "political objectives and ambitions."[8]

Thanks in large to its engagement and intersection with elements of cultural theory, particularly the theoretical and political debates revolving around postmodernism, poststructuralism, post-colonialism and psychoanalytic theory, postfeminism,[9] which denotes "a stage in the constant evolutionary movement of feminism,"[10] levels a comprehensive

---

[4] Carr, "Woman/Indian," 50, my emphasis.

[5] For an in-depth analysis of gender, see Scott, "Gender," *Gender and the Politics of History*.

[6] Ibid., 162.

[7] The book rests on the meaning of the hyphenated word post-colonialism, rather than postcolonialism, adhering to Bill Ashcroft's proposition that the hyphen in the word post-colonial is "a sign of interpolation… the transgression, the interruption, the countering of discourse. Hyphenated post-colonialism, recognizing the interpenetrating discursive practices of culture, *interferes* with colonal master narratives, thus changing their nature," (Ashcroft, "On the Hyphen in Post-Colonial," 6, quoted in Kossew, *Pen and Power*, 8, original emphasis).

[8] Ashcroft et al., *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*, 117, 86.

[9] In their article entitled "Second Thoughts on the Second-Wave," Deborah S. Rosenfelt and Judith Stacey refer the first media use of the term postfeminism to Susan Bolotin's article "Voices from the Postfeminist Generation." For a review of postfeminism in media context, see Rosenfelt and Stacey, "Review Essay: Second Thoughts on the Second Wave."

[10] Ann Brooks, *Postfeminisms,* 1. The prefix post- in postfeminism is conceived of in this book as one that acts as a temporal marker that is meant to refer to a process

critique at patriarchy as well as the 'metatheories' second-wave feminist epistemologies established.[11] One pivotal 'metatheory' that is rebutted by postfeminism is the crudely reductive assumption that patriarchal and imperialist oppression is "a universally experienced oppression."[12] Postfeminism, on the other hand, engages, as Patricia Waugh maintains, in a struggle to reconcile context-specific situatedness or difference with universal political aims.[13] Postfeminism thus implies feminism's paradigm shift, that is, its "turn to culture" in Michèle Barrett's words, which she explicates as "a marked interest in analysing processes of symbolisation and representation – the field of 'culture' and attempts to develop a better understanding of subjectivity, the psyche and the self."[14] What ensues is Ann Brook's definition of postfeminism, which cogently encapsulates the agenda of the discourse:

> Postfeminism expresses the intersection of feminism with postmodernism, poststructuralism, and post-colonialism, and as such represents a dynamic movement capable of challenging modernist, patriarchal and imperialist frameworks. In the process postfeminism facilitates a broad-based, pluralistic conception of the application of feminism, and addresses the demands of the marginalised, diasporic and colonised cultures for a non-hegemonic feminism capable of giving voice to local, indigenous and post-colonial feminisms.[15]

Poststructuralism's rebuttal of a unified centre, predicating it on its emphasis on the primacy of language and textuality has also had political ramifications in the arena of other post- frames of reference. Such a model brooks no claim to sovereign knowledge but welcomes what Michel Foucault calls a "discourse," an entity shaped and constructed by language, which is, in turn, an arbitrary system of differences and signification that knows neither origin nor centre, thereby being slippery, fluid and ambiguous. Jacques Derrida's consideration on the de-centred nature of language and discourse is extremely illuminating in this regard:

> This moment [of rupture with logocentric thought] was that in which language invaded the universal problematic; that in which, *in the absence*

---

of ongoing transformation and change, rather than signalling a complete break with a preceding frame of reference and discourse.

[11] For a full analysis of the relationship, see Ibid.

[12] Ibid., 2.

[13] Waugh, *Postmodernism*, 1992.

[14] Barrett, "Words and Things," 204.

[15] Brooks, *Postfeminisms,* 4.

> *of a center or origin, everything became discourse*... that is to say, when everything became a system where the central signified, the original and transcendental signified, is never absolutely present outside a system of differences [i.e., language]. The absence of the transcendental signified extends the domain and the interplay of signification *ad infinitum*.[16]

The unequivocal rejection of any truth outside the text, coupled with Foucault's suggestion of exposing discourse as "a construction the rules of which must be known,"[17] betokened a corresponding shift in attention towards language and artistic works. Post-colonial critic Edward Said opportunely avers that "the power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the main connections between them,"[18] whilst feminist critic Patricia Waugh states that "[h]istory becomes a plurality of 'islands of discourse', a series of metaphors which cannot be detached from the institutionally produced languages which we bring to bear on it."[19] Underlying all this is a rewarding insight into the complicity between narrative and political oppression: exercise of power is dependent upon the continuity of dominant discourses, which maintain authority by creating meaning systems that gain the status and currency of 'truth', and sustaining authority is possible through the exclusion of other voices or discourses that might pose a threat to its 'unity' and 'centrality'. In a related vein, Stuart Hall links the construction of identity with representation as such:

> questions of identity are always questions about representation. They are always questions about the invention, not simply the discovery of tradition. They are always exercises in selective memory and they almost always involve the silencing of something in order to allow something else to speak... Silencing as well as remembering, identity is always a question of producing in the future an account of the past, that is to say it is always about narrative, the stories which cultures tell themselves about who they are and where they came from.[20]

The postmodern impetus is, then, "almost synonymous with the questioning of representation."[21] Post-colonial literatures hence sift through

---

[16] Derrida, "Structure, Sign, and Play," 249, my emphasis.
[17] Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 25.
[18] Said, *Culture and Imperialism,* xiii.
[19] Waugh, *Postmodernism*, 6.
[20] Hall, "Negotiating Caribbean Identities," 283.
[21] Docherty, *Alterities*, 60.

the link between language and power, which caters to imperial control that is basically "the invariable exertion of cultural and linguistic hegemony over colonized peoples and, the imposition, through language in particular, of a hierarchy of value."[22] An adjacent realm of concern is the process of "othering," described by Stephen Slemon as "the cognitive device by which 'knowledge' of the Other is constructed, and the ideological processs [*sic*] by which this knowledge is actuated in the control of surveillance of the subject peoples."[23]

This concern is ineluctably shared by postfeminists in their search for an authentic 'women's voice' related to the "double colonisation" of the woman within colonies and her "half-colonization," which denotes the ambivalent position of the colonial woman as both colonising and being colonised, "although she [the woman coloniser] too is oppressed by white men and patriarchal structures, she shares in the power and guilt of the colonists."[24] Both post-colonial and postfeminist writers, then, seek to find an authentic language that extends beyond that of the patriarch. To take a salient example, in her article "Women's Time," Julia Kristeva talks of a "new generation" of feminists, who, either as artists or writers, "have undertaken a veritable exploration of the *dynamic of signs*,"[25] which she dubs the "symbolic question,"[26] which is basically the relationship of women to power, language, and meaning.

In an attempt to facilitate both poetic and political justice, one may assert, postfeminist and post-colonialist writers set out to question objectivity in dominant historiography and reinstate what Robert Holton calls "jarring witnesses,"[27] i.e., the excluded or gagged voices of history, characteristically those of women and colonial subjects, bringing political and aesthetic dimensions together, particularly around the issue of representation. If the dualistic vision of high modernism with "the center functioning as pivot between binary opposites which always privileged one half"[28] serves to "conceal hierarchies,"[29] as Linda Hutcheon puts it, and if, as Terry Eagleton suggests, the literary text "conceals its more fundamental determination by the constituents of its ideological matrix" by being "unconstrained by the necessity to reproduce any particular

[22] Kossew, *Pen and Power*, 61.
[23] Slemon, "Cultural Alterity and Colonial Discourse," 103.
[24] Visel, "A Half-Colonization," 39.
[25] Kristeva, "Women's Time," 19, original emphasis.
[26] Ibid., 21.
[27] Holton, *Jarring Witnesses*, 251.
[28] Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, 62.
[29] Ibid., 61.

'real,'"[30] then these writers "write back" to literary works that have been subsumed under the canopy of "Western Canon"[31] in order to expose the very dynamics that maintain a system predicated upon veiling and glossing over them. The canon is thus appropriated "in an attempt to 'move the center' and foster the process of cultural decolonization;" this way "[c]onventional assumptions are challenged and new meanings are uncovered as the moorings which keep the 'canons' attached to fixed positions are loosened."[32] In a postmodern rewriting, "a political or ethical commitment shapes a writer's, director's, or performer's decision to re-interpret a source text."[33] Which is to say, as John Barth puts it, it is, in fact, not language or literature that is "exhausted" but the "aesthetic of high modernism."[34] These writers thus take part in the aesthetic, ethical and political project of, as Angela Carter intertextually words it, "putting new wine in old bottles, [so that] the pressure of the new wine makes the old bottles explode."[35]

When in "On Originality" Edward Said notes that "the writer thinks less of writing originally, and more of rewriting"[36] and Jacques Derrida that "the desire to write is the desire to launch things that come back to you as much as possible,"[37] they refer to the impulse of rewriting that suggests the manifold ways in which texts interrelate. Palimsestuous writing is elaborated on by Gérard Genette in *Paratexts* and *Palimpsests*, adhering to which, the gesture of the appropriative process towards the source text can be asserted to revolve around mainly five types.[38] In the

---

[30] Eagleton, *Criticism and Ideology*, 74.

[31] The rationale behind this particular choice becomes clear when one takes into account the ascriptions to "Western Canon." In her article "Who is Afraid of the Canon?", Marie-Denise Shelton cogently explains that the term canon "legislates knowledge and draws clear dividing lines between the categories of 'good' and 'bad', 'worthy' and 'worth-less', 'we' and 'them', 'masters' and 'subaltern', and defines "Western Canon" as "the overdetermined expression of this already axiomatic logic [that] responds to a single-minded imperative: to legitimize the purported authority of the Christian West," (Shelton, "Who Is Afraid of the Canon?", 136).

[32] Ibid., 137, 139.

[33] Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation,* 2.

[34] Barth, "The Literature of Replenishment," 71.

[35] Carter, "Notes from the front line," 69.

[36] Said, *The World, The Text, and The Critic*, 135.

[37] Derrida, *The Ear of the Other*, 157.

[38] For further elaboration on the five types of textuality, namely, paratextuality, metatextuality, architextuality, hypertextuality and intertextuality, see Genette, *Palimpsests* and *Paratexts*.

last category of his taxonomy is intertextuality, which is associated with Julia Kristeva's notion that she develops in "The Bounded Text" to describe the process whereby any text, which is a productivity, is "a permutation of texts, an intertextuality."[39] Intertextuality has been adopted as a generic name for a textual notion of "how texts encompass and respond to other texts both during the process of their creation and composition and in terms of the individual reader's or spectator's response,"[40] despite the labile and multifarious distinctions or types of hypertextuality.[41] In a similar vein, Roland Barthes contends that "any text is an intertext,"[42] implying that the works of previous and surrounding cultures are always present in literature.

Taking as a point of departure the Bakhtinian notion of the dialogic,[43] Kristeva centres on text and textuality, accentuating the text's intertextual status that serves to subvert Western logic, which, stemming from Aristotle, is predicated upon the principle of singularity, non-contradiction, i.e., that something cannot at one and the same time be something (A) and something else (not-A), and 'unity', i.e., authoritativeness and unquestionable truth. For Kristeva, the literary word proves subversive in that "the minimal unit of poetic language is at least *double*, not in the sense of the signifier/signified, but rather, in terms of *one and other*,"[44] that is, the literary word is an "*intersection of textual surfaces* rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character), and the contemporary or earlier cultural context."[45] Kristeva defines this dynamic in terms of a "horizontal dimension" and a "vertical dimension," which coincide within the text:

---

[39] Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 36.
[40] Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, 2.
[41] To Adrian Poole's extensive list of terms to represent the Victorian era's interest in reworking the artistic past: "borrowing, stealing, appropriating, inheriting, assimilating... being influenced, inspired, dependent, indebted, haunted, possessed... homage, mimicry, travesty, echo, allusion, and intertextuality," (*Shakespeare and the Victorians*, 2, quoted in Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, 3), Sanders adds still another set of words: "variation, version, interpretation, imitation, proximation, supplement, increment, improvisation, prequel, sequel, continuation, addition, paratext, hypertext, palimpsest, graft, rewriting, reworking, refashioning, re-vision, re-evaluation," (Ibid.).
[42] Barthes, "Theory of the Text," 39.
[43] For his elaboration on the term, see Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," 674-85.
[44] Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 60, original emphasis.
[45] Ibid., 65, original emphasis.

> horizontal axis (subject-addressee) and vertical axis (text-context) coincide, bringing to light an important fact: each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read… The notion of *intertextuality* replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least *double*.[46]

In the above senses, not only the literary word but also the subject-position of the character who 'speaks' are double-voiced: "[t]he pronominal 'I' is always directed towards an 'other', and employs words that are themselves directed towards and contain within themselves 'other words' and 'other utterances.'"[47] The "I" in a literary text is, then, the utterance of three linguistic subjects: that of the protagonist, of the implied author, who is ultimately related to the real author, thus being simultaneously 'A' and 'not-A'. Double-voiced and heteroglot, the poetic word defies "any logical system based on a zero-one sequence (true-false, nothingness-notation)."[48] Also, furthering the notion of "*ideologeme*," which, as defined by Fredric Jameson, is "the smallest intelligible unit of the essentially antagonistic collective discourses of social classes,"[49] Kristeva contends that text, or at least each of its constituent parts, is an "*ideologeme*," thereby further hosting a double meaning: a meaning in the text itself and a meaning in what Kristeva calls "the historical and social text":

> The concept of text as *ideologeme* determines the very procedure of a semiotics that, by studying the text as intertextuality, considers it as such within (the text of) society and history. The *ideologeme* of a text is the focus where knowing rationality grasps the transformation of *utterances* (to which the text is irreducible) into a totality (the text) as well as the insertions of this totality into the historical and social text.[50]

Meaning is thus "always at one and the same time 'inside' and 'outside' the text."[51] Kristeva postulates within this context that texts cannot present stable meanings, for they embody society's dialogic conflict over the meaning of words. Leaning upon this, Toril Moi comes to the following conclusion:

---

[46] Ibid., 66, original emphasis.
[47] Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, 42.
[48] Ibid., 70.
[49] Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, p. 76.
[50] Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 37, original emphasis.
[51] Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, 37.

> The meaning of the sign is thrown open – the sign becomes 'polysemic' rather than 'univocal' – and though it is true to say that the dominant power group at any given time will dominate the intertextual production of meaning, this is not to suggest that the opposition has been reduced to total silence. *The power struggle intersects in the sign*.[52]

If language is thus inextricably intertwined with the power relationship of patriarchal and/or colonial discourse and control, the post-colonial or postfeminist text too is "a site of struggle for linguistic control."[53] Which comes to mean that, as opposed to those grand narratives, "[e]ach text, each little narrative, is a local, subversive struggle."[54] Within this respect, Mikhail Bakhtin attributes a special place to the novel among other genres due to its polyphonical nature that resists the monologic tendencies of language and discourse, allowing also dissenting or non-dominant voices to be heard.[55]

Postmodernist fiction that employs intertextuality as a strategy to blur the distinction between outside, i.e., 'fact', and inside, i.e., fiction, is called metafiction, which is defined by Patricia Waugh as

> fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality. In providing a critique of their own methods of construction, such writings not only examine the fundamental structures of narrative fiction, they also explore the possible fictionality of the world outside the literary fictional text.[56]

Owing to this "factionality,"[57] i.e., the blending of 'fact' and 'fiction', such fiction sets an example to what Linda Hutcheon designates as historiographical metafiction: "novels that are intensely self-reflexive but that also both re-introduce historical context into metafiction and problematise the entire question of historical knowledge."[58] Promoting this "incredulity toward metanarratives,"[59] as coined by Jean-François Lyotard, in this context, toward History, historiographical metafiction "uses and abuses those intertextual echoes"[60] as a way to show "the constant

[52] Moi, *Sexual/Textual Politics*, 158, my emphasis.
[53] Kossew, *Pen and Power*, 11.
[54] Marshall, *Teaching the Postmodern*, 176.
[55] For further discussion, see Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 1992.
[56] Waugh, *Metafiction*, 2.
[57] Bradbury, *The Modern British Novel*, 406.
[58] Hutcheon, "'The Pastime of Past Time,'" 474.
[59] Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, 23.
[60] Hutcheon, "'The Pastime of Past Time,'" 487.

potential for both deliberate and inadvertent error"[61] in the writing of History. Thus History, "although ultimately a material reality (a presence), is shown to exist always within 'textual' boundaries. History, to this extent, is also 'fictional', also a set of 'alternative worlds.'"[62] The postmodernist text is thus grounded both in a previous literary text and in the 'real world', and this rooting in the 'real world' is itself double since the postmodernist novel "refers both to an 'empirical past' (as in Hutcheon's 'historiographic metafiction') that is contemporary to the hypotext and to an 'empirical present,' i. e. the contemporary world, that of the hypertext."[63]

Postmodernist fiction tends to privilege parody that is inherently intertextual, which is predominantly why parody is, for Hutcheon, "a perfect postmodern form."[64] Much as parody is, in its broadest sense, "first imitating and then changing either, and sometimes both, the 'form' and 'content' or style and subject matter, or syntax and meaning of another work, or, most simply, its vocabulary,"[65] postmodernist parody is, in fact, directed at discourse, rather than at the genre or style of the hypotext. Parody is a postmodern form also because it reflects the ambivalence and the paradox the postmodern world is couched in.[66] A closer probing into the word "parody" reveals that, derived from the Greek *parôidia* (*παρωδια*), it is a paradoxical term suggesting both imitation and opposition manifest in its double etymology: the Greek root prefix *para* denotes "counter" or "against" as much as it conveys the ideas of "beside" or "near"; and *odos* means "song." This ambivalent function of parody as imitation and opposition is originally drawn attention to by Hutcheon, who further accounts for the manifestations of parody in artistic works, accentuating the relationship between the "background text" and the "incorporating work," which culminates in her definition of what she calls "modern parody":

> Parody, then, in its ironic "trans-contextualization" and inversion, is *repetition with difference*. A critical distance is implied between the background text being parodied and the new incorporating work, a distance

[61] Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, 114.
[62] Waugh, *Metafiction*, 106.
[63] Williams-Wanquet, "Towards Defining 'Postrealism' in British Literature," 392-93. The term postrealist is offered in this article as an alternative to postfeminist.
[64] Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, 11.
[65] Rose, *Parody*, 45.
[66] The postmodern paradox comes to mean that it seeks to operate against the discourse of Modernism but is burdened with it.

> usually signaled by irony. But this irony can be playful as well as belittling; it can be critically constructive as well as destructive. The pleasure of parody's irony comes not from humor in particular but from the degree of engagement of the reader in the intertextual "bouncing" (to use E. M. Forster's famous term) between complicity and distance.[67]

It is this ironic "trans-contextualization" that distinguishes parody from pastiche or imitation. Through irony, modern parody signals the ideological consequences that derive from both continuity and difference, that is, parody works to "foreground the politics of representation," so it is "a value-problematizing, de-naturalizing form of acknowledging the history (and through irony, the politics) of representation."[68] A related literary form is pastiche, a medley of references to different styles, texts, or authors, and the previously explored term *bricolage*, both of which constitute postmodernism's "natural modes of discourse," considering that postmodernism is "a complex combination of recreation and fragmentation."[69]

Much as various definitions are offered for post-colonial fiction, what is designated as "postfeminist fiction" by Deborah Silverton Rosenfelt in "Feminism, 'Postfeminism', and Contemporary Women's Fiction" (1991) is observed to be underdefined as a genre.[70] According to the paradigm set up by Rosenfelt, postfeminist fiction, by and large, embraces plurality by employing "a multiplicity of plots"[71] and shunning "linear... narratives"[72] to disrupt the patriarchally-controlled sequential narrative, thereby having the structure match up to the portrayal of "the diversity of women's experiences,"[73] reconsidering "heterosexual passion, especially motherhood."[74]

---

[67] Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody*, 36, 32, my emphasis.
[68] Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, 89-90.
[69] Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, 106.
[70] Heidi Slettedahl Macpherson's *Women's Movement: Escape as Transgression in North American Feminist Fiction* (2000), gives critical attention to some postfeminist novels, including, among others, Marian Engel's *Bear*, Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing* and *The Handmaid's Tale*, Joan Barfoot's *Gaining Ground* and *Dancing in the Dark*, and Margaret Laurence's *The Diviners.* Two of the other works analysing postfeminist novels is Cris Mazza's critical essay "Editing Postfeminist Fiction" and Jeannette Batz Cooperman's book *The Broom Closet: Secret Meanings of Domesticity in Postfeminist Novels by Louise Erdrich, Mary Gordon, Toni Morrison, Marge Piercy, Jane Smiley, and Amy Tan, New York, Peter Lang* (1999).
[71] Rosenfelt, "Feminism," 270.
[72] Ibid., 268.
[73] Ibid., 270.
[74] Ibid., 268. Rosenfelt further notes that feminist novels "narrate a mythic progress from oppression, suffering, victimization, through various stages of

Albeit a diverse phenomenon, postfeminist fiction, it would be safe to contend, is a genre, on the whole, partially nodding to postmodernist narrative techniques for its own political ends, employing various forms of intertextuality, such as pastiche, plays-within-plays, parallel characters and settings, to parody the discourse of the hypotext from the perspective of postfeminism.

Chantal Zabus notes that "[e]ach century has its own interpellative dream-text" and that *The Tempest* is that of "the seventeenth century."[75] With its complex history of copious artistic rewritings, drama and film adaptations, and parodies in various genres, across the centuries and around the globe that would hardly allow for documenting here,[76] *The Tempest* has indeed established itself as one of the most rewritten hypotexts. This is basically because "[i]f adaptation requires foreknowledge of the source for the system of analogue and juxtaposition to succeed... then Shakespeare is a reliable cultural touchstone, a language 'we all understand.'"[77] The afterlife of *The Tempest*, however, has proven to be a tempestuous one. A whole panoply of interpretations in diverse eras and cultures has vied for the ownership of meaning, varying according to the cultural perceptions of the age or decade, by either canonising, colonialising or post-colonialising the play. Hence Terence Hawkes' contention that "Shakespeare is a powerful ideological weapon, always available in periods of crisis, and used according to the exigencies of the time to resolve crucial areas of indeterminacy."[78]

Marie-Denise Shelton proposes, however, that "[n]o European text has solicited the imagination of post-colonial writers as much as Shakespeare's last play, *The Tempest.*"[79] Treated as a canonical text, i.e., a familiar

---

awakening consciousness to active resistance, and, finally, to some form of victory, transformation, or transcendence of despair," (Ibid., 269); "[t]heir characteristic tone compounds rage at women's oppression and revolutionary optimism about the possibility for change," (Ibid., 270). Postfeminist novels, on the other hand, are "less clear about what can be done, and more likely to grieve and worry than to rage and hope," and they find feminism "naively optimistic," (Ibid.).

[75] Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, 1.

[76] For an exhaustive list of the rewritings of the play starting from Restoration and going through the eighteenth century, Romanticism, until today, see Vaughan and Vaughan, Introduction. Also see Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare,* in which she reads a staggering number of works, ranging from the familiar to the most unfamiliar rewritings of *The Tempest* written in the twentieth century.

[77] Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, 52.

[78] Hawkes, "Swisser-Swatter", 43.

[79] Shelton, "Who is Afraid of the Canon?", 137.

landmark of culture with ascribed authority,[80] the play has served as a palimpsest from which post-colonial writers have sought to sift the foundational paradigm in the history of European colonialism so that the play "has now become an allegory of colonial relations"[81] between the axes of Prospero as coloniser, and Caliban, and less frequently Ariel, as representatives of indigenous colonised peoples. Indeed, it is by far acknowledged that very few discussions could revolve around colonialism without referring to the lineaments of the coloniser/colonised conundrum in the play. The post-colonial and postfeminist interest in the play that burgeoned in the 1950s has come from the "third world," a term that "both signifies and blurs the functioning of an economic, political, and imaginary geography able to unite vast and vastly differentiated areas of the world into a single 'underdeveloped' terrain,"[82] thus covering, within this context, African, Caribbean and Canadian writers. The 1950s[83] also witnessed an attendant shift in attitude towards Prospero and Caliban: whilst previously the 'noble' features of Prospero were championed, "[a]fter nearly three hundred and fifty years of abuse, Caliban is beginning to be recognized as the true hero of *The Tempest*."[84]

Within the terrain of feminism, much as the play has been revisited by women from the late seventeenth-century on,[85] interest in the play has thrived with the advent of postfeminism. Zabus postulates that "in its nearly four centuries of existence, *The Tempest* has most endured of any text," and by virtue of its rewritings, it has helped shape "three contemporaneous movements – postcoloniality, postfeminism or postpatriarchy, and postmodernism – from the 1960s to the present."[86] Marianne Novy

---

[80] For further discussion of *The Tempest* as symbolic of a whole culture, see Nixon, "From 'Caribbean and African Appropriations of *The Tempest*."

[81] Loomba, "Shakespeare and Cultural Difference," 171.

[82] Sangari, "The Politics of the Possible," 900.

[83] Peter Hulme states that in the 1950s "much of what we can now see as Caribbean post-colonial theory clustered around readings of *The Tempest,* a work written at that crucial juncture just before the first major English settlements on the Caribbean islands," (Hulme, "Survival and Invention," 297).

[84] Monegal, "The Metamorphoses of Caliban," 79. Mainly three post-colonial writers have ignited this shift in perspective: Mannoni with his article "Prospero and Caliban," Fanon with his book *Black Skin, White Masks*, which took the discussion from Africa to the Caribbean context, and Césaire with his rewriting of the play entitled *Une Tempête* (*A Tempest*). For elaboration on the contribution of these works, see the quoted article.

[85] For further discussion on the issue, see Novy, *Women's Re-Visions of Shakespeare*.

[86] Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, 1.

ascribes this recent interest in part to its being a play "of fathers and daughters that make it possible to criticize patriarchal heritage as well as colonial heritage," thus providing the opportunity to dramatise a link between "multiple intersecting pasts," that is, to understand "a condition of cultural hybridity."[87] In a similar vein, Peter Erickson propounds that "Shakespeare becomes a resource in a different sense as a richly complex reference point within the larger project of cultural change we are undergoing with regard to race, *gender*, and class."[88]

The Tempest, however, seems to enjoy such popularity mainly because it is couched in controversy and ambiguity from its type, structure and language to its setting – its island "is not found on any map,"[89] and the play is set in an indefinite time – and loose ending, thus being an elusive play which provides no answers to the questions it provokes.[90] In addition to the contention over whether the play is a romance or comedy, the play is problematic in its relationship to the unity of time: characters "*remember* the events of the twelve years preceding."[91] Additionally, Ernest Schanzer notes that *The Tempest* is "Shakespeare's most extended mockery of the critics' demand for unity of time,"[92] which he achieves "by depicting Prospero in the role of the harassed designer of the plot, who is obliged by the critics' demand to bring his action to a close by a certain hour of the day, and so has to keep his eyes riveted to the clock."[93] Also, the play's "symmetric structure of correspondences gives it the multiplicity of a hall of mirrors, in which everything reflects and re-reflects everything else."[94] As such, the play "always seems to frustrate attempts to limit its significance to any specific theatrical context, to determine its meaning, or to appropriate its repetitions."[95] For George Lamming, *The Tempest* is a particularly important text, for it "is a drama

[87] Novy, *Transforming Shakespeare*, 2.
[88] Erickson, *Patriarchal Structures*, 176, my emphasis.
[89] Garber, *Shakespeare After All*, 856.
[90] In his book *The Tempest*, David Lindley states that, from its inception, the play has been read, among others, as "a romance of reconciliation, a Christian allegory of forgiveness… a psychological drama of fatherhood" due to its ambiguity in dramatic form, stage-craft as well as content, (Lindley, Introduction, 1). In the same part, he also provides an extensive explication of the range of readings and stagings the play has provoked.
[91] Vaughan and Vaughan, Introduction, 15, original emphasis.
[92] Schanzer, "Shakespeare," 60.
[93] Ibid., 61. For examples of how Prospero mocks "unity of time," see the quoted article.
[94] Harold F. Brooks, "*The Tempest*", 37.
[95] Murphy (ed.), "Interpreting *The Tempest*," 3.

which grows and matures from the seeds of… paradox."[96] In this respect, the accruing interest of feminist criticism in the play derives from the fact that "the extent to which Shakespeare aligns himself with patriarchy, merely portrays it, or deliberately criticizes it remains a complex and open question, one that feminist criticism is aptly suited to address,"[97] which is also the main premise this book takes as its own during the analysis of the play.

What is observed is that despite a burgeoning interest in the play by feminist criticism in the late twentieth century, the figure of Miranda and her relationship with other female figures, that is, what Adrienne Rich calls "the great unwritten story" of mother-daughter plot, still remains largely underexplored. Additionally, much as *The Tempest* has been revisited by postfeminist writers from the margins,[98] or "writers from elsewhere,"[99] the only postfeminist novel to re-vision the play 'from the centre' is *Indigo, or Mapping the Waters* by British woman writer Marina Warner, which is at the same time one of the most comprehensive rewritings of the play. All this has rendered *Indigo* ripe for bringing under scrutiny in this book.

This work first explores the attitude of *The Tempest* to the embedded patriarchal and colonialist schemata ignited by Prospero the central character. Within this context, a strong differentiation is made between the implied author's larger play[100] and Prospero's plot embedded within the

---

[96] Lamming, *The Pleasures of Exile*, 95.

[97] Lenz et al., Introduction, 6.

[98] Among Caribbean rewritings of the play by women which use aspects of the Miranda-figure are, most notably, Jamaica Kinkaid's *Annie John* (1983), Michelle Cliff's *No Telephone to Heaven* (1987) and Elizabeth Nunez's *Prospero's Daughter* (2006). One of the most prominent rewritings from Africa is Gloria Naylor's *Mama Day* (1988). Canadian women show a lot of interest in *The Tempest* because of Canada's history as a land colonised first by England then by the United States. Of the most notable Canadian increments to the play are Margaret Laurence's *The Diviners* (1974), Nancy Huston's *Plainsong* (1993), Sarah Murphy's *The Measure of Miranda* (1987) and Linda Bamber's short story "Claribel at Palace Dot Tunis" (1998). For a cogent analysis of the postfeminist rewritings of the play, see especially Zabus, "Part II: Miranda and Sycorax on the 'Eve' of Postpatriarchy," *Tempests after Shakespeare*, 103-76.

[99] Salman Rushdie has used this definition to refer to those contemporary writers who have chosen the English language as their means of expression, albeit not having been born into that language.

[100] The term "implied author" draws upon the formulation Seymour Chatman develops in his seminal book, *Coming to Terms*. Chatman separates the implied author from the real author of a work: "[t]he source of a narrative text's whole

former. The conclusions regarding the treatment of female and colonial figures as well as representations of femininity in *The Tempest* are drawn based on the implied author's larger play. What ensues is a comparative analysis of *Indigo* to map out to what extent it enlarges, renews and debunks the issues and codes already problematised in *The Tempest* with the ultimate aim of revealing the novel's "text intent"[101] from a postfeminist angle overlapping with a post-colonialist one.

Over two hundred instances of "however" and "on the other hand" as well as their cognates occurring in the chapters to follow well explain the choice of "ambivalence, liminality and plurality" for the subtitle of this book, whose particular focus is on the textualisation of these interrelated terms at various turns in so far as they lie within the compass of postfeminist and post-colonial discourses. Overall, their appeal for the said discourses lies in their negation of and challenge to the modernist paradigms' insistence on order, unambiguity, certainty, non-contradiction, linearity and singularity, providing opportunities for movement, empowerment and resistance. Therefore, during the analysis of both works, the specific manifestations of these umbrella terms have been employed as central axes in drawing conclusions regarding these works' stand in relation to each other and to the implications of the intertwined economies of patriarchy and colonialism. These terms are addressed in terms of both poetics and politics, the former of which provides the literary aspect of this book. In this respect, the book also aims to

---

structure of meaning – not only of its assertion and denotation but also of its implication, connotation, and ideological nexus – is the implied author," (Ibid., 75); "[t]he text itself is the implied author… Upon publication, the implied author supercedes the real author," (Ibid., 81). For Chatman, "[p]ositing an implied author inhibits the overhasty assumption that the reader has direct access through the fictional text to the real author's intentions and ideology. It does not deny the existence of important connections between the text's and the real author's views, but it does deny the simplistic assumption that somehow the reader is in direct communication with (1) the real author (with all the troublesome questions that idea raises) or with (2) the fictional speaker, for how then could we separate the denotation (what the speaker says) from the connotation (what the text means), especially where these differ," (Ibid., 76). For further information on the implied author, see "Chapter 5: In Defense of the Implied Author" and "Chapter 6: The Implied Author at Work" in Ibid., 74-108.

[101] Seymour Chatman dubs "text intent," or "text implication," "a sense of purpose reconstructable from the text that we read, watch, and/or hear;" it is "not what was in the mind of the real author bent over a desk but what is *in* the text that we hold in our hands, or see on the stage or the screen," (Ibid., 86, original emphasis).

contribute to the mapping of postfeminist fiction through the emphasis it places on the poetics of the novel *Indigo*.

The parameters of concern within this book reflect the burgeoning interdisciplinarity of the academia. It explores these narratives combining theory and textual analysis, adopting a reading of metaphor and symbols to deepen the context of feminist interpretation. Mainly two theoretical frameworks have been utilised for analysing *The Tempest*, namely, psychoanalytical and the political, both of which are utilised in a feminist approach. The arguments and methodologies employed in the analysis of *Indigo* draw heavily upon knowledge generated within other disciplines, especially anthropology, sociology, cartography, mythology and not least, psychoanalysis, and within various arenas of interdisciplinary cultural studies, particularly women's and post-colonial studies. They are also informed by literary studies with the emphasis on representation, textuality and narrative poetics.

What follows is first a brief examination of the ways in which the terms ambivalence, liminality and plurality as well as adjacent concepts are employed within postfeminist and post-colonial discourses and then an introduction of *The Tempest* and *Indigo* in line with their intersections with the implications of those concepts.

The word liminal, which finds its roots in the Latin word *limen* for threshold with physical connotations, denotes "of, pertaining to, or situated at the limen."[102] The adoption of the word liminal as a critical concept has been linked to first, the anthropologist Arnold van Gennep's formulation of it as the second of three phases of *les rites de passage*, i.e., rites of passage: *séparation* (preliminal), *marge* (liminal), and *aggrégation* (postliminal);[103] and second, and most importantly, to the elaboration and extension of the use of the term by anthropologist Victor Turner in his studies on ritual,[104] where he defines it as "the mid-point of transition of a status-sequence between two positions."[105] In *The Ritual Process*, Turner explains the interface nature of the liminal as a site between two spaces:

> [t]he attributes of liminality or of liminal personae ("threshold people") are necessarily *ambiguous*, since this condition and these persons *elude* or *slip through* the network of classifications that normally locate states and positions in cultural space. Liminal entities are *neither here nor there*; they

[102] "liminal," *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary*, 831.
[103] For further information, see Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*.
[104] For a detailed comparison between the two terms Turner introduced: liminoid and liminal, see Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre*.
[105] Turner, *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors*, 237.

> are *betwixt and between* the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremonial.[106]

Turner thus accentuates the cardinal role liminality plays in undermining social or cultural categorisations, for the condition of liminal personae, who are "neither here nor there," is "one of ambiguity and paradox, a confusion of all the customary categories."[107] Applied as a literary term, "liminality" thus designates a fluid space in which binary categorisations are blurred, thereby rendering liminal personae "neither/nor" or "both/and," in lieu of "either/or."

Another term that denotes a liminal state is the hyphen. Much as the hyphen derives from the Greek word *huphen* denoting "together," in a philosophical sense, it is the liminal or "betwixt and between." In the words of Derrida, the hyphen is "a bringing together and yet separating what is hinged, operating across the divide *yet never belonging entirely to either side*."[108] It is the hyphen's standing for both separation and connection that resonates with postmodern transitional paradigm between two separate geographies, sociographies and cultural identities. The hyphen as connection relates to the concept of the rhizome as described by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari: "[a] rhizome has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things, interbeing, *intermezzo*... The tree imposes the verb 'to be' but the fabric of the rhizome is the conjunction, 'and... and... and...'"[109] As such, a rhizomic collection of hyphens traces where a subject has been, connecting all the places where s/he has roamed, defining her/his psychogeographical habitat. A related term is a hyphenated memory, which refers to a memory tied to the places or people left behind. Memories occur in no particular linear order and as such are rhizomic, acting as the hyphen between here and there, demarcating the past and the present.

Women symbolically occupy the same space as the liminal hyphen. Luce Irigaray refers to women as "interdit," i.e., "in-between signs, between the realized meanings, between the lines."[110] Tobias Döring quotes Marina Warner, who, in another context, ascribes great importance to women as figures of the hyphen:

---

[106] Turner, *The Ritual Process*, 95, my emphasis.
[107] Turner, *The Forest of Symbols*, 96-97, my emphasis.
[108] Collins and Mayblin, *Introducing Derrida*, 138. Also refer to Cixous and Calle-Gruber, *Rootprints, Memory and Life Writing*, 9, 25, my emphasis.
[109] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 25.
[110] Irigaray, "This Sex Which is Not One," 20.

> Women cannot be smoothly allocated their place in the same division of roles; the historical – and mythical – part they play in the inauguration of new histories, new societies, new families demands a fresh taxonomy. Women, through their bodies, become the hyphen between the forest/morne and the habitation/house/plantation, either by force or by choice.[111]

The implications of the hyphen within this context is connected to such key terms as cultural stereotypes, in-between, between and betwixt, third space, ambivalence, mimicry, hybridity, creolisation and *mestizaje* employed in an implementation of the post-colonial mode of literary analysis of subjectivity, identity, ethnicity, nation, racism and gender. In the ideological construction of otherness, "[a]n important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity.'"[112] However, as Homi Bhabha propounds, the stereotype, "which is its major discursive strategy,"[113] embodies an ambivalence that shakes the authority of the coloniser:

> It is recognisably true that the chain of stereotypical signification is curiously mixed and split, polymorphous and perverse, an articulation of multiple belief. The black is both savage (cannibal) and yet the most obedient and dignified of servants (the bearer of food); he is the embodiment of rampant sexuality and yet innocent as a child; he is mystical, primitive, simple-minded and yet the most worldly and accomplished liar, manipulator of social forces.[114]

For Sue Kossew, stereotyping is thus "a much more ambivalent text of projection and introjection, metaphoric and metonymic strategies, displacement, overdetermination, guilt, aggressivity" since the stereotype "is at once a substitute and a shadow… Its symbolic meaning, however, is thoroughly ambivalent."[115] Another indispensable concept in Bhabha's theorisation is the term hybridity, which, in colonial discourse, was employed disparagingly to refer to a person of mixed race. Bhabha, however, reclaims the concept of hybridity in a positive way, emphasising the advantages of this state of in-betweenness that challenges the validity and possibility of an essentialist cultural identity: "[f]or me the importance

---

[111] Warner, "Siren, Hyphen; or, The Maid Beguiled," quoted in Döring, "Woman, Foundling, Hyphen," 24.
[112] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 94.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid., 118.
[115] Sue Kossew, *Pen and Power*, 86.

of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the 'third space' which enables other positions to emerge."[116] He thus theorises the concept of the "Third Space," which, in his influential book *The Location of Culture*, he uses to introduce hybridity by preserving the spatio-temporal conception of liminality: the "the third space," or "in-between space," that is, "interrogatory, interstitial space between the act of representation… a space of translation: a place of hybridity"[117] are sites where identities are performed and contested, thus debunking the parameters of Western critical thinking: a "linear narrative of the nation" with its claims for the "holism of culture and community" and a "fixed horizontal nation-space."[118] What he describes as "border lives" is the outcome of a continuous negotiation simultaneously leading to new cultural traits characterised by fluid and hybrid combinations and the dissemination of the primary conceptual categories such as class and gender into a multitude of subject positions, i.e., differences and their claim to identity. In *Poetics of Relation,* Édouard Glissant sees the solution as lying in accepting (national) identity as springing from a tangle of many "roots," arguing against the myth of a unique root: "[m]ost of the nations that gained freedom from colonization have tended to form around the idea of power – the totalitarian drive of a single, unique root – rather than around a fundamental relationship with the Other."[119]

A form of cultural hybridity within Caribbean context, which is where *Indigo* is partly set, is what is defined as "Caribbean Creolisation," which is a *construct* shaped by the European colonising powers on the islands, as evidenced by its very name:

> Creolization, in the Caribbean at least, is the process of *forging* new human and cultural identities primarily out of the white and the black races. The concept derives from the past participle, *criode*, in the Afro-Portuguese Creole language already spoken on the west coast of West Africa in the fifteenth century. The Creole verb is *cria*, from the Portuguese verb *criar*, "to breed." The participle means "(locally) bred": standing against that which is foreign and imported. In the early Caribbean, the concept more often had the latter sense – that of becoming native – than the sense of racial mixing. For the European colonists, becoming native in the

[116] Bhabha quoted in Rutherford, "The Third Space," 211.
[117] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 3, 25.
[118] Ibid., 142.
[119] Glissant, *Poetics of Relation*, 14.

> Caribbean did not connote racial mixing, but rather the *adaptation* of a new outlook on life, even the *adaptation* of a complete new culture.[120]

The product of a project which aims at "forging" new human and cultural identities out of black and white races through "adapting" a new culture, "the 'creole' has always been the most indicative product of Caribbean *interculturation*."[121] The emphasised word "interculturation" encapsulates the dynamics of the word "Creole": it possesses more cultural than racial signifieds. Thus the word "Creole" is the local, i.e., Caribbean, equivalent of the more global name "hybrid" as opposed to the native or indigenous. "Creole" itself is a slippery and liminal word which focuses on what one is not – European, Native American, African – rather than what one is. Creolisation in this sense suggests a nonexclusive, plural, dialogic, or multicultural model of culture. Columbus himself noted the Carib Indians in 1492 as neither black nor white.[122] Perhaps the most significant paradigm of how the other races are assessed by British male colonisers is best defined in the following lines by Captain Frederick Marryat in *Peter Simple and The Three Cutters*, quoted by Robert J. C. Young:

> The progeny of a white and a Negro is a *mulatto*, or half and half – of a white and mulatto a *quadroon*, or one quarter black, and of this class the company were chiefly composed. I believe a *quadroon* and a white make the *mustee* or one-eighth black. And the *mustee* and white *mustafina*, or one-sixteenth black. After that they are *whitewashed* and considered as Europeans…The quadroons are certainly the handsomest race of the whole, some of the women are really beautiful… I must acknowledge at the risk of losing the good opinion of my fair country-women, that I never saw before so many pretty figures and faces.[123]

Yet another term employed by Bhabha, interrelatedly with ambivalence, is the term mimicry. Within the conflictual economy of colonial discourse that is marked by a tension between panoptical vision of domination and the counter-pressure of the history, "mimicry represents an *ironic* compromise," which entails that "colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed Other, as *a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite.*"[124] Just as the 'colonial stereotype' is "ambivalent," so is "mimicry." Bhabha thus iterates:

---

[120] Arion, "The Victory of the Concubines and the Nannies," 110, my emphasis.
[121] Preziuso, "Trajectories of Creolization," my emphasis.
[122] Hulme, "Tales of Distinction."
[123] Young, "Colonialism and the Desiring Machine," 87, original emphasis.
[124] Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man," 126, original emphasis.

> the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an *ambivalence*; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. The authority of that mode of colonial discourse that I have called mimicry is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy: mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal.[125]

The "excess" or "slippage" produced by the ambivalence of mimicry does not merely "rupture" the discourse but "becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a 'partial' presence… [i.e.,] both 'incomplete' and 'virtual.'"[126] For, in order to be able to mimic the coloniser, a colonised subject must be placed in a position where s/he can 'observe' or 'gaze' upon the coloniser; the colonised subject is thus a "partial" presence through her/his gaze. This also implies that the perspective of the colonists is not the only 'point of view' from which the colonial process is being observed. This "partial presence" of the colonised other, which is the basis of mimicry, challenges the narcissistic demand of colonial authority since it "rearticulates the whole notion of *identity* and alienates it from essence."[127] Leaning upon Lacan's formulation, Bhabha propounds in his article that

> mimicry is like camouflage, not a harmonization or repression of difference, but a form of resemblance that differs/defends presence by displaying it in part, metonymically. Its threat, I would add, comes from the prodigious and strategic production of conflictual, fantastic, discriminatory "identity effects" in the play of a power that is elusive because it hides no essence, no "itself." And that form of *resemblance* is the most terrifying thing to behold… nothing other than the repetition of its resemblance "in part."[128]

It is within this context that the ambivalent mental state of the coloniser, who is narcissistic on the one hand and paranoiac on the other, can be justified:

> The ambivalence of colonial authority repeatedly turns from *mimicry* – a difference that is almost nothing but not quite – to *menace* – a difference that is almost total but not quite. And in that other scene of colonial power,

[125] Ibid., original emphasis.
[126] Ibid., 127, original emphasis.
[127] Ibid., 129, original emphasis.
[128] Ibid., 131, original emphasis.