

# Multiculturalism in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and E. M. Forster's *Where Angels Fear to Tread*

Elif Derya ŞENDURAN\*

Multiculturalism in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and E. M. Forster's *Where Angels Fear to Tread*

Jean Rhys'in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* ve E. M. Forster'in *Meleklerin Uğramadığı Yer* Romanlarında Çokkültürlülük

## Abstract

The aim of this article is to compare and contrast how multiculturalism is handled in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and E. M. Forster's *Where Angels Fear to Tread* regarding the lifestyles of the characters, language, intermarriage, management of freedom, the cultural practices in the West Indies, and Monteriano Italy, within the tumultuous time of the twentieth century. In multicultural societies, Forster elucidates cross-binaries questing humanistic views whereas Rhys focuses on subversion of the post-slavery era. In both novels, the characters' prejudices, values run counter to the practices of social integration such as intermarriages, immigration. The culturally diverse societies undergo the dominant culture's enforced practices to integrate minorities into their own culture in the twentieth century. Thus, this article explores the denial of prejudice, the denial of cultural integration under the umbrella term multiculturalism in these two novels.

**Keywords:** Multiculturalism *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *Where Angels Fear to Tread*, social integration, language

## Özet

Bu makalenin amacı, Jean Rhys'in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* ve E. M. Forster'in *Meleklerin Uğramadığı Yer* romanlarında, karakterlerin yaşam tarzları, dil, milletler arası evlenme, özgürlüğün idaresi, kültürel uygulamalar bağlamında, çokkültürlülüğün, Büyük ve Küçük Antiller ve İngiltere'de, yirminci yüz yılın karmaşasında nasıl ele alındığını, karşılaştırmaktır. Çokkültürlü toplumlarda, Forster humanist bakış açısını sorgulayarak ikili zıtlıkları açıklamakta, Rhys ise kölelik sonrası dönemdeki değişimden kaynaklanan yıkıma odaklanmaktadır. Her iki romanda da karakterlerin önyargıları, değerleri; sosyal entegrasyon olan milletlerarası evlilik ve göçe karşıt oluşturur. Kültürel çeşitliliği olan toplumlar, yirminci yüzyılda azınlıkları kendi kültürlerine entegre etmek için baskın kültürün zorlayıcı uygulamalarına maruz kalırlar. Bu makale şemsiye terim çokkültürlülüğün altında, önyargının ve kültürel entegrasyonun reddini her iki romanda inceler.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Çokkültürlülük, *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, *Meleklerin Uğramadığı Yer*, Sosyal Entegrasyon, Dil

**Paper Type:** Research

**Makale Türü:** Araştırma

## 1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to compare and contrast how multiculturalism is handled, regarding the lifestyles of the characters in the West Indies and England in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, and in Monteriano and Sawston in E. M. Forster's *Where Angels Fear to Tread*, within the tumultuous time of the twentieth century. The cultural diversity in the societies brings out firstly the social integration among the different groups and secondly the dominant culture's enforced practices to integrate minorities into their own culture in the twentieth century. Thus, this article asks whether social integration is possible without cultural integration or not in the two twentieth century novels, regarding the theory of multiculturalism. The study compares and contrasts the role of emancipation, management of freedom, language, intermarriage, the cultural practice of primogeniture within the framework of multiculturalism in the fictional realm of *WSS* and *WAFT*. This article explores the two novels within their diversity of culture which leads to cultural practices, such as forced-marriage or forced cultural practices imposed on Antoinette, Anette, and the nameless character as a mediocre and petty man in *WSS* and Lilia and Gino in Italy in *WAFT*. Forster focuses more on cross binaries of class distinction in geographies whose borders are blurred with intermarriage with a humanistic view. Whereas Rhys focuses more on racial

\* Elif Derya ŞENDURAN, Dr., İngiliz Edebiyatı, elifderyasenduran@outlook.com ORCID ID orcid.org /0000-0002-4840-5053

discrimination, acculturation is forced upon coexistence of white and black creoles in Coulibri Estate. She pinpoints confusions and ambiguities of post-slavery era, from the perspectives of the hated white Creole former slave owners, and the fortune seeking younger son of an English bourgeois family. The article explores the denial of cultural integration, and the acceptance of social integration, and their problematization in the two novels, under the umbrella term multiculturalism, axiologically. Ultimately, new subjectivities are constituted in minority groups to come to terms with the value judgements, and the prejudices of the majority in the two novels.

E. M. Forster's *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1905) (*WAF*) epitomizes the hypocrisies and prejudices of English Edwardian upper middle-classes within the family circle of the Herritons, via their unexpected relation to Italian lower middle class Gino Carella, and their ex-bride Lilia. After Lilia's husband, Charles Herriton's death, Lilia goes on a trip to Italy, taking her brother-in-law, Philip's advice. In Monteriano, she marries Gino Carella, an Italian "kicking his heels" (Forster, 2007, p.19). Her intermarriage with Gino infuriates the Herritons. The prejudiced Herritons also sicken Lilia and her second husband with their repressive attitudes. The Herritons, Lilia and Gino encounter a culture clash. The Herritons' prejudices against the relationship between Gino and Lilia run counter to Lilia and Gino's value judgements. But soon, Gino's cultural repressions on Lilia end up their passion and mutual understanding in their relationship. The tone of the novel is humorous due to the misunderstandings based on cultural diversity and expectations of the characters. However, the death of Lilia while giving birth to Gino's son, and the death of the infant are the unexpected shifts of the novel. Multiculturalism denies cultural integration but the characters in the novel experience forced upon cultural integration during their attempts for social integration to the community.

Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) (*WSS*), is connected to "Rhys's Caribbean affiliation" (Savory, 2004, p. 203). Thus, by bringing together her Caribbean origin and Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, Rhys writes about her own experiences. She draws on the characters Bertha, Rochester, Grace Poole in *Jane Eyre* (203). The novel is formed of three parts, the first part is written from Antoinette's perspective in the West Indies; narrating her childhood and her relation to her mother, the "good servant" (Jaising, 2010, p. 818) Christophine, Aunt Cora and her father-in-law Mr Mason, and the ex-slaves. The second part delineates her nameless husband's perspective in the West Indies and his relation to Antoinette, Christophine, his family, and Antoinette's brother-in-law Charles Mason. The nameless character succumbs to an intermarriage, arranged by Antoinette's brother-in-law, Charles Mason, his father, and brother. This cultural act of primogeniture aims at obtaining the bride's dowry, so the family forces him to leave his home, and marry Antoinette, a stranger. The last part is again Antoinette's narration but this time she acts irrationally due to her displacement in England in Thornfield Hall. Because of the culture clash triggered by the diversity of perspectives, each character expresses his/her anxiety and alienation. Thus, the multiplicity of the narrators goes hand in hand with the cultural diversity of the West Indies and the economic expectations of men who try to integrate socially to that community. The novel also involves traumatic events which deepen the dislocation for Antoinette as a slave owner's daughter in her homeland. Antoinette's brother, Pierre's death during the ex-slaves' arson attack leads to Antoinette's mother's psychic instability. What is more, the ex-slaves stigmatize Antoinette and her family regarding their psychic, economic and social positions.

My argument is that these two novels include different temporal realms, in which one can sense the transformations in characters' relations with shift in axiological stances that problematize the social integration among diverse multi-cultured groups. The globalization, the scientific revolutions and decolonisation in 1945 fuel immigration and blur the borders between the countries. Lilia, the nameless character and Antoinette immigrate to have a chance for social integration, for freedom, and for economic welfare. I argue that cultural homogeneity in Monteriano and the cultural diversity of the West Indies prevent social integration among people because there are always prejudices against ethnic, racial, sexual, religious minorities in societies. Thus, social integration seems almost impossible without cultural integration. I also ask the question how far the measures taken for social integration are successful in

promoting equality in these fictional realms. Both minorities and majorities take equality or emancipation according to their own standard of living. The characters in the novels break the norm against the prejudice to some extent as long as they appear rational and open minded in their discursive strategies. Lilia and Antoinette experience the transformation in their value judgments: Lilia regrets immigrating to Italy but Antoinette totally loses her reason owing to the fragmentation of her Caribbean identity when she moves to England. They become marginalized in their communities and look for equality in a distant land. This study examines the role of intermarriage as a social integration, cultural acts such as primogeniture, marginalization of women, the agency of minorities, and the role of language in multiculturalism in *WSS* and *WAFT*.

Decentralization of Man as the measure of all things problematizes the management of freedom in the twentieth century. Security and social cohesion are in danger because of the subversion of the dominant European discourse. Immigration and decolonisation after 1945 threaten Britain's international standing British identity because immigration challenges that national identity (Ashcroft & Bevir, 2019, p. 25). The Englishman's immigration to Caribbean and back to England in Rhys's *WSS* depicts the culturally diverse West Indies and the Englishman's desire to obtain wealth from the marginalized ex-slave owners' widowed wives or lonely daughters through intermarriages. These intermarriages maintain an agency for the economic growth of the nameless character in *WSS*. "The pivot of *WSS* is class underpinned by money not national identity" (Savory, 2004, p. 133). Hence, "the absence of national identity" (Savory, 2004, p. 133) in *WSS* was challenged long ago due to immigrations. Whereas in *WAFT*, national identity and culture clash are intertwined because both the Herritons and Gino Carella refer to their national identity to stabilize their ontic stance.

As Gozdecka argues "similar to the way countries differ in their practice of multiculturalism, they also differ in their responses to the crises of multiculturalism, and the way they feature post-multicultural tendencies" such as problematized "management of freedom" (2014, p. 60). For instance, Emancipation Act leads to ambivalent consequences in *WSS*, whereas in *WAFT* Lilia runs away from repression for more freedom but Gino's management of Lilia's freedom disappoints her. Neel puts forth the situation of the West Indies diachronically to shed light on the crisis of multiculturalism in the West Indies: "The period apprenticeship in the West Indies entailed a four – to six year period of transition from a slave economy to a system of 'free' wage labour. During that time, former slaves occupied the position of apprentices, i.e., unpaid servants, and were compelled to stay on their master's plantation" (Neel, 2017, p.172). This practice of "free wage labour" enhances laziness among the former slaves, who start to subvert the value judgments of the white creole planter class. They cannot integrate socially to the community. They subvert the white creoles verbally and physically, as a way of showing their protest to the ex-slave owners: "In Rhys's characterization of this historical period, the white planter class comes to represent a marginalized, denigrated group in relation to England; in a brute dialectical move, the former master becomes the object of punishment and undergoes a kind of house arrest during apprenticeship" (Neel, 2017, p.172). Antoinette's narration epitomizes the destitution of social disintegration during that apprenticeship: "No more slavery – why should anybody work? This never saddened me. I did not remember the place when it was prosperous in *WSS*" (Rhys, 1982, p.19).

In the empirical realm of the West Indies, security and social cohesion problems appear in *WSS*, and crisis emerges in the form of an arson attack from the ex-slaves towards the ex-slaveowners, Anette's family. Securitization becomes a problem in the crisis of multiculturalism (Gozdecka et. al., 2014, p. 56-57) in Coulibri Estate after the Emancipation Act. Whereas in *WAFT*, Lilia and her son's sad end demonstrates how the "lack of management of freedom" emerges when economically powerful ones are marginalized as minorities. They also lose their capacity to practice their cultural, and social activities as their identity markers become blurred through displacement. Thus, the crisis of multiculturalism goes hand in hand with the subversion of centralization of human, and Cartesian thought in the twentieth century because the notion of Vitruvian Man disappears as minorities go against the grain, stating that man cannot be the measure of all things.

There are many studies exploring the two novels in terms of the lifestyles of characters such as Carine M. Mardorossian's "Caribbean Formations in the Rhysian Corpus" in which she focuses on "landscape function" in *WSS*. She also examines this function "within the interconnectedness of the human and the nonhuman worlds" (2015, p. 113). She argues that Caribbean landscape functions for "complication and humanisation" (Mardorossian, 2015, p. 119) of the characters on that land. Thus, she foregrounds effects of geography on the lifestyles of characters in *Coulibri Estate* in *WSS*. John Su, on the other hand, examines "Rhys's representations of the affective experiences produced by a form of European modernity whose emergence was inseparable from imperialist forms of capitalism that developed in Great Britain" (Mardorossian, 2015, p. 172). Su argues that "Rhys's experiments with literary form" cannot be connected "to her efforts to describe the particular experiences of disorientation of her characters" (Mardorossian, 2015, p. 172). Forster's *WAFT*, on the other hand, has drawn the attention of critics mainly for family relations, social and economic class distinctions, aesthetics, and culture clash. For instance, Kenneth Womack in his article foregrounds how "Lilia, Caroline, and Philip become triangulated by the Herriton family's regressive social ideology" in *Sawston's circle*. This regressive attitude ends up in Lilia's "liberating voyage to Italy" (2000, p. 113).

These valuable attempts to explore Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and E. M. Forster's *Where Angels Fear to Tread* bear recognition. However, there still seems to be a gap regarding how multiculturalism as an umbrella term would redefine the impasse of the cultural and social integration within the norms of the society, either as minority groups or as centrifugal forces resonating the logocentric views in twentieth century literature. The gap is that, as the two novels demonstrate, cultural integration, which is very hard to prevent is a result of social integration. Lilia and Antoinette become victims to the centrifugal forces that marginalize them in their community. The multicultural impasse of the twentieth century emerges from the slave trade and the emancipation, search for more freedom, and the management of that freedom, the cultural feudal practices such as primogeniture. This article also examines the characters' lifestyles, and their use of language to find out why it is difficult to sustain equilibrium and integration among minority groups through multicultural practices such as intermarriage in two novels. In doing so, it uses multiculturalism as an umbrella term to form a framework of analysis. Thus, the article attempts to answer whether the characters succeed in breaking "the norm against the prejudice" (Nortio et. al., 2020, p. 2) as long as they appear rational and open minded to justify their rights for existence in ethnic hierarchies and inequalities they live in, within multicultural practices. It questions whether Lilia, Gino, Annette, Antoinette, and the nameless character can constitute a national identity with formal recognition of their cultural diversity. This leads to another wonder whether their attempts for the recognition are obstructed by the dominant cultural group's securitisation demand in the novels.

## 2. 2. What is Multiculturalism?

Culture is "a value judgement" and it is related to "axiological type of content". *La culture* is farming crops or cultivating plants, and it is cultivation (Simondon, 2015, p. 17). Hence, culture aims at transformation and improvement. Multiculturalism, on the other hand, has various definitions as it may differ from people to people. Weinstock defines it as "the denial of cultural integration, but the acceptance of measures of social integration" (Simondon, 2015, p. 308). Thus, cultural integration aims at changes in people's "value judgments", and multiculturalism aims at the denial of that change in people's "value judgment". Multiculturalism accepts various value judgments of ethnic, racial, sexual, religious minorities, and takes measures against the prejudices towards these groups in the society. The role of the values, approaches, normativity and prejudices constitute the cultural and cross-cultural content for cultivation. Multiculturalism accepts various value judgements to cultivate the society. Another definition of multiculturalism puts forth the importance of ethnocultural diversity and equality asserting that:

[w]hile the dominant definition of multicultural ideology and policy highlights equality and the acceptance of ethno-cultural diversity, everyday face-to-face discourses have been

found to revolve around justifying inequality between the majority and immigrants. Previous discursive research has shown that one of the most prominent features of the discourse of intergroup relations among majority populations is the denial of prejudice. Indeed, breaking ‘the norm against prejudice’ can be avoided by using various discursive strategies, such as discursive deracialisation, which enables people to appear rational and open-minded when justifying ethnic hierarchies and inequality” (Nortio et. al., 2020, p. 2).

“Discursive deracialisation” against the prejudice of majorities paves the way for minorities to appear rational in their search for equality. Ashcroft and Bevir, on the other hand, define multiculturalism as the opposite of cultural homogeneity because there are multiple cultural groups rather than just one in a multicultural society. The topics of multiculturalism are language, lifestyle, modes of dress, land rights, anti-racism, religious freedom, immigration, and educational policy. It may also be used for marginalized groups such as people with disabilities, racial, ethnic and religious minorities, women, and LGBTQIA groups (Ashcroft, Bevir, 2019, p.2). Thus, Nortio focuses on the prejudices of majorities as a threat to multiculturalism whereas Ashcroft and Bevir refer to “cultural homogeneity” as the cross binary of multiculturalism.

The entry of *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* states that multiculturalism “is about how to understand and respond to the challenges associated with cultural and religious diversity. The term ‘multicultural’ is often used as a descriptive term to characterize the fact of diversity in a society”. Assimilation and acculturation imbue culturally homogenous societies, and they lurk in multicultural societies to instigate hegemony of the majorities. Nevertheless, “proponents of multiculturalism reject the ideal of the ‘melting pot’ in which members of minority groups are expected to assimilate into the dominant culture in favour of an ideal in which members of minority groups can maintain their distinctive collective identities and practices” (<https://plato.stanford.edu/info.html#c> 2016). Rejection of melting pot ideal paves the way for the individual to appear rational because the justification of the presence of ethnic hierarchies and inequality in multicultural groups are voiced and refuted. Karademir explains the reason for the rejection of ideal of ‘melting pot’ in multiculturalism as to maintain justice in multicultural societies for every member as follows: human beings “exercise their individual freedom to choose, as well as the freedom to lead their lives in the way they see fit, against the background of their ethnic, ethno-national, or ethnoreligious culture, any liberal theory should take into account individuals’ ethno-cultural identifications and communal belonging in conceptualising justice” (2018, p. 217).

As the above given definitions ramify, there is also a diversity to elucidate the meaning of multiculturalism. Meer, Modood and Barrero state the reason for the diversity of definitions of the umbrella term as it: “has facilitated social fragmentation and entrenched social divisions; for others it has distracted attention away from socioeconomic disparities or encouraged a moral hesitancy amongst ‘native’ populations” (2016, p. 5). Social integration of culturally diverse groups may not be enough as cultural plurality may also wane the spirit to unite, with the expectance of freedom and individualism. The solution to this impasse is premised as Gozdecka adds up to the literary studies, by drawing on the term ‘post-multiculturalism’, in which the emphasis is ‘to foster both the recognition of diversity and the maintenance of collective national identities’ (Gozdecka, 2014, p. 52) As Gozdecka contrasts,

[u]nlike multiculturalism and as a way of moving forward, post-multiculturalism is claimed to offer a way of combining strong national identity with the official recognition of cultural diversity [...] strategies confirm the emergence of an interesting mixture of a strong common national identity coupled with recognition of cultural diversity. (2014, p. 52)

As long as the minorities do not develop an angle of vision to be a part of that society they are prone to react against the values of that society instead of integrating socially either in Sawston England, Jamaica West Indies or Monteriano Italy.

Thus, this study uses the given concepts of multiculturalism as a toolbox to analyse Rhys's *WSS*, and Forster's *WAF* because both texts present multicultural communities confronting the crisis of social integration. In *WSS*, the multiple narrators: Antoinette, the nameless character, Grace Poole, Cristophine concretise the diversity of angle of visions and life experience problematizing social integration. Whereas in *WAF* the omniscient narration with free association of thought foregrounds the shift from the authorial voice of logocentric view on to subjectivity. This emerges from or against the bourgeoisie epistemology, and individuality in Sawston and its patriarchal counteract in Monteriano. Lilia immigrates to Italy within this ideal of freedom, that triggers the crisis of multiculturalism.

Hence, the multicultural dilemmas in these texts also resonate cross binaries of bourgeois epistemology such as high/low class for Lilia and Gino, rational/irrational for the nameless character and Antoinette. Cultural codes and conventions change with modernization including the new woman image for Lilia as a free spirit, globalization due to immigration and technological advancement like the use of trains in *WAF*. These encounters erase borders and broadens Antoinette, Lilia, the nameless character and Gino's life experience and increases the detachment of feelings in the two novels.

### **3.The Role of Inter-marriage as a Social Integration in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Where Angels Fear to Tread*.**

Regarding the acceptance of social integration in the theory of multiculturalism, intermarriage is also a means not only for liberation but also for breaking ethnic exclusiveness: Khoo's demographic research on "integration of immigrants or ethnic groups in multicultural societies" delineates "intermarriage between people of different national origins or ethnic background" (Khoo, 2011, p. 111) as "one of the most definitive measures of the dissolution of social and cultural barriers". Khoo declares that intermarriage dissolves the cultural barriers which is refuted by multicultural theory. That is, the intermarriages between Lilia and Gino; Antoinette and the nameless Englishman become social realities that force to transform the value judgements of the couples as they aim at cultural integration. According to Mr Mason, however, marriage is a contract that brings equality and human rights for the couple. How can it bring those rights if "the social interaction is also related to the 'melting pot' theory of assimilation", regarding the cultural integration? Khoo answers this question by stating that the "intermarriage breaks down ethnic exclusiveness and mixes various ethnic populations more effectively than any other social processes". At first, the couples in the two novels construct "social cohesion" as they start to share common values and aspirations, and contribute to social integration (Khoo, 2011, p. 101). Nevertheless "intermarriage functions to integrate diverse societies" (Khoo, 2011, p. 102) such as English upper and lower social classes and people from different ethnicities in the two novels. The variety in the cultural practices, and the prejudice against the lifestyles of the characters lead to anxiety, chaos and sanctions that prevent social cohesion, intended in the practice of intermarriage.

It is now essential to point out how Mr Mason the New English master of the old Cosway plantation, and Aunt Cora understand marriage. It is also worth mentioning that, Mr Mason has come to "Jamaica to impose order and to make money after Emancipation. On the evening Coulibri burns, Mason notices that the apprentices' homes are empty and asks Aunt Cora and Antoinette about it" (Gilchrist, 2012, p. 468): "There is some festivity in the neighborhood. The huts were abandoned. A wedding perhaps? 'Not a wedding,' I said. 'There is never a wedding.' He frowned at me but Aunt Cora smiled" (Rhys, 1982, p. 33). It is obvious that Mr Mason and Aunt Cora do not share the same view about marriage, and Mr Mason cannot unfold the polymorphous epistemic violence in the neighbourhood. Marriage is uncommon in the neighbourhood of old Cosway plantation. Mr Mason thinks "marriage would improve the slaves' moral behaviour and also prepare them for full freedom" (Gilchrist, 2012, p. 469). Aunt Cora, however, "did not favour slave marriage, especially the formal kind. Their attitude was largely informed

by the connotation of marriage with equality. An Anglican marriage was the only legal contract that slaves could engage in. Like all social contracts, it presupposed a degree of autonomy and rights" (Gilchrist, 2012, p. 469). Thus, marriage is a social control promising autonomy and rights for the slaves or another means for social integration promising equality for both men and women. It is "the 1836 Marriage Act, which the Imperial Government forced on the planters to make it easier for apprentices to marry legally" (Gilchrist, 2012, p. 469). Although according to Mr Mason, "liberation for the apprentices is to be found in the assertion of legal, human rights; for Cora, freedom is resistance against the imposition of foreign morality" (Gilchrist, 2012, p. 469). Both of these understandings are hard to manage in the social diversity of the West Indies.

When social barriers are lifted with the intermarriage between Mr Mason and Antoinette's mother, Mr Mason never cares to be called "white pappy" (Rhys, 1982, p. 33) by Antoinette although the impasse in the multicultural society of the West Indies further deepens. Other people start to question the intermarriage between the two: "Why should a very wealthy man who could take his pick of all the girls in the West Indies and many in England too [...] marry a widow without a penny to her name and Coulibri a wreck of a place?" (Rhys, 1982, p. 28). That is, the diverse groups in the society refuse to be a part of the social integration, due to scepticism. At first the newly married couples tend to share "common values and aspirations and contribute to social integration" (Khoo, 2015, p. 101) multiculturally. This social integration between Mr Mason and Anette's family would have succeeded depending on their rational and open-minded attitude in their relationships. However, the securitization becomes a problem in Coulibri and Anette refuses to stay there as "[it] is not safe. It is not safe for Piere" (Rhys, 1982, p. 35), Antoinette's younger brother. Unluckily Philip dies in the arson attack and his mother Anette loses her psychic stability.

Although Anette and Mr Mason break ethnic exclusiveness within their intermarriage, the ex-slaves react to the mixing of ethnic populations to disintegrate former slave owners socially. Burney's explanation sheds light on the ex-slaves' (black creoles) violence towards the white creoles: before emancipation, slave owner's former miscegenation of mixing of black and white races is seen as "a threat to imperialism by the colonialists" (Burney, 2012, p. 191) so they send English settlers like Mr Mason to prevent the slave owners' hierarchisation system. Consequently, ex-slaves' continuous hatred towards white Creole women is triggered by the imperialists, and Anette voices her disturbance as follows: "They talk about us without stopping. They invent stories about you [Mr Mason], and lies about me. They try to find out what we eat every day" (Rhys, 1982, p. 32). Then, comes the reason for this hatred into Antoinette's mind: "The black people did not hate us quite so much when we were poor. We were white but we had not escaped and soon we would be dead for we had no money left. What was there to hate" (Rhys, 1982, p. 34)? Anette and Antoinette's words suggest that they are marginalized in their lands with the practices of another former marginalized group; and the "indigenous peoples" claim "for political autonomy or reparations" (Ashcroft, Bevir, 2019, p. 3), instead of side to side co-existence. For instance, *WSS* begins by foregrounding the difference between the ranks of the white people, and the narrator's (Antoinette's) mother as a Martinique girl through the gaze of Christophine "modelled after the generic trope of the good black servant—a trope that was central to the liberal vision of black humanity expressed in transatlantic pro and antislavery writing" (Jaising, 2010, p. 816). Christophine is "a commodified person" (Spivak, 1985, p. 253) because she is Anette's "wedding present" (Rhys, 1985, p. 21) from her husband. This phrase justifies ethnic hierarchies in the West Indies. Christophine explains this difference and the disapproval of the Jamaican ladies of Antoinette's mother to her: "because she pretty like pretty self" (Rhys, 1985, p. 17). "Christophine is the first interpreter and named speaking subject in the text" (Spivak, 1985, p. 252). Thus, jealousy of "the white people" (Rhys, 1985, p. 17) for the white Creoles comes together with the hatred of the black Creoles for Antoinette and her family after the Emancipation Act, that Neel explains as "a blueprint for social control" (2017, p.172). The hatred emerges from economic reasons, but it is palpable that the reaction of that hatred results in impulsive violence of an arson attack, throwing stones, verbal abuse. Antoinette accepts the prejudices of

these people by moving to England with her husband. Immigration disintegrates her from her community, so she loses her reason.

In Forster's *WAF*, the impasse in the intermarriage foregrounds the social class, and gender distinctions as reasons for forced upon cultural integration in cultural homogeneity of Monteriano, running against the grain of Lilia's search for equality. For instance, widowed Lilia's decision to marry an unemployed young Italian man, called Gino Carella, during her short visit to Monteriano delineates her naïve belief in bourgeois epistemology as she is unable to escape from its repressive mechanisms, which reincarnates in the Herritons. Gino is a "peasant" quoting Dante; he is also "pure and simple" (Olson, 1988, p. 395), Gino's value judgements run counter to Lilia's lifestyle in Sawston. Therefore, she cannot get used to Gino's tendencies to manage her freedom in Monteriano. In the beginning, she rationalizes her intermarriage to her brother-in-law Philip, not foreseeing the cultural incompatibilities, that would bring her life to an end in displacement in Monteriano:

I'll thank you [Philip] to leave me alone... For twelve years you've trained me and tortured me, and I'll stand it no more [...] when I came to your house a poor young bride, how you all looked me over—never a kind word... and your mother corrected me [...] And when Charles died I was still to run in strings for the honour of your beastly family, and I was to be cooped up at Sawston and learn to keep house, and all my chances spoilt of marrying again [...] I can stand up against the world now, for I've found Gino, and this time I marry for love (Forster, 2007, p. 26-27)!

Restrictions on Lilia lead her to behave counter to the Herritons' values, as she justifies her search for freedom, and equality through her rational speech. Lilia rejects to belong to the Herritons' milieu in Sawston socially. She is the image of a new woman, a "bourgeois rebel who represented female independence through activities" (Sherry, 2016: %47), such as her intermarriage with a young Italian for love and her immigration to Italy. However, she cannot calculate how the desire of her husband would affect her living style. Gino mixed up with Lilia's solitary walks, asks his friend Spiridione's advice: "I want to consult you since you are so kind as to take an interest in my affairs. My wife wishes to take solitary walks." Spiridione was shocked. "But I have forbidden her." "Naturally." "She does not yet understand. She asked me to accompany her sometimes [...] You know, she would like me to be with her all day" (Forster, 2007, p. 39).

Gino is a "culturally embedded" (Karademir, 2018, p. 217) person. His culture functions as a context of meaning and significance in his life. The culture he is born into shapes his understanding of who he is and "what is meaningful" (Karademir, 2018, p. 217) for him. Gino would like to control Lilia and adapt her socially to his circumstances or in multicultural terms, he struggles to integrate her culturally to his standard of living. However, Lilia reacts to this situation because Gino's repression on his wife contradicts Lilia's living standards. She disobeys her husband's decisions, what is set out as a rule for her so they quarrel:

It was the old question of going out alone. "I always do it in England." "This is Italy." "Yes, but I'm older than you, and I'll settle." "I am your husband," he said, smiling. They had finished their midday meal, and he wanted to go and sleep. Nothing would rouse him up, until at last Lilia, getting more and more angry, said, "And I've got the money." (Forster, 2007, p. 44).

Thus, Lilia refuses cultural integration by sticking to her former lifestyle although she is socially integrated to Gino through her intermarriage. That is, she is culturally embedded in Sawston lifestyle, and refuses to disintegrate from it. She looks for equality, despite her cultural incompatibility with Gino so she rationalizes her act with the enunciation of being richer. In this way, she tries to resist being a submissive woman, nevertheless, she soon realizes that out of Sawston she has been into a frying pan, or in multi-cultural terms she realizes that she is in a melting pot, where her acculturation process takes place:

"It's nothing." She went in and tore it up, and then began to write—a very short letter, whose gist was "Come and save me." [...] Lilia went to the post herself. But in Italy so many things can be arranged. The postman was a friend of Gino's, and Mr. Kingcroft never got his letter. So she gave up hope, became ill, and all through the autumn lay in bed. Gino was distracted. She knew why; he wanted a son...Falling in love was a mere physical triviality, like warm sun or cool water, beside this divine hope of immortality (Forster, 2007, p.50).

This instance puts forth how Gino's wishes counteract Lilia's lifestyle. Love is a physical triviality for Gino, yet Lilia resists to integrate to the culture of another community. Her struggle to escape is in vain because Gino cuts her communication with her daughter, and her friend Mr Kingcroft. Multiculturalism is bad for Lilia because it hands her over to Gino and Spridiono as the embodiment of the patriarchal authority structure. Therefore, they act according to their cultural values, that tend to dominate Lilia's values and her finance. Both Antoinette and Lilia are far from protection and support so they "wither away" (Weinstock, 2015, p. 320) in a distant land away from home.

The desire for freedom in both novels eliminates "cross cultural dialogue", and leads to "cultural marginalisation" (Karademir, 2018, p. xviii) of Anette, Antoinette: they cannot constitute a relationship based on mutual recognition with their husbands because of the hatred and jealousy triggered by imperialism. These prejudices affect the normativity of relationships. The intermarriages are based on economic reasons for Mr Mason, the nameless Englishman in *WSS*, and Gino in *WAFT*.

#### **4. Primogeniture as a Cultural and Economical Act in *Wide Sargasso Sea***

The second part of *WSS*, the narration of the nameless Englishman epitomizes his angle of vision, and the hardships of his social integration to his wife, and the West Indies. In the "morning before the wedding" (Rhys, 1982, p. 77), Mr Mason's son, Richard tells the groom that Antoinette "won't marry" (78) him. Antoinette's rejection shapes the Englishman's subjectivity through his fee association of thought: "I did not relish going back to England in the role of a rejected suitor jilted by this Creole girl." (Rhys, 1982, p. 78). However, hypocritically, he promises Antoinette "peace, happiness, safety" (79). Antoinette's procrastination totally depends on the teleological drive of being "afraid of what may happen" (78) because the white English ladies, who disapprove of mixing of ethnicities and ex-slaves systematically abuse her, and her family verbally or physically. However, this arranged intermarriage for primogeniture aims at the global social integration and economic wealth. Primogeniture is "a major cultural phenomenon" (Jamoussi, 2011, p.3), leading to the ejection of the younger sons "from paternal mansion", and they are "forced to fend for themselves" (Jamoussi, 2011, p.3). The young sons are "not only downwardly mobile but [become] agents of social mobility" (Jamoussi, 2011, p.4). The nameless character in *WSS* becomes an agent of social integration, promoted by his father and brother for economic reasons.

Aunt Cora, on the other hand, foresees the "socioeconomic disparities" (Meer, 2016, p, 5) lurking behind Antoinette when Richard arranges the intermarriage for her sister, and this emerges as a conflict between Aunt Cora and Richard as Christophine narrates: "'It's disgraceful,' said. It's shameful. You are handing over everything the child owns to a perfect stranger. Your father [Mr Mason] would never have allowed it. She should be protected legally. A settlement can be arranged. That was his intention.'" (Rhys, 1982, p. 114) Thus, Aunt Cora's insistence on "lawyer's settlement", and Richard's refusal lay bare how Antoinette's dowry is given to a stranger with the permission of her brother. The social incompatibility between Antoinette, and the nameless character results from Antoinette's ethnicity, and her family's

profession so she cannot break the norm against the prejudice to integrate. Their biased attacks impose economic inequality on Antoinette indirectly. This is an arranged intermarriage without any lawyer's settlement to protect her rights. The Englishman's narration delineates the incompatibility of the couple. This incompatibility reveals that his intermarriage is an enforcement of cultural integration called primogeniture for economic reasons.

The Englishman's social mobility to Coulibri triggers the ex-slaves' hatred towards Antoinette further. The Englishman becomes an investiture for the black Creoles to complain about Antoinette and her family. They do not gossip anymore instead they discredit Antoinette by writing false letters to her husband, and acting in accordance with their depictions, that fits their complaints. Thus, the cultural act of primogeniture turns into repression on the marginalized women in the West Indie society. As far as the definition is concerned, "[p]rimogeniture privileges the first born son yet it "is not examined in relation to the monarchy or even to the nobility as a political body, but rather to land and the evolution of land-ownership as well as to the changing relations between the individual, the family and society" (Jamoussi, 2011, p. 2). Its purpose is social integration, however, the ex-slaves take sides with the nameless character to repress Antoinette. This promotes the patriarchal lineage because the younger son's wife becomes dependent on this system, which Okin criticizes as a repression on woman in multicultural societies (Weinstock, 2015, p. 320).

The father and the brother of Antoinette's husband also force him for social mobility, so he moves to Coulibri Estate, and marries Antoinette for her dowry according to their plans and wishes. That is, through this arranged marriage, he secures his future, as he is deprived of his father's inheritance due to this notion of primogeniture. The nameless character, as the youngest son in the family, expresses his redefined identity in the West Indies, as a metonymic extension of forced upon social integration as follows: "I will never be disgrace to you or to my dear brother the son you love. No begging letters, no mean requests [...] 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" (Rhys, 1982, p. 70). Hence, on their honeymoon the unnamed character is far from viewing himself as a metonymic extension of his cultural background, as his dialogue with Antoinette indicates: "Am I expected to wear one of these? And when?' I crowned myself with one of the wreaths and made a face in the glass. 'I hardly think it suits my handsome face, do you?' 'You look like a king, an emperor.' 'God forbid.' I said and took the wreath off" (Rhys, 1982, p. 73). His image in the mirror is the reincarnation of British imperialism for Antoinette but this image disturbs the nameless character, who wants to secure himself from that national identity, by not mentioning it to Antoinette. The nameless character is unhappy with his family's forced upon practices on him. He abstains from appearing like an emperor, which is, a figure of a far cry for him. The nameless character's letter to his father explains his intricate situation, and the reason behind his presence in the West Indies: "All is well and has gone according to your plans and wishes. I dealt of course with Richard Mason. His father died soon after I left for the West Indies as you probably know. He is a good fellow, hospitable and friendly; he seemed to become attached to me and trusted me completely" (Rhys, 1982, p. 75). The nameless character is abstained from his family and from his national roots due to primogeniture. As the younger son of the family, he tries to settle down in a distant land without an identity and any relatives likewise neither Antoinette nor the nameless character himself mention his name and surname in their narration.

Both the nameless character, and his wife Antoinette are disintegrated from their social community by one way or another. Unlike Antoinette, the misfortunes of her husband reverse to fortunes when his father and brother die. Grace Poole narrates how the "fortunate" nameless character utilizes from the cultural act of primogeniture economically at Thornfield Hall in the last part of the novel: "They knew that he was in Jamaica when his father and brother died,' Grace Poole said.' He inherited everything, but he was a wealthy man before that. Some people are fortunate, they said. She [Antoinette] sits shivering and she is so thin. If she dies on my hands who will get the blame" (Rhys, 1982, p. 177). Both characters yield to the cultural act of primogeniture in the end.

### 5. Marginalization of Antoinette and Lilia

One can see how Lilia and Antoinette's identities are challenged when they leave their homeland to settle down in another country. They are marginalized as they "reject both their culture of origin and the dominant host culture" ([www.wikipedia.org/acculturation](http://www.wikipedia.org/acculturation)). Antoinette is already marginalized by the ex-slaves' verbal attacks. These attacks lead to her rejection to marry the nameless Englishman. Her desire to be in England seems to be a sense of rejection of her culture first but when she moves to Thornfield Hall, she becomes totally irrational according to her husband because she becomes deprived of her "good servant" Christophine, and her looking glass. She loses her reason in the attic: "There is no looking-glass here and I don't know what I am like now [...] The girl I saw was myself yet not quite myself" (Rhys, 1982, p. 180). In another instance, she rejects her existence in England as follows: "They tell me I am in England but I don't believe them" (Rhys, 1982, p. 181). Antoinette's desire to see England and her presence in Thornfield Hall do not overlap. What she expects is not there. Lilia, on the other hand, openly refutes the Herritons first but the repressive attitudes of Gino lead her to reject him as well. Both Antoinette and Lilia become marginalized as their identities are erased in the host culture.

Antoinette's red dress, on the other hand, demonstrates her ontic self and its "durability" in terms of multiculturalism in Thornfield Hall. The short letter to Richard in its pocket manifests her alienation and dislocation in England. "In Part Three Rhys associates Antoinette's red dress positively with the ideas of durability, origins, rootedness and 'home', and she deploys the red dress to intimate a deeper existential identity" (Joannou, 2015, p. 128). Dress constitutes Antoinette's bodily consciousness, cultural identity and its presence in Thornfield Hall, however, in the pocket of the red dress, there is a letter crying out for help to her brother-in-law, who has arranged her marriage: "Dear Richard please take me away from this place where I am dying because it is cold and dark" (Rhys, 1982:183). Likewise, Lilia's letter to her family in Sawston pleads to save her but Gino's friends at the post office in Monteriano prevent its postage. The written letters, in other words, have no function for social contact with the homeland because after the immigration it becomes almost impossible for Lilia, and Antoinette to contact their homeland and relatives. Gino and the nameless character treat their wives as if they are their possessions.

Antoinette's sense of displacement is heightened in England when she moves to Thornfield Hall with her husband. The "shift in narrative voice" implies her "disorientation" (Su, 2015, p. 173) from Antoinette in the West Indies to mad Antoinette at Thornfield Hall. It also points to the shift in her subjectivity: as her inner speech and dialogues with Grace Poole become incoherent and irrational. "Unable to recognise her place in the world" (Su, 2015, p. 184), she speculates on her identity and self as she feels that her ontic status is at stake in Thornfield Hall. Thus, English country house becomes a "carceral space" which delineates Antoinette's inability to get out of it (Henderson, 2015, p. 102).

*Where Angels Fear to Tread*, on the other hand,

mocks the prejudices, snobbery, and rigidity of the Sawston society she rejects, it exposes Lilia's errors and failings and renders the society of Monteriano, Italy, where she weds, as far from ideal. Eventually, Lilia realises that her Italian husband, the lively and passionate Gino Carella, is no prince charming, but a penniless and philandering dentist's son, and that Italy is not a dreamland of freedom and romance, but a nation as constraining as the one she fled (Peppis, 2007, p. 50).

Lilia becomes passive in Monteriano because her husband, Gino, represses her, in accordance with his norms so that Monteriano becomes a "carceral space" for Lilia as well. Indirectly Gino is unable to

manage Lilia's desire for freedom successfully because he is embedded in a different culture. Their social integration soon leads to the need for cultural integrity. Gino applies "constraining" restrictions to Lilia's shocking act of taking solitary walks: "Lilia's pitiful fate – her suffering under Italy's repressive gender conventions and eventual death in child birth– casts a sceptical light on the effort to escape Englishness, playing on popular English anxieties about intercourse with foreigners" (Peppis, 2007, p. 50). As Peppis argues Lilia's rejection of the Herritons' sanctions imposed on her, and her departure from Sawston are just acts that lead to her ambivalence to move into an unknown culture. Antoinette's nameless husband, too, encounters the same feeling as his wife seems totally a stranger to her. Hence, both Lilia in *WAF*T and the nameless character in *WSS* undergo a culture clash as they try to integrate into the different lifestyles of a foreign country. The nameless character suffers from the cultural effects of primogeniture imposed on him, yet "the gender conventions" both in the West Indies and Monteriano position women, as the lower leg of the cross binary: Peppis's comments on "escaping Englishness" discredit Lilia's standards of living in Sawston, that she has been used to. As Gozdecka points out, adherence to nationality, and respect for the diversity of culture are the main assets to come out of the crisis of multiculturalism. Lilia's rejection of the Herritons pays her no good because it distances her from the sense of belonging to her national origins.

### 6. Titles and Renaming: Breaking the Norm Against the Prejudice

Abel argues that "personal names function not only as identifiers, but as locus of identity" (2019, p. 333) in multicultural societies. Specifically, in *WSS*, the unvoiced name of Antoinette's husband, appearing only as a pronoun "he" generalizes his ontic stance without any particular feature. He is like anybody in the novel. Her husband's renaming her as "Bertha" after Rochester's mad wife in the attic in *Jane Eyre* has a cross-cultural function as opposed to his namelessness, which involves the intention "to injure rather than individuate" (Abel, 2019, p. 333). The nameless husband, feeling dislocated from his home also dislocates Antoinette by renaming her Bertha. Spivak comments on this act of naming as follows: "In the figure of Antoinette, whom in *Wide Sargasso Sea* Rochester violently renames Bertha, Rhys suggests that so intimate a thing as personal and human identity might be determined by the politics of imperialism" (Spivak, 1985, p. 250).

The unfixity of their locus of identity prevents Antoinette and her husband's capability to break their norm against the prejudice. Names can function "as markers of origin, kinship, or ethnicity" or they can also "indicate processes of acculturation, creolisation or racialisation" (Abel, 2019, p. 333). Thus, from the perspective of the nameless character, the intention is never for social integration but for acculturation especially when Antoinette goes to Thornfield Hall leaving her homeland: "Creolisation [...] implies a process of mixing" which leads to "pointed contrasts" (Abel, 2019, p. 340), such as mad/rational. The renaming of Bertha may also be considered as a process of "domination and subjugation" within the creolization process through "a passive process of acculturation" (Abel, 2019, p. 340). Although multiculturalism is against the process of acculturation, specifically in the last part of the novel, Antoinette is forced to adopt the "oppressed cultural patterns" (Abel, 2019, p. 340) within the traces of the grand narrative that encodes Antoinette to a self other than her West Indian identity. Spivak's term "the planned epistemic violence of imperialism" (1985, p. 254) also fits to the practices of the nameless character in *WSS*, which Antoinette foresees, and rejects through her unwillingness to get married to him. Her rejection further marginalizes her because she cannot stick to her original choice as she succumbs to the enforced intermarriage. This "planned epistemic violence of imperialism" also resonates in Neel's naming the Emancipation act as "a blueprint for social control" (Neel, 2017, p.172). As a result, the nameless Englishman's violent act of renaming her after the mad character of a grand narrative is a form of Antoinette's cultural disintegration from her homeland.

E. M. Forster's *WAF*T, on the other hand, delineates the social and economic class distinction and its importance for the Herritons, with titles as a privilege. "Locus of identity" points to Phillip Herriton's search for distinction of title. His mother Mrs Herriton sends him on a mission to Italy in order to let him

learn about Lilia's engagement. However, he is disappointed when he learns that Gino is from lower class and understands that he has married Lilia for wealth and prosperity. Miss Abbott, who has come to Italy to accompany Lilia feels distracted with Phillip's questions about Lilia:

"May I be told his name?" Miss Abbott whispered, "Carella." But the driver heard her, and a grin split over his face. The engagement must be known already. "Carella? Conte or Marchese, or what?" "Signor," said Miss Abbott, and looked helplessly aside... "Then how old is he?" [...] "Twenty-one, I believe." There burst from Philip the exclamation, "Good Lord!"... What is he, please? What is his position? [...] No positions at all. He is kicking his heels (Forster, 2007, p. 18-19).

The Herritons prioritize titles to let anybody integrate into their social milieu. Ruth Padel calls the impasse between the Herritons, Lilia, and Gino Carella: "culture clash. The English Edwardian upper middle classes, armoured in the provincial conventions of their day... hypocrisies and the mealy prejudices" contrasts "Italian lower-middle-class conventions, values, landscape, open sensuality and art" (Padel, 2007, p.ix). The below quotation demonstrates that Philip, as a fan of Italian culture, is anxious about becoming socially integrated to lower class Italians because he thinks his idealization of Italy might diminish or he is unwilling to lose his ideal image of Italy: "a place which knew the Etruscan League, and the Pax Romana, and Alaric himself, and the Countess Matilda, and the Middle Ages, all fighting and holiness, and the Renaissance, all fighting and beauty! He thought of Lilia no longer. He was anxious for himself: he feared that Romance might die" (Forster, 2007, p. 20).

The culture clash, in both of the novels, leads to disastrous consequences: Lilia's son and Antoinette's younger brother are in need of protection and nurture but they wither away due to hatred and jealousy. Antoinette's brother passes away in the ex-slave's arson attack, and Lilia's son passes away in the Herritons' attempt to rescue him from his father Gino. Thus, multiculturalism gives the autonomy of women to the patriarchy when it exempts gender equality, which is particularly bad for women, this also affects the infants who need protection from women.

### **7.The Denial of Minority Women's Agency**

"[T]he excessive focus on gender inequality in traditional cultures led to the denial of minority women's agency rather than their emancipation" (Gozdecka et. al., 2014, p. 58). Thus, multiculturalism in traditional cultures lessens the minority women's agency: likewise in *WSS*, Antoinette's husband obstructs "good servant" Christophine's agency by forcing Christophine to leave and frightening her with police. Christophine, as a matter of fact, enhances Antoinette's social integration to her marriage, the following dialogue between Christophine and Antoinette elucidates how Christophine backs up Antoinette's nameless husband to ease her anxieties: "The man not a bad man, even if he love money, but he hear so many stories he don't know what to believe. That's why he keep away" (Rhys, 1982, p. 114). Ironically, the nameless Englishman denies the agency of Christophine in his intermarriage by distancing her from Antoinette. Christophine has already been emancipated, yet she chooses to be with her master's daughter to support her. This shows that she is a "good servant". This act moves beyond "gender inequality" for Antoinette as she is distanced from her past with Christophine's departure. Having lost her father, brother and mother, Antoinette becomes vulnerable to "the exemptions" of the nameless character, who seeks his individual rights from the law and order in the local area. Thus, Christophine is a good servant for Antoinette, yet the nameless character sides with Amelie and Daniel Cosway. Mr Mason, Charles Mason, the nameless Englishman do not bother to translate Caribbean culture into their standards of living instead the nameless character imposes sanctions on Antoinette, destabilizing her position in society. Antoinette also denies Christophine's role as a minority woman by letting her go away from Coloubri Estate.

In Forster's *WAFI*, the Herritons and Gino's limitations on Lilia manifest how her agency as a mother and wife is denied: The limitations prevent her from creating a sense of wholeness within her new family circle and her role as a mother. Lilia is forced to abide by Gino's rules, which are no more

than sanctions to manipulate her. For instance, forbidding Lilia from taking solitary walks and from communication with her family leaves her alone, away from her daughter Irma. Both Antoinette and Lilia are alienated and their alienation articulates Weinstock's explication of Okin's view on the measures of multiculturalism "exempt group practices from the liberal protection of individual rights. As many of these exemptions have to do with the way in which gender roles are policed, these exemptions bear particularly hard on women" (Weinstock, 2015, p. 320). Likewise, Lilia's son would live if her mother survived. Once again both the Herritons and Gino deny Lilia's agency in bringing up her children. That hardness on women, regarding the Herritons and Gino's denial of Lilia, and the nameless character's denial of Christophine reduce the chance of psychological and cultural compatibility of the couples in the society:

[Lilia's] marriage with Gino soon dissolves, however, in a series of unforeseen cultural clashes that result in her isolation from the Monteriano community that she hoped to befriend [...] Prompted by the norms and mores particular to his Italian culture, Gino destroys Lilia's dream of liberation through his extramarital affairs and by forbidding her to walk unaccompanied among Monteriano's picturesque surroundings. (Womack, 2000, p. 136)

### **8. Emancipation Act and Multicultural Diversity**

Ashcroft and Bevir differentiate the political practice and theory of multiculturalism pinpointing "postwar immigration" through the concepts of "assimilation versus integration" (2019, p. 3) and in theory multiculturalism includes the claims of "indigenous peoples and their claims for political autonomy or reparations" (Ashcroft and Bevir, 2019, p. 3). The theory about multiculturalism is "how we understand the world, and practice" is "how we respond to the world by acting" (Ashcroft and Bevir, 2019, p. 4).

In *WSS*, Anette's "neighbour and her only friend" Mr Luttrell (Rhys, 1982, p. 18) feels isolated after the Emancipation Act. Mr Luttrell's claim for the reparations of Emancipation Act becomes his anomie after Anette reminds him of its delay: "'Of course they have their own misfortunes. Still waiting for this compensation the English promised when the Emancipation Act was passed. Some will wait for a long time.' How could she know that Mr Luttrell would be the first who grew tired of waiting? One calm evening he shot his dog, swam out to sea and was gone for always. No agent came from England to look after his property" (Rhys, 1982, p.17). Obviously, Mr Luttrell feels desperate about his situation because his understanding of life cannot go beyond the measures taken for emancipation. Considering Mr Luttrell's case, the cultural integration of the slaves to this situation, either as a "good servant" (Jaising, 2010, p.818) or as a rebel counter-actualizes distancing from "logical positivism" (Ashcroft and Bevir, 2019, p. 5) constituting emancipation as the embodiment of modernity in the West Indies. The tension between master and slave relation triggers the impasse between "the centre and the local" (Ashcroft and Bevir, 2019, p.6). The logocentrism of the feudal patriarchal culture manages the "social diversity" (Ashcroft and Bevir, 2019, p. 6) by imposing sanctions on women.

The conditions in Antoinette's home demonstrate how her cultural practices have become void of "autonomous choice and self-respect" (Ashcroft and Bevir, 2019, p. 8). That is, the expectance of autonomy and reparations for Mr Luttrell, Anette and Antoinette turn into acculturation, which hinders their integration to the modern world. How Mr Luttrell understands and responds to the new system differs from Anette and Antoinette, who are left to the mercy of the new settlers of plantation.

### **9. Is Language a Way to "Connect"?**

The role of language in cultural diversity is to express the value judgements for cultivation, improvement and transformation of the characters in the two novels. Language starts social integration with specific associations of meaning. Literature in native tongue dovetails the connection between distinct hierarchies, as Gino's quotation from Dante can be associated with Lilia's journey to Italy and her

transformation. In this way, Philip and Lilia can learn from Gino, and connect with him through Italian literature. His reference discredits Philip's prejudices, with the start of a mutual contribution to culture, involved in the notion of interculturalism rather than multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, in this respect, lacks the cultural borrowings as it celebrates songs, dance, food rather than art and literature (Burney, 2012, p. 202). Gino expresses himself as a "noble peasant", dining with Philip Herriton sincerely as he states:

"Signor Carella, heartened by the spaghetti and the throat - rasping wine, attempted to talk, and, looking politely towards Philip, said, "England is a great country. The Italians love England and the English." Philip, in no mood for international amenities, merely bowed. "Italy too , "the other continued a little resentfully , " is a great country. She has produced many famous men — for example Garibaldi and Dante. The latter wrote the 'Inferno ,' the ' Purgatorio ,' the 'Paradiso.' The 'Inferno' is the most beautiful." And with the complacent tone of one who has received a solid education, he quoted the opening lines —

*Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita*

*Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura*

*Che la diritta via era smarrita<sup>†</sup> —*

a quotation which was more apt than he supposed. Lilia glanced at Philip to see whether he noticed that she was marrying no ignoramus" (Forster, 2007, p. 23-24).

Lilia is proud to hear Gino quoting Dante which is a sign of his intellectual background. The quotation acknowledges that to "understand [literature] does not mean primarily to reason one's way back into the past, but to have a present involvement in what is said. It is not really about a relationship between persons [...] but about sharing in the communication that the text gives" (Gadamer, 1997, p. 67). The quotation from Dante's *Inferno* elucidates Gino's value of judgement at that moment, regarding his belief and cultural background. Gino might have foreseen that Lilia's breaking the norm against the Herritons' prejudice would somehow affect his marriage with her. Gino associates his new attempt to start a new life with his middle-aged wife with the ambivalence of being in a forest dark.

The aptness of the quotation also indicates the year of jubilee when the full moon was lightening at night in 1300, the year in which, the church forgives the sins of the visitors of Rome in Catholicism. The forest refers to (Galileo, 2009, p. 63) a place where Cumae and Napoli are located and its significance comes from the implication that it is the entrance to hell<sup>‡</sup> (Galileo, 2009, p. 62). Gino, probably, refers to the beginning of his troubles, when he gets connected to the Herritons. The darkness may also be considered as the irrationality associated with the following instances, which would lead to unreasonable prejudices between Lilia and Gino. Thus, the reference foreshadows a series of tragicomic instances that involve culture clash amidst the lower middleclass Gino Carella and Lilia, the bourgeoisie Herritons from Sawston. Within the theory of multiculturalism, Monteriano seems to be a space, where Lilia would integrate socially at first but soon the implications of Gino's quote from Dante's *Inferno* actualizes the forced cultural integration of Lilia to Monteriano and her desperate resistance to it. The quotation also delineates how language connects people through literature paradoxically. The opening lines of *Inferno* point to Gino's literary sensibility, and Lilia is proud of its utterance since it elucidates that Gino is never an "ignoramus" although Philip thinks just the opposite. Lilia considers Italian literature would justify her

---

<sup>†</sup> *Nel mezzo...smarrita*: Dorothy Sayer translates the Dante quotation: "Midway this way of life we're bound upon,/ I woke to find myself in a dark wood,/ Where the right road was holly lost and gone" (Forster, *Notes* 2007, p. 11). Lilia is thirty-three-near enough 'midday'; Forster may have had in mind also the disaster which will occur, literally, 'in dark wood'" (12) in which Lilia's son dies.

<sup>‡</sup> The translation of the paraphrase from the book is mine.

connection to Gino from Philip's point of view. The multiculturalist vantage point also justifies Lilia's intention to start a new life, nevertheless, Dante's quote "where the right road was holly lost and gone" problematizes the intended social integration through associations and implications. The normativity of Dante's quotation epitomizes the high value judgement of Gino against the backdrop of his visitors' prejudices. The loss of the linearity for the right path goes hand in hand with forgiven sins. Gino as a "noble peasant" never uses language to belittle his visitors or to constitute a cross binary to define himself, instead he uses language to express his ontic, and epistemic stance for his axiological transformation and improvement. By using Italian, instead of English, Gino foregrounds his national identity, ignoring Philips's prejudices.

In *WSS*, on the other hand, Amelie's song for the newly-wed couple elucidates how language can express the formations of the black creole's counterculture against the value judgements of the white Creoles. Amelie parodies the British culture and her master with her song. She, in a way, belittles her master, backing up the Emancipation Act, that becomes a centrifugal force to marginalize Antoinette through her husband's consent. Amelie's language produces a new signification system that responds and challenges the cultural diversity abused for economic needs in her ironic song to Antoinette: "The white cockroach she marry/ The white cockroach she marry/ The white cockroach she buy young man / The white cockroach she marry" (Rhys, 1982, p. 101). Antoinette reacts to the song violently and asks her husband:

"Did you hear what that girl was singing?' Antoinette said. 'I don't always understand what they say or sing.' Or anything else. 'It was a song about a white cockroach.' 'That's me.' 'That's what they call all of us who were here before their own people in Africa sold them to the slave traders. And I have 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 never born at all (Rhys, 1982, p. 101)

Burney states that multiculturalism focuses more on songs, dance, dress... and ignores literature and art, that Other contributes to. This creates a lack in multiculturalism as it can only refer to stereotypes and subjectification. Likewise, the absence of literature for the Creoles is prevalent in the novel. This "dehumanises the Other" in Caribbean culture. In the novel, Antoinette has "no foundation or cultural context" (Burney, 2012, p. 202) to belong to, other than her husband's reductive marginalization with his reference to *Jane Eyre's* mad Bertha. Amelie's song dehumanises Antoinette by disorienting her ontological status. She transgresses master/slave duality to break the norm against the prejudice by creating her own language system. In a way she forces Antoinette to appear irrational in the Englishman's eye. Although "multiculturalism calls for equal coexistence of different cultures within a national society" paradoxically Amelie fuses "the language of separation and antagonism [as well as] cultural superiority and ethnocentrism" (Adebanwi, 2019, p. 168). This song elucidates how Amelie's culture functions to give meaning and importance to the happenings around her. She parodies her master, her husband, and this act shapes her understanding of who Amelie is, as she makes fun of her masters. Daniel Cosway also shapes his life by belittling, Antoinette and her family in his letter to her husband. Both Amelie and Daniel try to constitute their identities symbiotically with Antoinette's. In doing so, they create a decadent language, causing incoherence in their master's lifestyle. Amelie also cannot situate her subjectivity other than Antoinette's, as her value judgments have undergone a transformation after her own people have sold her to Antoinette's family as a slave.

Antoinette's husband contemplates on his wife's reaction as follows: "I thought these people are very vulnerable. How old was I when I learned to hide what I felt? [...] It was necessary, I was told, and that view I have always accepted" (Rhys, 1982, p. 103). Although Antoinette's husband cannot understand the meaning of Amelie's song, the primary meaning of the song is related to the normativity of the ex-slave's discourse, which sets a standard to improve and transform their social, and cultural status after the Emancipation Act. The ex-slaves' systematic verbal attacks on the masters cultivate their own

subjectivity in the West Indies. The lack of art and literature in the West Indies prevent the Creoles from borrowing and learning “from the Other”, which is the basis for the notion of interculturalism that opposes multiculturalism (Burney, 2012, p. 202). Instead, Antoinette and Anette adhere to songs, dances, yet they are deprived of their own literature foregrounding their own cultural artefact.

### 10. Conclusion

Both novels elucidate that culturally homogeneous and culturally diverse societies can never constitute social integration without cultural integration. Art and literature appear to be the fundamental asset for social integration. Hence, multiculturalism is a dead end in itself because without cultural mixing, borrowing, analysing texts from different cultures; it is almost impossible to come together due to the hierarchy of cultures in the societies. On the other hand, the shifts in the normativity of the characters and their transformations result from the prejudices and their desperate acts to break the norm against the prejudice. Lilia’s decision to settle down in Monteriano with Gino is an example of how she goes against the grain, in *WAF*. Lilia tries to escape the repressions of the Herritons but she is unable to cope with the limitations imposed on her in Monteriano as well.

The Emancipation Act leads to the chaotic lifestyle of Antoinette that increases “social control” among the planters of the West Indies, denigrating her arranged intermarriage with the nameless character in *WSS*. The social control involves “the epistemic violence” of the ex-slaves over the ex-slaveowners to deaccelerate the possible social integration in the intermarriage, which blurs the disabling borders of the centripetal forces, and when Amelie and Daniel Cosway transgress the norms with their epistemic violence in their letters and songs, they also turn the master/slave binary upside down. That is, their transgression controls the plantocracy by problematizing their masters’ future attempts of cultivation within English norms. Imperialism, seeing slaveowner’s hierarchisation as a threat, prefers to reverse master/slave cross binary with the Emancipation Act.

Lilia’s search for equality and individuality is stronger than Antoinette’s, whose attempts become ineffective by the ex-slaves and the white English woman’s jealousy. Hence, Lilia is more open minded and rational than Antoinette, despite her passionate relation to Gino. Antoinette, on the other hand, cannot escape her empirical reality of being the daughter of slaveowners. Forster’s humanistic ideal to connect appears in Lilia’s attempts to seek for individual freedom with Gino. It is worth mentioning that the time span between the publication of the two novels delineates how language becomes vulgar for the vulnerable ones. Forster’s liberal humanism connects his characters in a humorous tone in *WAF*. Rhys’s bitter tone in *WSS* points to dehumanisation of Antoinette through ex-slaves and English ladies’ meaningless signification system. Lilia’s cultural background in Sawston encourages her to seek individual rights in distant lands. Gino’s reference to Dante puts forth his strong adherence to Italian national identity, and his politeness towards Philip delineates his willingness for social integration. On the contrary, Antoinette lacks art and literature to refer to, and this leads to her husband’s reductive marginalization on her. He renames her as Bertha after English grand narrative, *Jane Eyre*, which is another act of “epistemic violence”. The arranged intermarriage triggers the hatred of the nameless character towards both his family and Antoinette. Without cultural integration, it seems almost impossible to integrate socially, considering Anette, Antoinette, and Lilia’s intermarriages in the two novels. As a result, multiculturalism is metaphorically dead because the characters in the novels, stick to their former lifestyles. They mostly act counter to the other’s values, instead of learning from one another respectfully. The two novels’ cross binaries such as good/bad servant, rational/irrational, bourgeois/working class, wo/man create only one-dimensional caricatures foregrounding material reality and they also veil psychic, social, and empirical realities. These polar opposites create an impasse for cultural learning from others because they prevent polysemic thought which might also be achieved through art and literature.

### Funding Statement

The author received no specific funding for this work.

## References

- Abel, Sarah, George Tyson, Gisli Pálsson. (2019) "From Enslavement to Emancipation: Naming Practices in the Danish West Indies". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*; 61(2): 332-365. <<http://www.cambridge.org/core>>. doi:10.1017/S0010417519000070.
- Adebanwi, Wale. (2019) "Contesting Multiculturalism: Federalism and Unitarism in Late Colonial Nigeria": *Multiculturalism in the British Commonwealth: Comparative Perspectives on Theory and Practice* Eds: Richard T. Ashcroft and Mark Bevir University of California <http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctvr7fcvv.12.31>. May 2020.
- Acculturation. <https://www.wikipedia.org/acculturation.30.06.2020>.
- Ashcroft, Richard T. and Mark Bevir. (2019) "What is Postwar Multiculturalism in Theory and Practice?" *Multiculturalism in the British Commonwealth*. University of California Press. <<http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctvr7fcvv.4>>. 31 May 2020.
- Ashcroft, Richard T. and Mark Bevir. (2019) "Comparative Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Multiculturalism". *Multiculturalism in the British Commonwealth*. University of California Press. <<http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctvr7fcvv.4>>. 31 May 2020.
- Burney, Shehla. (2012) *Pedagogy of the Other*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Forster, E. M. (2007) *Where Angels Fear to Tread*. London: Penguin Books.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (1997) "Language as Determination of the Hermeneutic Object". *Twentieth Century Literary Theory*. Ed. K.M. Newton. Second Ed. New York: MacMillan Education.
- Galileo, Galilei. (2009) *Dante'nin Cehennem Üzerine Dersler*. Trans. Murat Sirkecioğlu. İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat.
- Gilchrist, Jennifer. (fall 2012) "Women, Slavery, and the Problem of Freedom in *Wide Sargasso Sea*": *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 462-494. Duke UP <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24246943> Accessed: 31-05-2020 06:24 UTC. 31 May 2020.
- Gozdecka, Dorota, Selen A. Ercan, Magdalena Kmak. (2014) "From Multiculturalism to Post-Multiculturalism. Trends and Paradoxes" *Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 50(1) 51 –64. [sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav](http://sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav) DOI: 10.1177/1440783314522191 [jos.sagepub.com](http://jos.sagepub.com).
- Henderson, Katherine C. (2015) "Claims of Heritage: Restoring the English Country House in *Wide Sargasso Sea*" *Journal of Modern Literature*, Vol. 38, No. 4, Spaces and Places. Summer, pp.93-109. Indiana UP. <https://www.jstor/stable/10.2979/jmodelite.38.4.93>.
- Jaising, Shakti. (2010) "Who is Christophine? The Good Black Servant and the Contradictions of Racial Liberalism." *Modern Fiction Studies*, Vol. 56, No. 4, Postcolonial Literature, Twenty-Five Years Later (Winter), pp. 815-836. The Johns Hopkins University Press Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26286958> 31-05-2020.
- Jamoussi, Zouheir. (2011) *Primogeniture and Entail in England: A Survey of Their History and Representation in Literature*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- Joannou, Maroula. (2015) "'From Black to Red': Jean Rhys's Use of Dress in *Wide Sargasso Sea*". *Jean Rhys: Twenty-First-Century Approaches*. Eds. Erica L. Johnson and Patricia Moran. Edinburgh UP <http://www.jstor.com/stable/10.3366/j.ctt16r0hd3.12/> 31-05-2020.
- Karademir, Aret. (2018) *Queering Multiculturalism: Liberal Theory, Ethnic Pluralism, and the Problem of Minorities within Minorities*. London: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group. EBSCO Publishing: eBook Collection 5/31/2020.

- Khoo, Siew-Ean. (2011) "Intermarriage, Integration and Multiculturalism": A Demographic Perspective": Multiculturalism and Integration : A Harmonious Relationship, edited by James Jupp, and Michael Clyne, ANU Press, ProQuest Ebook Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/metu2-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4612340.1>
- Mardorossian, Carine M. (2015) "Caribbean Formations in the Rhysian Corpus". *Jean Rhys Twenty-First-Century Approaches*. Ed: Erica L. Johnson and Patricia Moran Published by: Edinburgh University Press. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/10.3366/j.ctt16r0hd3.11>
- Meer, Nasar, et al. (2016) "Multiculturalism and Interculturalism" *Debating the Dividing Lines*. Edinburgh University Press. EBSCOhost, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1424250&site=ehost-live](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1424250&site=ehost-live).
- Miller, Christanne. (2016) "The 'New Women' of Modernism". *The Cambridge History of Modernism*. Ed. Vincent Sherry. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. e-book, e-pub.
- Multiculturalism. (2016) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* by The Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information (CSLI), Stanford University Library of Congress Catalog Data: ISSN 1095-5054. <https://plato.stanford.edu/info.html#c> 2016 (Stanford%20Encyclopedia%20of%20Philosophy).html First published Fri Sep 24, 2010; substantive revision Fri Aug 12, 2016. 01.06.2020.
- Neel, Alexandra. (2017) "Qui est là?": Negative Personhood in Jean Rhys's "Wide Sargasso Sea" Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal, Vol. 50, No. 2, FEATURING REBECCA COMAY (June), pp. 171-186 Published by: University of Manitoba Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45158934>. 31-05-2020.
- Nortio, Emma, Miira Niska, Tuuli Anna Renvik, Inga Jasinskaja. (2020) "The nightmare of multiculturalism': Interpreting and deploying anti-immigration rhetoric in social media." DOI: 10.1177/1461444819899624 [journals.sagepub.com/home/nms](http://journals.sagepub.com/home/nms).
- Olson, Jeane. (1988) "The 'Nobel Peasant' in E. M. Forster's Fiction" *Studies in the Novel*, winter 1988, Vol. 20, No. 4, Faulkner Fielding Forster Melville (winter), pp. 389-403 The Johns Hopkins University Press URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/29532599>.
- Padel, Ruth. (2007) "Introduction" to *Where Angels Fear to Tread*. by E. M. Forster. London: Penguin Books.
- Peppis, Paul. (2007) "Forster and England." *The Cambridge Companion to E. M. Forster*. Ed. David Bradshaw. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. e-book.
- Rhys, Jean. (1982) *Wide Sargasso Sea*. London: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Savory, Elaine. (2004) *Jean Rhys*. Cambridge : Cambridge UP.
- Simondon, Gilbert. (1965) "Culture and Technics". *Radical Philosophy*. (Jan./Feb. 2015) Trans. Olivia Lucca Fraser, Giovanni Menegalle.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. (Autumn 1985) "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *Critical Inquiry* 12 <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c>. June 29, 2020.
- Sherry, Vincent. *The Cambridge History of Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2016. e-book
- Su, John J. (2015) "The Empire of Affect: Reading Rhys after Postcolonial Theory". *Twenty First Century Approaches*. Ed. Erica Johnson and Patricia Moran. Edinburg UP. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/10.3366/j.ctt16r0hd3.14/>

- Weinstock, D. (2015) "Liberalism and multiculturalism". In S. Wall (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Liberalism* (Cambridge Companions to Philosophy, pp. 305-328). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139942478.017.
- Womack, Kenneth. (2000) "A Passage to Italy: Narrating the Family in Crisis in E. M. Forster's *Where Angels Fear to Tread*". *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal*, September, Vol. 33, No. 3 pp. 129-144. University of Manitoba Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/44029699>.