

WOMANLY EXPERIENCE IN DIASPORIC SPACES:
BUCHI EMECHETA AND EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ŞERMIN SEZER TORAMAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

FEBRUARY 2022

Approval of the thesis:

**WOMANLY EXPERIENCE IN DIASPORIC SPACES:
BUCHI EMECHETA AND EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR**

submitted by **ŞERMİN SEZER TORAMAN** in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in English Literature, the Graduate School
of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Çiğdem SAĞIN ŞİMŞEK
Head of Department
Department of Foreign Language Education

Prof. Dr. Nurten BİRLİK
Supervisor
Department of Foreign Language Education

Dr. Sevil ONARAN
Co-Supervisor
Department of Foreign Language Education

Examining Committee Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil KORKUT NAYKI (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education

Prof. Dr. Nurten BİRLİK (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĞÇE
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa KIRCA
Çankaya University
Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fırat KARADAŞ
Hatay Mustafa Kemal University
Department of Western Languages and Literature

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Şermin SEZER TORAMAN

Signature:

ABSTRACT

WOMANLY EXPERIENCE IN DIASPORIC SPACES: BUCHI EMECHETA
AND EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR

SEZER TORAMAN, Şermin

Ph.D. Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Sevil Onaran

February 2022, 276 pages

This study discusses the reasons for the migration of women protagonists to another country and their subject formation processes in four novels whose stories take place in the 1960s and 70s in a diasporic context: Buchi Emecheta's *In the Ditch* and *Second-Class Citizen*, and Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Life is a Caravanserai- with two Doors, through one of which I came, and through one of which I left* and *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*. Taking diaspora as the social context, this study deals with the subject formation processes of women protagonists against the backdrop of Rosi Braidotti's understanding of nomadic thinking and subjectivity because it explores a search for subjectivity beyond the experience of migration and diaspora by highlighting the possibility of an alternative space, which Braidotti calls rhizome. Since the protagonists of the novels are women, I claim that feminine writing becomes a substantial part of their subject formation; thus, Helen Cixous's theories on writing the body are

consulted along with Braidotti's theories on subjectivity. The protagonists showcase not only the subversion of prevalent identity markers such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion etc. but also the denial of these categories. They go through similar subject formation processes despite being 'embedded' in totally different traditions, histories and countries. Thus, this study claims that women characters migrate from their home countries to host countries to open up a rhizomatic space where they can get rid of patriarchal restrictions and engage in liberating subject formation processes.

Keywords: Diaspora, nomadic thinking, nomadic becoming, counter-memory, rhizome.

Öz

DİASPORİK ALANLARDA KADIN DENEYİMİ: BUCHI EMECHETA VE
EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR

SEZER TORAMAN, Şermin

Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Sevil Onaran

Şubat 2022, 276 sayfa

Bu çalışma, hikayesi 1960'lar ve 70'lerde diaspora bağlamında geçen, Buchi Emecheta tarafından yazılan *Çukurda* (1972) ve *İkinci Sınıf Vatandaş* (1974) ve Emine Sevgi Özdamar tarafından yazılan *Hayat Bir Kervansaray* (1992) ve *Haliçli Köprü* (1998) adlı dört romanda kadın karakterlerin başka bir ülkeye göç etme nedenlerini ve onların özne oluşum süreçlerini tartışmaktadır. Diasporayı romanların geçtiği sosyal bağlam olarak ele alan bu çalışma, Rosi Braidotti'nin göçebe düşünce ve öznellik anlayışının zemininde kadın kahramanların özne oluşturma süreçlerini incelemektedir. Braidotti'nin kavramlarına başvurulmasının nedeni Braidotti'nin rizom (köksap) kavramının sağladığı alternatif bir mekan olasılığını vurgulaması ve göç ve diaspora deneyiminin ötesinde bir öznellik arayışını incelemeye olanak tanımasıdır. Çalışmada, romanların hem yazarları hem de ana karakterleri kadın olduğu için, kadın yazınının da karakterlerin özne oluşumunun önemli bir parçası haline geldiğini ileri sürüyorum; bu nedenle, Braidotti'nin göçebe öznellik

kavramı ile birlikte Helen Cixous'nun kadın bedeninden ve deneyiminden yazma üstüne düşüncelerine de başvuruyorum. Ana karakterler yalnızca cinsiyet, ırk, etnik köken, din vb. gibi yaygın kimlik belirteçlerinin altüst oluşunu değil, aynı zamanda tamamen farklı gelenekler, tarihler ve ülkelere 'gömülü' olmalarına rağmen, bu iki farklı karakterin benzer özne oluşum süreçlerinden geçişini de, bu kategorilerin inkârı olarak gözler önüne serer. Dolayısıyla bu çalışma, kadın karakterlerin ataerkil kısıtlamalardan kurtulabilecekleri ve sürekli özne oluşturma süreçlerine girebilecekleri 'köksap' bir alan açmak için kendi ülkelerinden göç ettikleri sonucuna varmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Diaspora, göçebe düşünce, göçebe oluş, karşı-bellek, rizom (köksap).

To my mother Şenay and my father Murat

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof.Dr.Nurten Birlik for her constant support, meticulous feedback and patience in reading several drafts of this dissertation. I also owe special thanks to her for her theory and poetry courses, which helped me create a new look at literary texts and life in general. I truly miss our classes, where we had a lot of fruitful discussions. It has been a pleasure to write this dissertation under her guidance. I am also grateful to my co-supervisor Dr. Sevil Onaran, whose insights into German culture and literature helped me develop my discussion of Emine Sevgi Özdamar's novels.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz who has been on the jury for a long time and contributed to my study with her detailed feedback and constant support. Her presence has been reassuring at all times.

I am grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kırca for his constructive feedback and suggestions in our meetings and his supportive attitude. He was always ready to share ideas to improve my research, and his stimulating questions made this study better.

My heartfelt thanks go to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı whose undergraduate literature courses ignited my interest in English literature. I decided to pursue my graduate studies in English Literature after attending her Short Story and Survey of English Literature I & II courses as an undergraduate student. Since then, she has been a role model as a scholar, teacher, and human being in general.

Finally, I am grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hülya Yıldız Bağçe and Assist. Prof. Dr. Fırat Karadaş for their detailed reading of the final manuscript and for their suggestions to improve my study.

An African proverb says: “It takes a village to raise a child.” It also takes a large group of people to survive the dissertation writing process. I feel thankful as I have been surrounded by many great people. We started this journey together with Şule Akdoğan and Tuba Korkmaz. Without their friendship, it would not have been easy to go through the different phases of Ph.D. life. When we were all in Ankara, we almost lived together to support each other intellectually in a friendly atmosphere. Together, we studied for hours and days, chitchatted a lot, danced a lot, and had a lot of fun despite everything. Throughout the years, despite the physical distance, our support for each other has been constant.

Özlem Türe Abacı, Buket Doğan and Reyhan Bal are great friends, who were always willing to share ideas and materials. As they were senior students when I started my graduate studies, I admired their performance in classes, and I cannot deny how their encouragement made me feel more comfortable in class discussions. Your presence is a blessing in my life. Also, I would like to thank Aslı Kutluk for sharing materials and ideas, and more importantly, for sharing the agony of Ph.D. life.

My thanks also go to my former colleagues and life-long friends Emel Yüksel, Sinem Sonsaat, Gülden Taner, Gözde Balıkcı and Şule Okuroğlu Özün.

My dear friend Seda Coşar Çelik has also been extremely supportive in this long process, trying to motivate me to finish writing my dissertation. Now, I know that she is almost as happy as I am. She is the one who made up the adjective ‘Şermineque’ to refer to my personality, and my

friends liked and used this word. I want to thank all my friends who like my Şerminesque ways and who have become my chosen family.

My dearest thanks go to my mother Şenay and my father Murat, who have always supported my studies. I am indebted to them for their unconditional love and support. I would also like to thank my sister Duygu, who was my roomie at the beginning of my Ph.D. studies. Uygur, my nephew, you made my life more bearable with your incredible questions and imaginative ways of creating games. I thank my extended family as well, especially my cousin Derya Akbulut, who not only emotionally supported me but also solved my computer-related problems when I felt totally panicked. Last but not least, my heartfelt thanks go to Hüseyin, who married a dissertation writing woman and who had to watch all these nice TV series and movies alone at night. ☺ His visits to my study with tea, coffee, snacks and fruit, and his efforts to sooth my anxiety and boost my spirits have been invaluable. We have gone through hard times together. Luckily, our love has helped us to survive the challenges life has offered us. Thank you for believing in what I do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
CHAPTERS	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Aim and scope of the study.....	1
1.2 Becoming a transnational writer in a postcolonial context: Buchi Emecheta	12
1.3 A guestworker becoming a transnational writer: Emine Sevgi Özdamar	24
1.4 Research Methodology	32
2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	37
2.1 Transformation of the Concept of Diaspora.....	37
2.2 Transnationalism.....	48
2.3 Translocalism	52
2.4 Nomadic Subjectivity by Rosi Braidotti	58
3 REMEMBERING HOME IN BUCHI EMECHETA'S <i>SECOND-CLASS CITIZEN</i> AND EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR'S <i>LIFE IS A CARAVANSERAI</i> ..	87
3.1 Rewriting Homeland through Feminine Language.....	91
3.1.1 Bodily experience in <i>Second-Class Citizen</i>	94
3.1.2 Feminine language in <i>Life is a Caravanserai</i>	104
3.2 Female Genealogy and Solidarity in Relation to Counter-memory	115
3.2.1 Women's Legacy and the Need for Women's Solidarity in <i>Second-Class Citizen</i>	116

3.2.2 Women's Tradition and Solidarity in <i>Life is a Caravanserai</i>	123
3.3 The Representation of Religion, Tradition and Education (as Counter-memories) in the Reconceptualization of Home	138
3.3.1 <i>Second-Class Citizen</i>	138
3.3.2 <i>Life is a Caravanserai</i>	148
4 BECOMING IN BUCHI EMECHETA'S <i>SECOND-CLASS CITIZEN</i> , IN <i>THE DITCH</i> AND EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR'S <i>THE BRIDGE OF THE GOLDEN HORN</i>	162
4.1 Feeling at Home: Rhizome	164
4.1.1 Remaking Home in <i>Second-Class Citizen</i> and <i>In the Ditch</i>	164
4.1.2 Theatre as a homely space in <i>The Bridge of the Golden Horn</i>	176
4.2 Nomadic thinking and Subjectivity.....	195
4.2.1 Adah's resistance to subordination in <i>Second-Class Citizen</i> and <i>In the Ditch</i>	195
4.2.2 The unnamed protagonist's search for freedom in <i>The Bridge of the Golden Horn</i>	214
5 CONCLUSION.....	236
REFERENCES	242
APPENDICES	
A. CURRICULUM VITAE	254
B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	256
C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU	276

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aim and scope of the study

As migration-forced or voluntary- has been an issue for so long in all geographical regions, subject positions shift endlessly, which has resulted in a proliferation of studies on migration, diaspora, postcolonialism, transnationalism and nomadism. While thinkers and sociologists explore how these social events function in the formation of human subjectivity, the experiences of migrant / diasporic / transnational / nomadic people have entered literature by extending the boundaries of discussions in literary studies. The borders have become loose and tight at the same time, forcing millions to migrate because of colonial history, postcolonial experiences, wars, domestic turmoil in countries, political reasons and inequality in the distribution of the world's sources. This mobility, in different contexts, is perceived either as a threat to or a promise for cultural and economic proliferation in the host countries. This study focuses on the affirmative consequences of diasporic experiences in woman's subject formation as represented in fiction.

Bearing the mobile state of the current world in mind, this study argues that women characters' migration from home to a host country in Buchi Emecheta's *In the Ditch* (1972) and *Second-Class Citizen* (1974), and Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Life is a Caravanserai with two Doors, through one of which I came, and through one of which I left* (*Das Leben ist eine Karawanserei hat zwei Türen aus einer kam ich rein aus der anderen ging ich raus*) (1992) and *The Bridge of the Golden Horn* (*Die Brücke Vom Goldenen Horn*) (1998) is a quest for reconstructing their subjectivity and for emancipation from patriarchal oppression. Despite their different circumstances, Emecheta's and Özdamar's heroines reconfigure their

concept of home in diaspora, which becomes a substantial part of their subject formation process. Therefore, to decipher why they want to leave their countries, I will first focus on the reconceptualization of the protagonists' homelands, then try to show how they liberate themselves from the constraints of the countries they were born into and migrated to, thanks to what is called nomadic thinking and nomadic subjectivity in Rosi Braidotti's theoretical framework.

Belonging to different national and historical backgrounds, the protagonists have similar concerns about the womanhood in a patriarchal society and re-homing themselves in the host country. This re-homing takes place in a rhizomatic space, rather than a territory dominated by hierarchies, in which they discover their potential to reconstruct their subjectivity despite the limitations of the discourses they are embedded in. Thus, these novels combine feminist issues with diasporic experiences and, in the end, become a discussion of women's subjectivity in a diasporic space. This study discusses the women's experiences in diaspora as represented in fiction in relation to their attachment to or detachment from the concept of home. The oppression by the native land's patriarchy is combined with the oppression of being a second-class citizen in a Western patriarchal environment. Therefore, the woman is marginalized twice in a society where the powerful ones have the chance to recreate their hegemony. This common predicament is challenged by the women protagonists as they find a way out of binary oppositions. Indeed, they are 'embedded' in non-Western discourses; that is why, Western tools of explaining human subjectivity fall short of describing their subjectivity. Combining diasporic context with a nomadic subjectivity somehow provides a way out of their impasse. The nomadic people (women or men) can posit a space, enabling them to transform their subjectivity as a result of which dichotomous boundaries are dissolved.

To delineate human subjectivity, Homi Bhabha says that every identity is hybrid, regardless of the migrant experience, interracial marriage or a colonial heritage; consequently, the postcolonial or diasporic experience is not exclusive to those whose country has been once colonized or to the ones who have migrated to another country. The mass migrations that the world faces transform not only the immigrant but also the resident. Thus, the binaries get blurred in Bhabha's sense. While many postcolonial thinkers such as Homi Bhabha, Robert Young, Avtar Brah discuss how the binary opposition between the colonizer / colonized or the immigrant / resident dissolves, some other thinkers such as Deleuze and Guattari totally reject dichotomous thinking. Rather than focusing on the dissolution of binaries they offer a rhizomic model where all subject positions co-exist without a hierarchical relationship. Rosi Braidotti, as a transnational feminist, follows the Deleuze-Guattarian line and offers alternative ways of *becoming* without falling into the traps of binary thinking. While taking diaspora as the social context in which the protagonists live in this study, the subjectivity of women characters is discussed against the background of Braidotti's understanding of nomadic thinking, nomadic subjectivity, counter-memory and rhizome.

Diaspora studies has been an autonomous and vibrant discipline since 1991 when *Diaspora Journal* started to be published, and inevitably entered into a dialogue with literary works as diasporic experience found representation in literature. However, in its early phases, diaspora studies neglected gender differences by disregarding women's experiences. As James Clifford highlights in "Diasporas" by referring to Janet Wolff's evaluation, theoretical discussions about diaspora tend to hide the gendered aspect of diasporic experience so as to be able to normalize the male practice. Wolff believes that in a diasporic environment the experiences of man will likely be prevailing so long as

diasporic experience is viewed in terms of displacement rather than placement, traveling rather than dwelling, and disarticulation rather than re-articulation. Specific diaspora

histories, co-territories, community practices, dominations, and contact relations may then be generalized into gendered postmodern globalisms, abstract nomadologies. (qtd. in "Diasporas" 313)

Wolff's comments raise questions about the women's experience in diaspora as early as 1993. She highlights the importance of rehoming one's self in the host country and the necessity of acknowledging the diverse experiences which different genders go through.

Gloria Anzaldua (1987) and Avtar Brah (1996) also discussed women's diasporic experience by referring to their own lives. Their contribution to the discussion of women's diasporic experience is significant and sometimes consulted in this study. However, the conceptual tools their theories provide are not sufficient to interpret the subjectivity of the protagonists of the novels in question. Anzaldua pinpoints the function of *borderlands* in subject formation and shows how *new Mestiza*¹ is able to deconstruct binaries. Likewise, Brah focuses on cartographies by acknowledging the importance of the transnational experience. Both thinkers draw attention to the boundaries, which need to be surpassed. Acknowledging their contributions, this study consults Braidotti's concepts which suggest a thought free of binary thinking rather than concentrating on how to deconstruct them.

This study combines Rosi Braidotti's nomadic thinking with diaspora theories because the protagonists are situated in diasporic contexts, which needs to be acknowledged, but diaspora theories fail to explain their inter and intrapersonal relationships. That is why, the social dynamics are explored through diasporic consciousness, but woman's subjectivity is explored against the background of Braidotti's nomadic thinking. I suggest that, while demonstrating how the protagonists

¹ In Gloria Anzaldua's words: "the 'new Mestiza' is a kind of border woman who is able to negotiate between different cultures and cross over from one to the other and therefore has a perspective of all those different worlds that someone who is mono-cultural cannot have." (Interview)

reconceptualise the idea of home, a closer look at the employment of language is necessary. At this point, Helen Cixous's theory is consulted as she specifically elucidates the process of feminine writing. Furthermore, I coined the term 'linguistic translocation' by bringing the discussions of diaspora criticism, and Braidotti's and Cixous's views on the use of language together, to clarify the function of transferring the linguistic elements of the native language to the language of the host country in the protagonists' subject formation process.

Buchi Emecheta's and Emine Sevgi Özdamar's heroines are from different nations and histories, but they have similarities in terms of remembering their homelands and exploration of women's subjectivity. The women characters challenge the boundaries of the new language in which they begin to perform their subjectivity in a new diasporic space. The womanly experiences are at the heart of both novelists' works although their heroines have different positions in distinct patriarchal discourses. Buchi Emecheta's protagonist Adah seeks for emancipation from the norms of the society and her overpowering husband; Emine Sevgi Özdamar's unnamed protagonist discovers her femininity in a politically charged atmosphere, which is also patriarchal, thus, suffocating for a woman. The common point of the two heroines is the way they create a new home in a foreign country while remaining connected with the native land and treating the host country as a psychic space where they can explore their womanhood. This dissertation attempts to demonstrate the coming together of womanhood with diasporic experiences, which results in a performative and fluid subjectivity.

The analysis of Emecheta's and Özdamar's novels are important so as to raise questions about the situation of women in a diasporic context since both protagonists in the chosen novels have gone through the migration process and made a home out of what they have collected in their (counter) memories about their homelands, and what they have chosen to adopt and adapt to in the host countries. Focusing on two different

protagonists from different regions will enable this study to find out if there are any similarities or differences in what women with distinct backgrounds experience in a patriarchal society in the course of migration. These women are almost of the same age, and their stories take place in the 1960s and 70s, which means that they write with an awareness of similar socio-political contexts. The two novelists' works carry some similarities such as using and abusing the linguistic elements, English in Buchi Emecheta's case and German in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's case. They modify the language of the host country with motifs from their native homelands, with direct translations of idiomatic expressions into the second language, thus, carrying their native experience into a culture which is alien to their own. In this study I call this process *linguistic translocation*. Looking at the genealogy of diaspora criticism and how it breeds concepts provided the inspiration to coin this term to explain the women's experience in the novels.

Emecheta's and Özdamar's novels have been discussed in relation to gender, migration, diaspora, race, ethnicity, feminism, etc. However, most of the analyses remain within the boundaries of binary thinking by undermining the novels' potential to lend themselves to more positive meaning-making processes. I will first focus on Emecheta's critical perception and continue with Özdamar's to mark what this study shares with similar academic endeavours, what it suggests to add up to the reception of these novels, and how I depart from the previous studies on these novels.

Buchi Emecheta's *Second-Class Citizen* and *In The Ditch* are generally discussed within the scope of postcolonial literature (McLeod 2004, Uraizee 2000), black women's writing (Weedon 2008) and the experience of motherhood (Raghav 2008). The analysis of her work is confined within the limits of African writing, Black feminist writing and postcolonial writing. Several literary critics such as Bala (2004), Weedon (2008), Raghav (2008) have interpreted Emecheta's work by highlighting its

aspects as bildungsroman and the possibilities to transform one's identity and /or subjectivity by referring to the novels' autobiographical aspects. This stands in contradiction to this research as they follow a dualistic approach in dealing with identity formation. Still, their ideas are quoted when relevant. For example, Sasi Bala's stress on how Emecheta shares her sympathies with all the women regardless of their identity markers through Adah's struggle to gain her individuality has common points with this study, but Bala's emphasis on the authorial intervention and autobiographical elements is out of context as this dissertation offers a textual hermeneutics. Chris Weedon also draws attention to the extension of identity markers in the novels against the background of Stuart Hall's theories, but her perspective is built around binary thinking in line with Hall's own stance, and her article "Migration, Identity, and Belonging in British Black and South Asian Women's Writing" also deals with autobiographical aspects of the novels in question. The autobiographical nature of Emecheta's novels are emphasized by many critics and scholars, but the liberating feature of her narrative is overlooked. Christine W. Sizemore (1995) in "The London Novels of Buchi Emecheta" has common claims with this dissertation: "Emecheta's London novels chart the progression of her Nigerian-British and Caribbean-British heroines in opening up a space for themselves and establishing a place for themselves" (368). She also touches upon the feminist aspects of Emecheta's writing. The point my work departs from hers is that she refers to biographical elements in analysing the engagement of the characters with London as a physical territory.

Another influential study on Emecheta is Katherine Fishburn's (1995) *Reading Buchi Emecheta*, which points to the traps the Western readers fall into by neglecting Nigerian values and looking at the novel from a universal perspective. Although I agree with her on the importance of acknowledging the situatedness of Nigerian characters, I disagree with Fishburn as she thinks that Emecheta's "novels are a reaffirmation of her received African concepts of community" (56). I believe that female

subjectivity finds a way to relieve itself from the constraints of the discourses in which the female characters are embedded. Thus, I refer to Braidotti to give an ear to the 'embodied' experiences of 'embedded' subjects. Still, Fishburn's comments on religion and the function of education in Nigerian perspective are in line with the claims of this study. Additionally, John McLeod in *Postcolonial London* concentrates on the division because of race and ethnicity, and in opposition to this study, he sees chaos rather than harmony in the novels.

Unlike the previous studies, this dissertation reveals the affirmative tone of the novels in subject formation process. Also, the previous studies elucidate only one or at most two aspects of the novels such as gender and postcolonialism. This kind of a limiting attitude falls short of explaining the multi-layered and hopeful nature of the novels. Reading Emecheta's novels as the story of a victimized black, migrant woman in England would not do justice to the affirmative processes of empowerment that Adah goes through. Adah skilfully creates her own alternatives to keep her life going while also trying to protect her personal dignity. Also, the novels display a polysemic narrative with their use of language but they have never been analysed by referring to Braidotti's and Cixous's theories. Thus, this study aims to respond to these gaps in Emecheta scholarship.

Özdamar's works have been explored from many vantage points such as sexuality (Mani 2001), (Weber (2010), (Chronister (2011), migration (Schade 2007), (Gezen 2012), home (Schade 2007), theatre (Galloway 2010) employment of language (Ghaussey 1999, 2001) and transnationalism (Johnson 2001), (Gezen 2012). This study departs from the earlier discussions in that it looks at the connection between the above-mentioned aspects by discussing the mechanisms of subject formation in the process of remembering the homeland and creating a sense of home in the host country within the framework of Rosi Braidotti's ideas. It also consults diaspora criticism to explain the social

context the protagonists are situated in. Moreover, by analysing both Özdamar's and Emecheta's novels, it brings together the works from different geographies of the world, which enforces this study's attempt to reveal universal aspects of transnational feminism. In fact, Stephanie Bird, Azade Seyhan, Kader Konuk and Monika Shafi designate Özdamar as a transnational writer, but this dissertation is interested in the protagonist's transnational experiences, not the writer's. Thus, it differentiates between the autobiographical and the textual.

My dissertation shares common points with Silke Schade (2007) who explores the function of theatre and has insightful comments on the corporeal language created by the effect of theatre, but her claims revolve around a binary thinking as she suggests, "Özdamar provides an alternative East-West narrative, a different perspective on the Cold War. While experiencing the '68 generation of student and community life in *[sic.]* West, she also plants roots in the East German Theater scene" (129). My work departs from Schade's in its attempt to bring all these elements onto a rhizomatic plane where theatre serves as the widest ground for nomadic subjectivity. To tackle the issues of space and place, she refers to Edward Soja, but my focus is specifically on how the protagonist appropriates the place and creates a sense of home through theatre. Her homing process is a result of her nomadic subjectivity.

This study is basically in agreement with Sohelia Ghaussy's work, which deals with nomadic consciousness in detail in *Caravanserai*. The fact that she consults *écriture féminine* to highlight the importance of nomadic language also finds voice in this study. My emphasis is specifically on how this language serves as an element of counter-memory, and this remembering creates the need to leave home to attain nomadic subjectivity. However, Ghaussy makes references to Özdamar's biography claiming that "Özdamar ties her personal history to Turkish history more generally, echoing the feminist credo of personal is the political" (151). Being aware of the fact that the novel is semi-autobiographical, I follow a different path

taking also Özdamar's own statement into consideration: "I'm not this girl" (*Chronicles*). I focus on the formation process of the protagonist without an intent to link the character's experiences to Özdamar's. I intend to decipher the subject formation of the protagonist by trying to find the traces of multiple meanings this writerly² text generates.

Consequently, the previous studies fall short of presenting the novels' embracing attitude to all identity markers suggesting a coexistence of them and denying binary thinking where one of the identity markers overweighs the other. The most distinct point of this study is the connection established between Emecheta's and Özdamar's works in terms of subjectivity formation following Rosi Braidotti's theoretical universe with its emphasis on nomadic thinking and subjectivity. Unlike, most of the previous criticism on the novels, this study, with the awareness of the way irony is employed in all the novels, emphasizes that there is a distance between the writers and the protagonists, which prevents easy identification between the biographical information and the character. Irony also disrupts the absolute power of established institutions by providing polyphony in the novels. Thus, instead of binary thinking, the embracing nature of Braidotti's concept of subjectivity can explain the processes that the protagonists go through. Besides, discussing their works from the angle of nomadic thinking presents a new hermeneutics as the protagonists of both Emecheta's and Özdamar's novels are from non-Western cultures, and they bring their own process of *becoming* in the new locations and traditions objectifying what Western thought names nomadic philosophy.

This study does not attempt to reduce the migrant women's experience to a discursive discussion, but tries to offer an affirmative approach to women's capacity to engage in alternative ways of becoming through

² Roland Barthes defines the goal of writerly text in *S/Z*: "to make the reader no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text" (4).

fictive characters. The protagonist of Emecheta's novels finds writing as her outlet, and for Özdamar's protagonist this liberating outlet is the theatre. Besides, it does not have the intention to undermine or overgeneralize migrant women's experience, but attempts to start a discussion about the possibilities of women's *becoming* against the oppressive political forces regardless of the countries they were born in and migrated to. It serves as an attempt to bring the philosophical questions on female subjectivity together with literary discussion. However, it should be kept in mind that the protagonists of the novels are not forced to migrate; theirs is a voluntary migration in search of more flexible ways of living. This study moves from the theme of migration to the quest for subject formation, and focuses on its possibility in another place rather than 'home.' The characters follow their own will to re-make their subjectivities in the course of homing in another cultural space. Bringing these concerns into a rhizomic relationship, this study explores the transitional aspects of the novels through a Braidottian approach, which provides conceptual tools to explore the transformation the protagonists go through thanks to its interest in experimentation, appreciation of fluidity and a distaste of confining conventionality. Thus, despite belonging to different cultures, there is parallelism between the way the protagonists live and think, and their state of mind objectifies Braidottian nomadic thinking with its affirmative capacity.

As a result, this dissertation intends to contribute particularly to the recent diasporic literature studies by presenting two writers' works to set another case of discussion on nomadic experience and its reflections in fiction. Rosi Braidotti's concepts of nomadic thinking and subjectivity, counter-memory and rhizome will complicate the discussions on diasporic literature, and relate the nomadic experience to literature.

Before moving on to presenting my research methodology, I will first give brief information about the context in which Emecheta and Özdamar have become writers.

1.2 Becoming a transnational writer in a postcolonial context: Buchi Emecheta

Buchi Emecheta was born in Lagos, Nigeria -a colony of British Commonwealth then- in 1944. Her parents belonged to the Igbo (Ibo) Tribe and her writing proves that she has always been emotionally tied to her native land and language. Being born in a colonized country, Emecheta was educated by the missionaries; however, gaining the right to education was not easy for her. Her struggle with inequality between genders began at an early age when she was not sent to school unlike her younger brother. With her strong will and determination, she persuaded her parents about being sent to school. Unfortunately, after the early death of her father, her mother was inherited by her uncle (following an African tradition), and Emecheta was sent to live with her mother's cousin, where she was treated almost as a servant. Winning a four-year scholarship at the Methodist Girls' School enabled her to continue her education. When school was over, she needed a home and agreed to marry Sylvester Onwordi, who then seemed to be an ambitious young man. Emecheta wanted to live in England and her husband was the first one to arrive in London to study accounting, while Emecheta was working at the American Embassy in Lagos saving money to go to England. The happy days of their marriage ended in England, and she decided to leave Onwordi when he burnt Emecheta's first novel *Bride Price* claiming that it would make his family ashamed. With her five children Emecheta managed to study sociology at London University and became a prolific writer.

Emecheta has written many novels with international reputation: *In the Ditch* (1972), *Second-Class Citizen* (1974), *The Bride Price* (1976), *The Slave Girl* (1977), *The Moonlight Bride* (1976), *The Joys of Motherhood* (1979), *Our Own Freedom* (1981), *Destination Biafra* (1982), *Naira Power* (1982), *The Rape of Shavi* (1984), *Double Yoke* (1983), *A Kind of Marriage* (1986), *Gwendolen* (1989), *Kehinde* (1994), *The New Tribe* (1999). She wrote her autobiography *Head Above Water* in 1986. For children and

youth, she wrote *Titch the Cat* (1979), *Nowhere to Play* (1980) and *The Wrestling Match* (1980). For BBC, she composed two plays: *A kind of Marriage* and *Family Bargain* in 1976.

In this long list of her works, Emecheta touched upon many different issues like the quest for equality and female dignity in *Second-Class Citizen* and *In the Ditch*, diasporic experience in England in *Gwendolen*, *Kehinde* and *The New Tribe*, enslavement of women in patriarchal societies in *The Slave Girl* and *The Joys of Motherhood*, identity in *New Tribe*, Nigerian Civil War in *Destination Biafra*. She problematizes fixed identities and offers fluid ways of subjectivity in her novels. Her use of a wide range of topics and refusal to hierarchize different cultures, histories or ways of living make it difficult to categorise her as a writer. While she dominantly writes in the realist mode, *The Rape of Shavi* focuses on an imaginary community in an unrealistic setting. The issues Emecheta writes about and the way she writes make her literature appealing to a wide range of readers.

Buchi Emecheta's writing is important in British literature as she is the first black woman writer³ gaining literary reputation and critical attention, and her writing sheds light on Nigerian traditions, colonial and post-colonial Nigeria, diasporic experience of Nigerians in England and the transnational experience between the two countries. Emecheta's African ancestry provides her with a different way of thinking, living and writing from that of the Westerners. That is why, contextualizing her work in Nigerian tradition and history is important to appreciate her position in British and world literatures. Obviously, Buchi Emecheta is considered as a British writer because of the colonial history of Nigeria. However, the traditions of pre-colonial Nigeria did not suddenly disappear in the colonization period, and traces of the pre-colonial period are also

³ In fact, Bessie Head and Flora Nwapa are also well-known Black women writers, whose works are acknowledged by Emecheta as she is influenced by their success. However, Emecheta's fame surpasses theirs.

dominant in Buchi Emecheta's work. Nigeria's political history can be divided to three periods: the pre-colonial politics, colonial politics and post-colonial⁴ politics. The different dynamics of three periods in Nigerian history shape Emecheta's writing. She was born in the colonial period and experienced post-colonial period, but this does not mean that she does not have access to the rich culture of pre-colonial Nigerian clans / tribes / societies; she inherits the pre-colonial aspects of Nigeria from her family.

In the pre-colonial period what is called Nigeria today did not exist as it was founded by the British colonial administration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Lots of ethnic groups lived there; various societies, states and even empires rose and fell, and none of them were directly related to the present Nigerian state (Falola & Heaton 17). "[T]he North Eastern kingdom of Borno, the Hausa kingdoms of Kano, Katsina, Zaria and Gobir in Northern-Central Nigeria; the Yoruba kingdoms of Oyo, Ife, Ijebu in South-Western Nigeria; Kingdoms of Benin and the Igbo communities of Eastern Nigeria" were some of them (Sklar qtd. in Olatunde 17). Accordingly, in contemporary Nigeria, there are "indigenous languages, historical memories, traditional lifestyles, and social frameworks with roots reaching into the distant past" (Falola & Heaton 17). The societies already existing before the establishment of Nigeria had distinctive and diverse qualities, but through the networks of trade and other forms of interaction across the Sahara, these kingdoms were somehow related (Olatunde 17). Thus, this inevitable interaction is transferred to what is called Nigeria today, and the memory of the pre-colonial period was inevitably carried to the colonial era of Nigeria. This multiplicity survives in oral traditions⁵ of Nigeria, and it appears in Emecheta's writing, too. Before learning English, Emecheta spoke three

⁴ 'post-colonial' is hyphenated because it refers to the time after colonization.

⁵ The traces of oral tradition in Emecheta's writing will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

African languages: Igbo, Yoruba and Agayin, whose characteristics are reflected in her novels.

In contrast to what overlooking western eyes might believe, Nigerian culture in pre-colonial times had many different ways to empower women and to protect their solidarity. For example, in *Second-Class Citizen*, against the cruelty of her husband, the protagonist Adah yearns for the solidarity of women whose traditions go back to the pre-colonial times. When in trouble with her husband in England, Adah states that he would not dare to be such an irresponsible or cruel husband in Nigeria as older women would punish him. In Nigeria, if a woman had complaints about her husband, she brought the issue to *mikiri* (women's meeting generally gathered through trade unions). When the group agreed that the husband should be punished, they went on strike together. For example, the wife would not cook until her husband came to his senses, and the other women would join that strike too so that the punished man would not go and eat with his brothers (Van Allen 170-171). In the Western world, such punishments are not relevant, but colonialism could not totally erase the memory of ways of living in Nigeria. Unfortunately, in England Adah lacks this protecting community.

Emecheta's Adah is a rebellious and strong-willed young woman despite the patriarchal oppression she goes through in both Nigeria and England. Her resistance against limitations of the society has its resonances in Nigerian women's struggle to keep their rights and interests in the early years of colonization. Women have always contributed to the development of Nigeria starting with the pre-colonial times. Their role has not been sufficiently acknowledged, but several studies and oral accounts tell that social, economic and political contribution of women have been at the heart of Nigeria's progress. In precolonial Nigeria, the economy was just good enough to meet survival needs, and women were active participants of this economy, which was mainly based on agriculture. Together with men, women worked on the farms. They also joined in the production of

palm oil and palm kernel. Local and long-distance trade which involved the purchase and sale of food and related products was among their economic activities. In different parts of Nigeria, women had different skills of processing food such as fish drying or salt production. Pottery making and weaving were among their resources of sustenance for their household. (Attoe)

The dual-sex rule was dominant before colonialism, and accordingly there was a division of labour between the two sexes, which complemented each other in a harmonious political structure. They were the decision makers of the issues concerning their province. Women were the leaders of women organizations through which they became politically influential. In different societies, there were different criteria to elect the women leaders. Some of them foregrounded the ability and character, and some others prioritized royal descent. Despite the differences in electoral criteria, women had a say in Igbo societies (Chuku 19). Men also abode by women's rules, and if there were young men violating the rules, the women either forced older men to police the younger ones, or they punished the offenders themselves by either going on a strike or practising "sitting on a man"⁶ ritual. Women did not use to lead the clans, but they were the advisers and always active in the group. They earned money and decided what it should be spent on.

⁶ Judith Van Allen explains how this ritual works in her article " 'Sitting on a Man': Colonialism and the Lost Political Institutions of Igbo Women":

"Sitting on a man" or a woman, boycotts and strikes were the women's main weapons. To "sit on" or "make war on" a man involved gathering at his compound, sometimes late at night, dancing, singing scurrilous songs which detailed the women's grievances against him and often called his manhood into question, banging on his hut with the pestles women used for pounding yams, and perhaps demolishing his hut or plastering it with mud and roughing him up a bit. A man might be sanctioned in this way for mistreating his wife, for violating the women's market rules, or for letting his cows eat the women's crops. The women would stay at his hut throughout the day, and late into the night, if necessary, until he repented and promised to mend his ways. Although this could hardly have been a pleasant experience for the offending man, it was considered legitimate and no man would consider intervening. (170)

With the interference of the colonial power, which had a claim on 'emancipating' African women, their position in the society deteriorated. Judith Van Allen puts forward that

[i]n the conventional wisdom, Western influence has 'emancipated' African women - through the weakening of kinship bonds and the provision of 'free choice' Christian monogamous marriage, the suppression of 'barbarous' practices, the opening of schools, the introduction of modern medicine and hygiene, and, sometimes, of female suffrage. (165)

However, what British thought would bring freedom and power to Nigerian women destroyed their existing autonomy in the traditional society. Their authority stemmed from solidarity among women, which they attained through "their market networks, their kinship groups, and their right to use strikes, boycotts and force to effect their decisions." Their voice was annulled in administration by the indirect rule⁷ of the colonial period. Women's institutions were not taken into consideration in the governmental issues. The British were trying to establish 'modern' institutions, but they did not attempt to guarantee women's participation in the process. There were instances, for example, when a woman's traditional right to reject a suitor was violated by the warrant chiefs who were not respected by their people.

It should also be kept in mind that cultural diversity in precolonial Nigeria granted women different positions as the situation of women changed from one place / group / tribe / kingdom to another. The dynamics of gender relationship took its shape according to religion, tradition and the economic situation. As Carolyne Dennis articulates:

The majority of women within all societies spent their lives within the household, but such households depended on a range of economic activities with variations in the sexual

⁷ The colonial administration in Nigeria appointed warrant chiefs instead of traditional leaders. Thus, dual-sex system was annulled.

division of labour and also in the division of labour within those economic activities reserved to women. (14)

Patrilineal and patriarchal kinship structures were central to almost all Nigerian societies which made it of utmost importance to bear sons to guarantee the prospect of the group. A young wife's position grew for the better when she gained the approval of the older members, produced children and became older; then, she won the privilege of being assisted by younger wives, which gave her the chance to take part in activities outside home. (It should be noted that as Buchi Emecheta herself stated in her speech "Feminism with a small 'f'," for most Nigerian women polygamy is not humiliating or oppressive, but comforting as women share responsibilities at home, which gives them more space and time to spare for themselves, socialize and work outside home.) In numerous societies like the one in Igboland, the participation of women in agriculture was very important. In Hausa society, Islam kept women in the household. Only the poor men's wives looked for other sources of labour. In contrast, the women in Yoruba society had the chance to find a job in manufacturing and trade. Thus, this variety resists a totalized explanation about the position of women.

The British were trying to change the dynamics of society, but the Nigerian women like Emecheta's characters had a long history of authority in governance, and they used to obtain what they desired through riots and strikes. The offense the British rule created got worse when they started to tax Nigerian people after a census conducted in 1926. The census provided information to detect the eligible ones for taxation. In south-eastern Nigeria only men were taxed; however, they were not able to pay these taxes on their own, and their wives, who were getting angry with the colonial rule, had to help their husbands pay the taxes with their own incomes. In 1928, an assistant district officer in Owerri Province told the local warrant chiefs to conduct another census. Women thought that after the census they would also be taxed. Already troubled by the taxes their husbands had to pay, the south-eastern

Nigerian women were outraged by the idea of being taxed as well (Falola & Heathen 133).

Okugoi, the agent of the Oloko Warrant Chief, asked Nwanyeruwa, a married woman, to count her animals on November 23, 1929. She angrily responded to the officer asking whether his mother was counted. They ended up “seizing each other by the throat,” and Nwanyeruwa informed what happened to Oloko women, which made women believe they were going to be taxed. Women sent messengers to neighbouring areas. They were using palm leaves to call each other for a war. All over Owerri Province, women flooded to Oloko. They gathered in huge numbers in front of the district office, and managed to receive a written document stating that they would not be taxed. Okugo, the warrant chief, assaulted women in this process, and with a further revolt, women convinced the colonial administration that he was guilty and he was sentenced to imprisonment for two years (Allen 173).

This event is fictionalised in Emecheta’s novels such as *The Slave Girl* and *Destination Biafra*. In *Destination Biafra*, this female legacy is commemorated in the chapter titled “Women’s War” (Peter 145). The British called the women’s action in 1929 ‘Aba Riots,’ however, Nigerian women called it ‘Women’s War’ as they were organized and consciously fought for their rights. Calling it a riot, as if it were the sudden outrage of Nigerian women, undermines the determined structure of their fight. After years of being silenced by the colonial oppression, women made an attempt to regain their rightful traditional position in governmental issues (Allen 173).

Solidarity of women in Nigeria was sadly missed by Buchi Emecheta’s heroine Adah when she lived in Britain. However, as she lacked the comfort of a supporting family unlike many others in Nigeria, she always thought that education is what would make her strong in life. The kind of education empowering women was possible only as a result of colonialism

and the laws that passed during the decolonization period. Going to the Methodist Girls' School, a colonial institution, prepares Adah to go to college in England. Colonization in Nigeria ended in 1960, and it became a republic in 1963. With this change women wanted to engage in politics but they had limited education as colonial missionaries only educated women to be beneficial housewives. Buchi Emecheta was among the lucky ones who were able to go the Methodist Girls' School, which later enabled her to benefit from the law giving the students of former commonwealth countries the right to study in the UK. This post-colonial period witnessed the emergence of several strong woman activists like Margaret Ekpo. Following their traditional inheritance women fought and still keep on fighting for equality and freedom.

Emecheta's literary works reflect three periods of Nigeria. The colonial rule in Nigeria plays a significant role in making Emecheta a world-famous writer as it provides her with the English language in which she writes her novels. The colonial education she is exposed to also plays a role in her becoming a writer, as English is the medium to make her voice her word. She learns Western ways of expressing herself thanks to the Methodist Girls' School. What makes her writing unique is the way she amalgamates different histories and social frames she has gone through.

Emecheta never favours one culture over another, but presents them as they are, with their weaknesses and strengths. In her autobiography *Head Above Water*, Emecheta explains how she makes use of amendments that colonialism brought to her life:

All I ever wanted was to tell my stories from my own home, just like my big mother Nwakwaluzo used to tell her stories in her very own compound ... The only difference was that instead of using the moonlight and her own emotional language as her tools, I have to use electricity, a typewriter and a language that belonged to those who once colonized the country of my birth. But I am happy I mastered the language ... for if not I would have been telling my stories

only to those women and children in Umuzeololo, Ibusa.
(242)

Obviously, Emecheta uses the language of the colonizer, but she *igboizes*⁸ English language and novel as a Western genre by using what she calls her 'emotional language.' Despite the choice of a non-Igbo language, she portrays Igbo life in her works. Susan Arndt believes that Emecheta's *igboization* of English bridges up the gap between "the literary medium (language and genre) and the subject (the world of the Igbo)" (28). Apparently, the colonial education provided Emecheta with the necessary intellectual tools to become a writer. In addition, the comprehensive reading of the Bible at the Methodist Girls' School taught Emecheta to tell stories in a smooth way. In an interview with Davidson and Marie Umeh, she declares: "The Bible influenced all my work. I like its simplicity. I always go back to the Bible, King James edition" (qtd. in Umeh "Introduction" xxx). In *Second-Class Citizen* Adah states how she can find all the answers to solve her problems in the Bible. Thus, when she is stripped of the discourse she is born into, she consults the Bible to find the support she needs. Clearly, Emecheta creates a character who is competent in reconciling her cultural inheritance with her Western education.

However, the advantages of the colonial rule do not solve one of Adah's biggest problems, shared by many other women characters: having an egalitarian life. In fact, as stated above, when Nigeria was colonized, women's lives became harder as they lost some privileges they once had. As Ketu H. Katrak puts it, in pre-colonial times women were not only mothers and wives, but they also took part in economic, social and political life. The colonial period introduced Victorian morals to the society and domesticized women by stripping them of their rights to earn

⁸ Susan Arndt explains it in a footnote in her article "Buchi Emecheta and the Tradition of Ifo:" she "use[s] *igboizing* of contemporary literature by analogy with Chinweizu, Madubuike and Jemie, who said that African literature has to be Africanized to be decolonized" (51).

money despite the fact that they were well-educated, and the nation had claims about modernization (160). In Emecheta's novels, there are rebellious female characters, which makes critics believe that they carry the soul of their Nigerian female ancestors who fought at the Women's War of 1929. Like her ancestors, Adah does not accept what is given to her when her rights (especially right to education) are concerned.

Emecheta's work is also important to raise questions about female subjectivity. Her work has been usually explored in terms of African feminism. Although this study offers a reading of female subjectivity by not restricting her experience to racial boundaries, it would be helpful to highlight the black feminist discussions on Emecheta's work. As Shalini Nadaswaran delineates by referring to Ogunyemi and Alice Walker's ideas on womanism⁹, Emecheta's work is a significant inspiration for Nigerian women (146). Alice Walker broadens the limits of feminism and creates a concept giving recognition to black female experience. Walker defines the concept of womanism in her *In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens* as follows:

From womanish. (Opp. of "girlish," i.e. frivolous, irresponsible, not serious.) A black feminist or feminist of color. From the black folk expression of mothers to female children, "you acting womanish," i.e., like a woman. Usually referring to outrageous, audacious, courageous or wilful behavior. Wanting to know more and in greater depth than is considered "good" for one. Interested in grown up doings. Acting grown up. Being grown up. Interchangeable with another black folk expression: "You trying to be grown." Responsible. In charge. Serious. (xi)

Womanism is not against feminism, but it is embedded in feminist discourse with the aim of integrating black female experience to feminist discussions. In Walker's words "Womanist is to feminist as purple is to lavender" (xii). Having a similar stance to Walker, Emecheta does not use white feminist discourses to explain her experience. Considering the fact

⁹ Although Emecheta's work is discussed by referring to Alice Walker by Ogunyemi, Emecheta criticizes Alice Walker for drawing a negative picture of Nigerian society.

that “the personal is the political,” “little happenings in the lives of the African women” matter in feminist discussions. Emecheta does not claim to be a feminist, but her way of engagement in the woman’s issues is unique to her. In her article “Feminism with a small ‘f’”, Emecheta makes her point clear about her take on feminism:

I write about the little happenings of everyday life. Being a woman, and African born, I see things through an African woman's eyes. I chronicle the little happenings in the lives of the African women I know. I did not know that by doing so I was going to be called a feminist. But if I am now a feminist then I am an African feminist with a small f. In my books I write about families because I still believe in families. I write about women who try very hard to hold their family together until it becomes absolutely impossible. I have no sympathy for a woman who deserts her children, neither do I have sympathy for a woman who insists on staying in a marriage with a brute of a man, simply to be respectable. I want very much to further the education of women in Africa, because I know that education really helps the women. It helps them to read and it helps them to rear a generation. It is true that if one educates a woman, one educates a community, whereas if one educates a man, one educates a man. I do occasionally write about wars and the nuclear holocaust but again in such books I turn to write about the life and experiences of women living under such conditions. Maybe all this makes me an ordinary writer. But that is what I want to be an ordinary writer. (qtd. in Peterson 175)

In the quotation above, Emecheta as a novelist philosophizes on her own understanding of feminism, which stems from her personal experience, not from any theoretical discussion. She does not intend to contribute to feminist theory or action, but writes about daily lives of women in different circumstances. Still, discussing the feminist aspects of her novels is not irrelevant as the literary work can function in numerous ways that contradict author’s intention.

I believe that Emecheta’s writing is inspirational for any gender, race or ethnicity studies due to its characters who owe their agency to nomadic subjectivity. Her novels demonstrate that not only the Nigerian society

but also England is patriarchal, though in different ways. In African society, women used to be welcomed to write only children's books. In fact, when the protagonist Adah decides to leave her husband, she also thinks that she can earn her living by writing children's books. Although it looks like an emancipating alternative for Adah, critics like Ogundipe-Leslie believe that the African woman writer is stripped of her real power and forced to represent the nation's morals (qtd. in Busby xvi). Emecheta herself challenges this tradition, and thus, becomes a prolific writer representing different moods, life styles, preferences of women characters.

To sum up, Emecheta is aware of the patriarchal dynamics of her society, but she does not condemn the traditions with a Euro-centric view. In contrast, she enriches her writerly identity with what she inherits from her culture. As Marie Umeh acknowledges: "Emecheta's unique contribution to world letters lies in her commitment to the representation of women's life stories in order to draw attention to the inegalitarian gender and class relations that cut across racial and geographical boundaries" ("Introduction" xxxv). My discussion is in line with Umeh's; it is because of this that I consult Braidotti's nomadic thinking, which allows exploring subjectivity without falling into the trap of limiting identity markers such as race, ethnicity, nation, religion, gender, etc.

1.3 A guestworker becoming a transnational writer: Emine Sevgi Özdamar

Emine Sevgi Özdamar is not only a writer of novels, short stories, plays and non-fiction prose but also an actress and a director. She was born in 1946 in Malatya, Turkey. She has lived in Berlin since 1976, and she produced most of her works in German not in her mother tongue, Turkish. Although she writes in German, her stories stem from her childhood memories in Turkey. During her childhood, she lived in various cities in Turkey, which provided her with the chance to see different ways

of living in various parts of the country enriching her perspective as a writer. Because of her father's financial problems, they had to move from Malatya to Istanbul, and then to Bursa and Ankara. In Bursa City Theatre, she acted in Molière's *The Bourgeois Gentleman* at the age of twelve, and she decided to become an actress. Being acquainted with theatre at such an early age might have played a role in making Özdamar a skilful writer. When she was nineteen, she went to Berlin both to be closer to her brother, who was a student in Switzerland then and to pursue her dreams in theatre. Berlin was recruiting guest workers that year, and Özdamar worked in a factory between 1965 and 1967. In 1967 she turned back to İstanbul with Bertolt Brecht's records and her passion for theatre and music. In Istanbul, she received theatre training until 1970. Her instructors include the masters of Turkish theatre such as Muhsin Ertuğrul, Ayla Algan, Beklan Algan, Melih Cevdet Anday, Nurettin Sevin and Haldun Taner. She acted the part of Charlotte Corday in Peter Weiss's *Marat-Sade*, and Widow Begbick in Brecht's *A Man is a Man*. In 1969-1970, she lived in Üsküdar together with Ece Ayhan- a famous Turkish poet. It is Ece Ayhan who added 'Emine' to Sevgi Özdamar's name, and she did not drop 'Emine' as a memory of Ece Ayhan, an influential figure in her life. Her memories and correspondence with Ece Ayhan are published in a book titled "*Kendi Kendinin Terzisi Bir Kambur*", *Ece Ayhanlı Anılar, 1974 Zürih günlüğü, Ece Ayhan'ın mektupları*¹⁰ (2007) ("*The Hunchback as his Own Tailor*", *Memories of Ece Ayhan, the Zurich Diary of 1974 and Letters from Ece Ayhan*).

Özdamar's creative career is manifold and rich, and her place in German literature reveals the contemporary perception of diaspora literature. Her writing career starts with a remarkable award. Written in German, Özdamar's semi-autobiographical novel *Life is a Caravanserai with two Doors, through one of which I came, and through one of which I left* received the "Ingeborg Bachmann" prize in 1991. This is significant because in

¹⁰ This is the first prose Özdamar wrote in Turkish.

Germany there is the Chamisso prize for the non-German writers who write in German language (Flotow 65), but Özdamar competed with the German writers, which implies that the concept of Germanness is being redefined. Indeed, I believe, rather than becoming a German writer, Özdamar becomes a transnational writer.

In a meeting organized at Boğaziçi University as a part of the events titled *Boğaziçi Chronicles*, Özdamar tells the story of opting for German instead of Turkish to produce her works. She reports that she naturally started writing in German without contemplating on which language to choose (*Chronicles*). She talks about how one can lose his or her own mother tongue in his/her native land. The military government's sovereignty over words shows itself through burning the books, which it considers a threat against its dominance. The newspapers talk about imprisonments, executions, arrests, fights among people from different ideological groups and so on. Özdamar suffered from the oppression of military governance like her friends. People were being punished for what they published, read or articulated, which made Özdamar feel that her words were 'sick' in Turkish. The regime wanted to control everybody's thoughts, which paralysed Özdamar's ability to express her thoughts and feelings in depth. She feels the need to cure her own words. In search of a new language and life, she ended up in Germany. She wanted to heal her 'sick' words, and enliven her memories in a new language.

Through migration, Özdamar wanted to discover a new language to forget the suffering she experienced in her mother tongue. Her move to Germany in 1976 was a journey to a new language, which would free her from the pains and the constraints of her mother tongue. She states that she found the language she was looking for in Germany; however, it was not the German language or culture which hit her heart, but it was the Brechtian language, which offered her a new way of perceiving theatre and life in relation to art work. Thanks to a friend, she got in touch with a Brecht disciple, Benno Besson, who hired her as an assistant director in

Volksbühne in East Berlin. Along with Besson, she had the chance to work with the German director Matthias Langhoff there¹¹.

In an interview, Özdamar repeats her famous saying: “my German words have no childhood,”(T24) and explains how she acquired German words corporeally in theatre. In another interview she states:

You must remember that my first encounter with German was via the theatre. I experienced the language as it were bodily, either by speaking lines myself or hearing them from the bodies of fellow actors. You could almost say that words themselves have bodies. (qtd. in Horrocks and Kolinsky 47)

Thus, Özdamar’s multilingualism is not only about languages, but also about different discourses such as Brechtian theatre and Marxism.

The theatre director Benno Besson is crucially important in Özdamar’s acquisition of discourse. Through theatre she engages in corporeal language, and her literary output becomes the product of the women’s body. The political charge of Brecht’s language also shapes her writerly identity. In this theatrical and politically charged language, she finds the means to understand her inner turmoil and the power to write. Brecht’s language cures the pain she has gone through in her mother tongue. She also learns how to speak French through theatre. Besson tells her that she can move to another language as she is still very young. They go to France together to put *Caucasian Chalk Circle* on stage, and she learns another foreign language via theatre there. Moving to another language also means translocating to another cultural space. The multiple worlds

¹¹ This part of her life would later enter into her novel *Strange Stars Stare at the Earth*, which becomes the third novel of her İstanbul-Berlin trilogy under the title of *Sonne auf halbem Weg*. In 1978 she moved to Paris and Avignon for two years together with Benno Besson to put Brecht’s *Caucasian Chalk Circle* on stage. She made the puppets of the figures in the play using wine bottles. Her collages drew a lot of attention and they were put in Jean Villar museum in Avignon. Thanks to her designs, her puppets and collages, she was given the chance to do a Ph D in Theatre Aesthetics at the University of Paris, Vincennes, although she did not have a bachelor’s diploma.

she is exposed to make her a transnational writer whose works bear the qualities of linguistic translocation.

In addition, all through her life, Özdamar has had friends from leftist circles. Marxist readings and talks she has been exposed to add up to her discourse formation, and she writes with a Marxist awareness. *Schwarzauge in Deutschland* (*Karagöz in Alamania*) is an example of her writing with Marxist nuances. She was inspired by a letter, which was handed to Özdamar by a leftist Turkish worker who was beaten by Turkish fascists. While he was going back to Turkey, he wrote a letter of eight pages which started as: "To my people and to all it may concern" and he quoted Marx and Nazım Hikmet in this letter. Özdamar was inspired by the story, and she talked to the stage manager of the theatre who was already expecting a play from her. Thus, Özdamar wrote *Schwarzauge in Deutschland* – a Dadaist story of an endless journey of a villager and an intellectual donkey who becomes a Marxist in the process. This worker turned back to Turkey before Özdamar had the chance to see him.

Özdamar realized that this man did not condemn Germany, but he was aware that a worker had no homeland; wherever he could find a job was a worker's homeland (Johnson 37). Following the Brechtian school, Özdamar breaks the dramatic illusion, making the audience consider their own experiences of alienation. On the flyer which introduced the play, it wrote: "While watching the play you will ask yourself: What is where? Are we in Turkey, or in Germany? ... You will make an effort to sequentialize the scenes because these scenes do not proceed in a logical order as we are used to" (Johnson 41). Özdamar wrote this play in broken German, deliberately. In 1986, the play was put on stage with its own unique methods, and considered as an innovation due to its technique. Özdamar also directed the play, and *Karagöz in Alamania* was the first play written and directed by a Turk in Germany.

Özdamar's work is different from earlier *Gastarbeiterliteratur* (literature by guest workers) whose themes are "difficulties of displacement, cultural loss and exclusion from the host country that the migrant experience entails" (Flotow 65-6). To illustrate, in *Caravanserai*, the experience of moving between countries and languages / discourses is fictionalized in the unnamed protagonist's story which takes place in Turkey. The seemingly naive but observant child-narrator relates the story of Turkey, where economic and social instability is present at a time of Westernization, namely Americanization. At the end of the novel, the protagonist concludes that immigrating to Germany as a guest worker is the best solution. Luise von Flotow explains the importance of the novel as follows:

Instead of thematizing the difficulties of adaptation to a new and sometimes hostile environment, or exploiting the topos of the abused or confined Turkish woman which has been a staple of cinema and popular writing by certain Turkish authors in Germany, Özdamar focuses on the source culture, and some of its troubles. Her descriptions of daily life in a family of six, constantly on the verge of, or in, bankruptcy and constantly in search of new lives in different parts of the country, provide fascinating and lively insights into another culture, while her unsentimental view of life in Turkey, her powerful and subversive women characters, and her inventive use of language and myth achieves what earlier works by migrants haven't: she avoids a confrontational stance vis-a-vis Germany, as well as clichéd, folklorish elements with regard to Turkey. (66)

Not being confined in 'clichés,' Özdamar becomes a universal writer speaking about the condition of human beings in the modern world.

The publication of *Mutterzunge* (*Mother Tongue*) accelerated Özdamar's career in writing. *Mutterzunge* in English translation was considered among the best books published in the USA in 1994. The story tells a woman's yearning for her lost language. The protagonist wavers among Turkish, her grandfather's language Arabic and her second language German, and her vacillation among languages raises questions about language, origin and identity which form the themes of this study, too.

Being culturally familiar with three different countries (Turkey, Germany and France), Özdamar combines the 'European' and 'Turkish' literary styles and cultural values and practices (Johnson 40). Her style in her short story collection *Mother Tongue* (*Mutterzunge*) (1990) promotes different forms of writing and thematically discusses language and identity. *Grandfather's Tongue* (*Grossvaterzunge*) also deals with language. It is a journey to the fading memories of the grandfather's culture in 1927, the time when Arabic alphabet was replaced with the Latin in the new Republic.

Özdamar wrote her second play in 1991, *Keloglan in Alamania* (*Keloglan in Germany*), which documents the predicament of Keloglan, a young man born in Germany yet holding a Turkish citizenship. He has to find a job or a wife to keep his residence permit in Germany. This is a very innovative play for the way it "emblemizes the mistrust of documentary forms and media" (Sieg 172). In the play, the spectators watch the projection of a documentary film clip in which foreigners protest against being deported, but the intervention of the author's voice over the speaker systems reveals that their efforts fail and this creates a Brechtian alienation effect. Özdamar's play problematizes identity and mimesis, and her work enriches the discussions on transnational and translocal experiences.

In 1991, Özdamar also wrote the first novel of İstanbul-Berlin trilogy *Life is a Caravanserai*. The novel tells the story of a little girl who draws attention to three generations of her family against the background of Turkish history. This novel is followed by its sequel *The Bridge of the Golden Horn* in 1998. The young protagonist engages in the 1968 generation movements in İstanbul, Paris and Berlin. After the publication of these novels, this time, Özdamar won Adalbert von Chamisso Prize in 1999. In 2000, she published her third play *Noah's Ship* and her story collection *The Mirror in the Yard*. The last book of the trilogy *Strange Stars Stare at the Earth* (2003) is the story of a young woman who left her

country, family, ex-husband and went to Berlin to work at the theatres in the 1970s. As the above texts illustrate, she has been a prolific writer by producing literary works in different genres and themes.

Özdamar's novels *Life is a Caravanserai with two Doors, through one of which I came, and through one of which I left* (1991) and *The Bridge of the Golden Horn* (1998) have drawn considerable critical attention. Considering the fact that Özdamar writes in Germany and in German, these stories whose settings are both Germany and Turkey start a discussion on how the concept of home is reconceptualised. One of the striking points of these novels is the juxtaposition of the form 'bildungsroman' with a woman's quest for emancipation from the patriarchal order. These two novels follow the same heroine's story which starts in Turkey in *Caravanserai*. The ending of *Caravanserai* tells that the heroine is on her way to Germany, and *The Bridge of the Golden Horn* vacillates between Germany and Turkey. *Strange Stars* tells the same protagonist's story in Germany, where she is educated by Benno Besson. She lives in East Germany and works in West Germany commuting back and forth every day.

Categorising Özdamar's work is not easy as one of the problems of theoretical discussion in migration and diaspora studies is the negligence of gender experiences in these processes. The migrant women do not form a homogenous group as they belong to different segments of the society. Among the women migrating to Germany, there were single women, married women, educated women, illiterate women, prostitutes, students and so on. This multiplicity is explicit in Özdamar's *Golden Horn*. The West tended to see a stigmatized version of Turkish Muslim women: they were walking behind their husbands; they were locked at home; they were humiliated, and their relation to social life was cut off. The German feminists were anxious about their own position as the immigrant women's presence was a threat to their hard-won status. However, overgeneralizing the position of all Turkish migrant women was not fair

at all. Canan Topçu, a Turkish-German writer, in her article “The Multiple Worlds of Turkish Women” talks about pioneer migrant women. As she states, travelling to Germany was a way of liberation from limiting relationships for woman migrants. They were able to escape undesired weddings and problematic marriages thanks to migration. Surprisingly, as Canan Topçu notes by referring to social scientist Nermin Abadan-Unat, even the women who migrated from rural areas and arrived in Germany without any intellectual readiness and any idea about living in a big city were quite apt in getting used to their new lives in Germany. Their role in the industrial society did not result in disappointment. In fact, there is ample evidence supporting Abadan-Unat’s claim in Özdamar’s novels.

To sum up, Özdamar’s literary works display women characters from different segments of the society engaging in new experiences in a new country. The experience of female characters in her novels *Caravanserai* and *Golden Horn* showcases the richness that the transnational experience brings. As a writer with many literary awards, Özdamar is labelled in different ways, as a Turkish, Turkish-German or German writer. I believe she is a transnational writer whose literary work surpasses the boundaries of any nationality or locality. Özdamar is able to bring different stories, linguistic qualities, histories and traditions of various localities together and creates a unique style of writing.

1.4 Research Methodology

In this dissertation, I build my methodology of discussion of Emecheta’s and Özdamar’s novels mainly on recent theoretical views about diaspora criticism and nomadism specifically with an emphasis on the key concepts of diasporic experience, transnationalism, translocalism, nomadic subjectivity, counter-memory and rhizome. To foreground the aesthetic value of the multi-layered and polyphonic narratives of their works, in addition to diaspora studies, which informs the social context

the protagonists inhabit, I largely consult Braidotti's ideas such as nomadic thinking and subjectivity, counter-memory and rhizome as my conceptual tools. Therefore, the theoretical chapter (Chapter 2) aims to introduce the conceptual framework of this study to highlight the philosophical and aesthetic concerns it deals with.

In Chapter 2, I will first lay bare how the concept of diaspora has evolved from more essentialist perceptions to newer and more flexible concepts such as transnationalism and translocalism and finally nomadism. Then, I will refer to transnational and translocal experiences of the protagonists within a broader framework of Rosi Braidotti's nomadic thinking. Braidotti's theoretical universe provides a helpful conceptual toolkit for this study because of its renunciation of the limitations of binary thinking, its affirmative approach to subject-formation processes and its emphasis on the importance of female genealogy in women's writing and subjectivity. The protagonists, who are from non-western cultures, are not encoded within the Western understanding of dualism - though they also suffer from power relations in their homelands-, and they bring their ways of becoming to the host countries challenging the Western perception of 'Being' which is defined according to identity markers such as race, gender, nation, religion, education and tradition.

The novels of Emecheta and Özdamar will be discussed from different viewpoints in the same chapters, focusing on the similarities in their subject formation processes, regardless of the contexts that different localities create. The third chapter aims to demonstrate the function of remembering home in Emecheta's and Özdamar's protagonists' development. By taking Braidotti's understanding of counter-memory (borrowed from Foucault) and minoritarian memory (borrowed from Deleuze and Guattari), this chapter deciphers the protagonists' motives to move to another country by also underlining the vitality of their memories in their subjectivity. The chapter is divided into three sub-chapters, the first of which is titled "Rewriting homeland through

feminine language.” This section highlights that the protagonists are multilingual and despite the patriarchal characteristics of the languages they speak, they are able to transgress the limits of the patriarchal languages and create a feminine one. The qualities of the “linguistic sites”¹² are combined without a hierarchical relationship forming a unique language taking its agency and power from the women’s bodily experiences.¹³ The corporeality of knowledge and language formation enables the women characters to relate their stories in their own ways. This process witnesses moments of linguistic translocation where the qualities of one language are directly transferred to another by reshaping both of them. The discussion of language, remembering and subject formation also emphasizes the qualities of feminine language, which stands as a common point in both novels.

¹² Braidotti, instead of talking about the mother tongue, refers to linguistic sites. The mother tongue, in her terminology, is the first linguistic site which is the starting point for polyglots.

¹³ At this point, I would like to highlight the fact that Özdamar’s novels are written in German and translated into English, and I refer to the English translations of the novels as this dissertation is written in English. While using the English translations, I am aware of the translation techniques like foreignization and domestication. Lawrence Venuti, referring to Schleiermacher, declares that a translator has two alternatives: “a domesticating practice, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing practice, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad” (15). He also states that “[f]oreignizing translation signifies the differences of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the translating language.” Indeed, Azade Seyhan takes Özdamar’s writing as an already translated work with a foreignization technique since Özdamar directly incorporates Turkish idioms, proverbs and linguistic qualities into German. In her own words, “In fact, it is the kind of ‘translation’ Lawrence Venuti has called a ‘foreignizing’ translation that, in contrast to a ‘domesticating’ one, retains the foreignness of the original text”(156). The English translations of Özdamar’s works maintain the foreignization techniques and preserve the foreign effect of original texts, whereas the Turkish translations are inevitably domesticated and lose the foreign resonances. Reading the novels in English translation does not weaken the discussion of this study because the English translations keep the cultural transfer as foreignized.

The second section of the third chapter is titled “Female Genealogy and Solidarity in Relation to Counter-memory,” and in dialogue with the first section, it stresses the importance of female writing and of transmitting the knowledge of older generations into contemporary writing. The connection between feminine writing and the experiences transferred by the older women to the younger ones and its function in subject formation are explained by referring to Helen Cixous’s call to women to write their bodies, and Braidotti’s emphasis on the politics of location in deciphering the effect of counter-memory. In relation to the transfer of knowledge from generation to generation, the function of the entry of non-Western oral tradition into a Western genre is explained. Women’s unique ways of telling stories extend and expand the boundaries of the genres, which can be called discourses. This generational transfer empowers women. In this process, limitations imposed on women are problematized.

The third section of the third chapter is titled “The Representation of Religion, Tradition and Education (as Counter-memories) in Reconceptualization of Home,” and it aims to offer a broader picture of the protagonists’ homelands as products of feminine writing. The social institutions which function in the process of writing the memory of the majority drive the protagonists out of their countries as they cannot gain the ability to perform their agency within the limitations of religion, tradition and education opportunities in their homelands. Thus, their remembering process is an outcome of counter-memory since the protagonists cannot fit in the dominant ideology and perform their individuality.

Chapter 4 titled “*Becoming in Second-Class Citizen, In The Ditch and The Bridge of the Golden Horn*” deals with the strategies, tools, and the ways of thinking the woman protagonists adopt to unchain themselves from the constraints of binary thinking, and demonstrates how their agency helps them reconstruct their subjectivity in the host countries. Their

translocal experiences create a transnational one, blurring the boundaries between the borders. The first part of this chapter analyses the process of appropriation of places and spaces against the background of Braidotti's concept of rhizome (borrowed from Deleuze & Guattari) in the novels. Rhizomic space is devoid of hierarchies as a product of nomadic thinking; thus, critical in building a sense of home. In Adah's case, this process encompasses a distaste for the locations offered to her in London and ends with a hopeful appropriation of these 'striated places' turning them into 'smooth spaces.' Özdamar's unnamed protagonist achieves the appropriation of places with the help of her engagement with theatre.

The second section of Chapter 4 puts the formation of both protagonists against the backdrop of Braidotti's nomadic thinking and the problematization of binary thinking at the centre of its discussion. Rhizome is a useful tool to suggest a non-binary thinking offering lines of flight i.e. loopholes to deconstruct dualisms. I conclude the chapter demonstrating how Adah and the unnamed protagonist of the *Golden Horn* appropriate the spaces in the host countries by turning them to home in the process of building their subjectivity devoid of binary thinking.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Transformation of the Concept of Diaspora

This dissertation does not aim to offer a detailed outline of the genealogy of diaspora criticism but will refer to diaspora criticism as much as it is necessary to create a discussion about the transnational experience of the women characters in the selected novels. I will first discuss when and how the word 'diaspora' is coined and used, and then explain how the concept of diaspora is extended and transformed. Lastly, I will clarify how diasporic theories facilitate deciphering women's subject formation processes.

To start with, the word diaspora is derived from the Greek word *sperio* (to sow) and preposition *dia* (over) (Cohen 2). Sophocles, Herodotus, and Thucydides were the first to use the word as early as the fifth century B.C. (Dufoix 4). Later, the word diaspora is seen in the Greek translation of "the Septuagint and midrashic rabbinical writings to describe Jewish diaspora" (Brazier 11); however, its connotations were positive signalling spreading over lands through "plunder, military conquest, colonization and migration" (Cohen 2). Stephen Dufoix states that the concept of diaspora started to refer to "both the scattered people and the locale of their dispersion" only in later Jewish tradition (5). In the New Testament, diaspora appears only three times and refers to "the church as a dispersed community of pilgrims waiting to return to the city of God" (5). In the fourth century, interest in diaspora disappears. It appears later during the Reformation and the counter-reformation to describe the protestant minorities in Catholic countries. In the late twentieth century, it becomes more popular than ever, keeping its appeal in social sciences.

The present take of diaspora owes its multiple connotations to the growing interest in the situation of scattered people in the second half of the twentieth century all around the world. Kachig Tölölyan, who initiated the journal *Diaspora* in 1991, tells the story of the journal in an interview with Robin Cohen- also an established scholar in diaspora studies. After asking personal questions to Tölölyan, Cohen interrogates how Tölölyan decided to launch *Diaspora*. Tölölyan states that it was partly due to his personal maturation. After having studied Armenian terrorism, he realized that all terrorists were born in diaspora, and he thought the condition of diaspora should have been critically evaluated. When he was invited to give a lecture in Queens College where he addressed Armenian, Greek and Jewish students, he realized how ready the students were to discuss the concept of diaspora in detail. The academic environment was also mature to assess the understanding of diaspora. Referring to Levi-Strauss' "good to think" with phrase, he realized that it was "good to think with diaspora" in that atmosphere. The journal contributed to the flourishing of the area as a scholarly discipline, and the 1990s marked the increasing interest in diaspora studies.

In the first volume of *Diaspora*, William Safran in his influential article "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return" (1991) states that diaspora studies has been neglected while there were a lot of books written on nationalism and ethnonationalism. Diaspora could not even enter into the index entries. After almost three decades, diaspora studies has gained momentum. Safran's views on diaspora have led the way for recent research, and should be visited to trace how the concept of diaspora has evolved. Safran thinks that this exclusion is not surprising since diaspora had a very limited meaning then: "the exile of the Jews from their historic homeland and their dispersion throughout many lands, signifying as well the oppression and moral degradation implied by that dispersion" (83). However, its meaning has expanded to include "expatriates, expellees, political refugees, alien residents,

immigrants, and ethnic and racial minorities *tout cour*" (83). When scholars based their arguments on a broader term like that of Walker Connor, "that segment of a people living outside the homeland," they started to apply the term to

Cubans and Mexicans in the United States, Pakistanis in Britain, Maghrebis in France, Turks in Germany, Chinese communities in Southeast Asia, Greek and Polish minorities, Palestinian Arabs, blacks in North America and the Caribbean, Indians and Armenians in various countries, Corsicans in Marseilles, and even Flemish-speaking Belgians living in communal enclaves in Wallonia. (83)

William Safran develops Walker Connor's definition and describes the six characteristics of diasporic people:

1) they, or their ancestors, have been dispersed from a specific original "center" to two or more "peripheral," or foreign, regions; 2) they retain a collective memory, vision, or myth about their original homeland—its physical location, history, and achievements; 3) they believe that they are not—and perhaps cannot be—fully accepted by their host society and therefore feel partly alienated and insulated from it; 4) they regard their ancestral homeland as their true, ideal home and as the place to which they or their descendants would (or should) eventually return—when conditions are appropriate; 5) they believe that they should, collectively, be committed to the maintenance or restoration of their original homeland and to its safety and prosperity; and 6) they continue to relate, personally or vicariously, to that homeland in one way or another, and their ethnocommunal consciousness and solidarity are importantly defined by the existence of such a relationship. (83-4)

These characteristics extend the definition of diaspora and make it possible to include "Armenian, Maghrebi, Turkish, Palestinian, Cuban, Greek, and perhaps Chinese diasporas at present and . . . the Polish diaspora of the past, although none of them fully conforms to the 'ideal type' of the Jewish Diaspora" (84). However, many critics such as Robin Cohen, James Clifford and Paul Gilroy believe Safran's definition is very limiting and has deficiencies.

Robin Cohen like Safran refrains from reducing diaspora studies only to dispersion of the Jews. They both affirm that diaspora studies has their roots in Jewish experience, but the concept of diaspora cannot be simplistically defined as it is not possible to collectively define a group's experiences. To clear the superficialities in diaspora studies, Cohen offers a typology: "victim, labour, trade, imperial and cultural diasporas" ("Introduction" X). Despite offering a typology, Cohen knows that one group may go under more than one category and it is still not easy to define and categorize diasporic experience. For instance, the Jews were not a mere victim of diaspora, but they were successful in trade and commerce and also in showing capability to adapt to contemporary cosmopolitanism. Likewise, the Chinese are the archetype of labour diaspora, but they have successfully become a trading diaspora, too.

Cohen takes the concept to be more flexible than Safran, and thinks his list of diaspora stated above ignores some diasporas, which fall within his description. Cohen states "the Irish, the Italians, the Russians, the Germans or the Kurds" (22) also qualify to be diasporic according to Safran's definition. Moreover, there are ambiguous cases such as "the Japanese, the Gypsies, the Hungarians, the Croatians, the Serbs, the British, the Sikhs [and] Caribbean peoples" among many others. Although Cohen highlights the weaknesses of Safran's argument, he still values Safran's line of thought. He appreciates the useful list provided by Safran and develops it trying to overcome the superficialities in diaspora studies. Safran's reference to homeland is repetitive and exaggerated in Cohen's opinion.

Cohen also thinks that two of Safran's criteria should be modified. The first criterion should be improved "by adding that dispersal from an original centre is often accompanied by the memory of a single traumatic event that provides the folk memory of the great historic injustice that binds the group together" (23). And the fifth criterion should also include a creation of a homeland in addition to "maintenance or restoration" of it.

Cohen reminds of us the Sikh and Kurdish cases. After broadening Safran's two criteria he adds four more to the list to enrich the discussions on the definition of diaspora.

The first additional feature includes "groups that scatter for aggressive or voluntarist reasons" in the category diaspora (23). Jana Evans Braziel thinks that these groups include "revolutionary minorities struggling for an imaginary homeland as well as those traveling for commercial" (25). Second argument is based on Marienstras's idea "that time has to pass" before a migrated community proves to be a diaspora. Leaving the homeland and settling in a host country do not guarantee the formation of a diaspora automatically. The migrants may choose to integrate in the society instead of forming a community which yearns for an imagined homeland. Diaspora and diasporic consciousness can only occur when there is "[a] strong tie to the past or block to assimilation in the present and future" (Cohen 24). Third point signals the positive aspects of diasporic identity. "The tension between an ethnic, a national and a transnational identity is often creative, enriching one" (24). This aspect added to Safran's list by Cohen supports the claims of this dissertation as the two diasporic writers in their own lives and their protagonists in the selected novels produce artwork thanks to the enrichment of their diasporic consciousness and experience. They opt for relocating themselves in the host culture bearing their cultural and linguistic heritage with them.

Finally, Cohen has a transnational remark: "members of a diaspora characteristically sense not only a collective identity in a place of settlement, nor again only a relationship with an imagined, putative or real homelands, but also a common identity with co-ethnic members in other countries" (25). What happened to the Jews in Damascus affects the Jews in France. "Language, religion, culture, and a sense of common fate" connect the scattered people, nonetheless, this linkage carries a tension between a "loyalty to the country of refuge/ settlement" and

“ethnic solidarity.” Cohen’s elaboration on Safran’s list provides a more flexible and useful tool to discuss diasporic experience. As this dissertation tries to show in the selected works,

transnational bonds no longer have to be cemented by migration or by exclusive territorial claims. In the age of cyberspace, a diaspora can, to some degree, be held together or re-created through the mind, through cultural artefacts and through a shared imagination. (Cohen 26)

Cohen’s elaboration on Safran’s list offers a new dimension, which is ethnonational consciousness and possibility of choosing between returning to homeland and permanently living in diasporas (Butler 192). Referring also to Tölölyan, Kim D Butler summarizes Safran’s and Cohen’s arguments: first, diaspora signifies “a scattering, rather than a transfer from homeland to a single destination. . . . Second, there must be some relationship to an actual or imagined homeland. . . . Third, there must be self-awareness of the group’s identity” (192). Butler adds a fourth dimension to this summary, that is, its continuation at least for two generations to differentiate diasporic experience from temporary migrations. (These theories somehow essentialize the diasporic identity. This study will adopt a different position which will be explained later).

Like Cohen, James Clifford also builds part of his ideas on Safran’s by appreciating his attempt to define diaspora, but also by criticizing his restrictive criteria. Safran’s checklist is useful to specify the concept of diaspora according to Clifford, but his mention of an “ideal type” of the Jewish diaspora makes his standpoint problematic (“Diasporas” 306). Clifford thinks Safran’s use of quotation marks might indicate a hesitation in talking of an ‘ideal type’ of a diaspora, but despite the quotation marks the term attacks the ‘ambivalent’ and ‘embattled’ nature of the concept. Approving Safran’s attempts, Clifford highlights the practicality of starting discussions on diaspora by referring to the Jewish, Greek or Armenian diasporas, however, he moves away from Safran’s essentialist views and builds his understanding referring to the

contemporary situation of 'travel' and the 'hybrid' world. Clifford grasps the condition of the contemporary world and focuses on how "articulation of travels, homes, memories and transnational connections appropriate and shift diaspora discourse" (306). To express its fluid nature, instead of directly defining what diaspora is, Clifford clarifies what diaspora defines itself against: "Diasporas are caught up with and defined against (1) the norms of nation-states and (2) indigenous, and especially autochthonous, claims by 'tribal' peoples" (307). People in diaspora mostly suffer from the exclusionary nationalist politics of the country they live in, which creates a sense of nostalgia as they need to belong and to feel 'at home.' Sometimes, immigrants "[i]n assimilationist national ideologies such as those of the United States," may suffer from loss and nostalgia, but only in the process of making a new home in a new land. However, different circumstances might provide both positive and negative diasporic or immigrant experiences.

In Safran's, Cohen's and Clifford's views, the discussion about nationalism and anti-nationalism in diasporic discourses comes to the fore. Referring to Clifford may clarify whether they are anti-nationalist or not. In fact, the nationalist aspiration of diasporic communities is another area of discussion where distinctions get blurred. Diasporas are not necessarily anti-nationalist or nationalist. They are against the state-nation's nationalism, and they ironically create their own nationalistic stance to resist the dominating country's attempts of assimilation. "Diasporas have rarely founded nation-states: Israel is the prime example" (307). According to Clifford, diasporas, despite their attempts to keep their cultural forms pure, can never be exclusively nationalist: "They are deployed in transnational networks built from multiple attachments, and they encode practices of accommodation with, as well as resistance to, host countries and their norms" (307). He also believes that diaspora is not the same as travel although travel is part of diasporic experience: "It involves dwelling, maintaining communities, having collective homes away from home (and in this it is different from exile, with its frequently

individualistic focus)” (307-8). Thus, as Sudesh Mishra also highlights, Clifford argues against teleology of origins and return (18). This brings us to discuss the dispersal of people in more fluid terms such as transnationalism, hybridity and subjectivity.

Like Clifford, Jana Evans Braziel thinks that diasporas are “transnational ‘tentacles’ of nation-states, both those of the homeland and of the country of adoption” (26). She also believes that the construction of diasporas is not overdetermined by ‘migratory formations’ only; they are also produced by the dominant flows of global capitalism, ethnic nationalisms, and corporate transnationalisms, among other forces. Braziel’s tendency to concentrate on the fluidity of diasporic experience is shared by Kim D. Butler as well:

If the concept of diaspora is rooted in the group itself, it encourages reification of diasporan identity. Such an approach is unsustainable because identities are never fixed; different intrinsic characteristics become salient based on the contexts in which people and groups identify themselves. Even within single diasporas, simultaneous diasporan identities are possible. (193)

She points out that diasporas are not essentialist structures, but they are productive. Diaspora’s productive aspects highlight its close relationship with issues which are also under focus in postcolonial discussions. Eva Jans Braziel and Anita Mannur in their “Introduction” to *Theorizing Diaspora* attempt to reposition diasporas “within the contemporary critical moments of postcolonialism, postmodernity, and late capital” (qtd. in Braziel 25). They aim at “articulat[ing] the possibility that *diaspora* (as a term) and that diasporas (as migratory formations) are produced and thus circulate with ‘new currencies’ in global discourses, and ones moreover that confound the once (presumed to be) clearly demarcated parameters of geography, national identity, and belonging” (25). They believe “diasporas work in two directions simultaneously, challenging both the strictures and structures of nationalism and the increasingly imperialist, hegemonic forces of globalization” (25).

When the understanding of diaspora is stripped of its fixing tendencies, other dilemmas occur like “how to configure diasporic subjectivity as hybrid, liminal, border and hyphenated without recourse to the strategy of consigning non-diasporic groups to imaginary domains of non-liminality, non-hybridity, non-heterogeneity and so on” (Mishra 22). At this point, the term hybridity, which has flourished in postcolonial studies but then turned out to describe the contemporary subject’s situation by many theorists, should also be clarified because diasporic identity owes its ever changing fluidity to the subject’s hybridity. The concept is borrowed from horticulture, and it means “cross-breeding of two species by grafting or cross pollination to form a third species” (Ashcroft et al. 118). However, in Bhabha’s understanding, hybridity is not simply a form of identity as a result of mixing two different races. Homi Bhabha criticizes the colonialist discourse for adopting the idea of pure cultures. In his *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha defines what hybridity is, and explains how it functions as follows. It:

is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the ‘pure’ and original identity of authority). Hybridity is the reevaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. It displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. It unsettles the mimetic narcissistic demands of colonial power but reimplicates its identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power. For the colonial hybrid is the articulation of ambivalent space where the rite of power is enacted on the site of desire, making its objects at once disciplinary and disseminatory – or, in my mixed metaphor, a negative transparency. (159-160)

Hybridity is important for the way it disrupts the hierarchical relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. Although in the text Bhabha talks about hybridity in relation to colonial identity, this new form of identity signifies “an original mixedness within every form of identity”

(Huddart 6-7). Therefore, since Bhabha's understanding of hybridity applies to all cultures, all ages and genders, it can also explain diaspora experience. Actually, Stuart Hall also uses hybridity to explain the diaspora experience, which in his words "is defined, not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of 'identity' which lives with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity" (235).

Likewise, when diaspora moves away from an essentialist standpoint to transnationalism, which allows a more productive means to understand the nature of dispersals, it changes the relationship between the homeland and the host country whose connotations for the migrant might be positive or negative according to the dispersed subject's experiences. As Bhabha puts it, "[h]ybridity ... reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority – its rules of recognition" (162-163). These denied knowledges belong to colonized cultures and they find ways to transform to enter into dominant discourse and make a change there. Similarly, the nation states of host cultures inevitably accept and are influenced by the knowledges of immigrants, expatriates, all kinds of dispersed people.

Consequently, hybridity becomes a useful tool to trace immigrant women's ability to transform their identity in diasporas. In Emecheta's and Özdamar's novels, women occupy psychic diasporic spaces where their dispersal from a physical homeland means an escape from patriarchal society. The protagonists of the novels are women who are dispersed from their homeland and who are in a constant dialogue with their native culture and land. This in-between status they inhabit, which can be called the third space in Bhabha's sense, allows other possibilities to emerge as in the cases of Emecheta and Özdamar. The reader witnesses the emancipation of women who were once suppressed by the rules of the patriarch. However, the protagonists in the novels display a fluid

subjectivity, which requires another concept different from hybridity. In fact, the tools of diaspora studies somehow prove inadequate to analyse subject formation in the novels as Bhabha's hybridity or Stuart Hall's cultural identity deals with the reversal of the power relationship between the West and the Other. Rather than engaging in a direct dualistic relationship to subvert the power relations, the protagonists in these novels bring their own ways of *becoming* to the host country.

At this point, I feel the need to consult Rosi Braidotti's theory on nomadic thinking and subjectivity as it compensates for what established diaspora studies lacks: offering a thought free of dualisms. Despite fostering fluidity in subject formation, nomadism also contextualizes the human subject's personal history making it a more useful tool than hybridity to talk about diasporic subject positions. Braidotti explains how nomadism works:

Nomadic, it flows like symbolic glue between the social and the self, the outside and the subject; the material and the ethereal. It flows, but it is sticky; it catches on as it goes. It possesses fluidity, but it distinctly lacks transparency. The term 'desire' connotes the subject's own investment - or enmeshment - in this sticky network of interrelated social and discursive effects, which constitutes the social field as a libidinal - or affective - landscape, as well as a normative - or disciplinary - framework. (*Transpositions* 86)

This understanding brings the relation between the diasporic context and the individual becoming together. While subjectivity is fluid and transparent, the human subject still moves in a social context, which in this study's case is diaspora. The novels present the possibility of experiencing alternative ways of becoming without falling prey to the limiting tendencies of patriarchal societies.

Current diaspora studies shares common points with Braidotti's theory, and it tends to point out the impossibility of an originary homeland. Clifford believes that "even ancient homelands have seldom been pure or

discrete” (308), it is difficult to decide what is “indigenous” and how long it takes to become so: “United by similar claims to ‘firstness’ on the land and by common histories of decimation and marginality, these alliances often deploy diasporist visions of return to an original place – a land commonly articulated in visions of nature, divinity, mother earth, and the ancestors” (309). However, diasporic experience does not treat homeland as something left behind, “but as a place of attachment in a contrapuntal modernity” (311). That is why, diaspora culture wavers tensely between “the experiences of separation and entanglement, of living here and remembering/desiring another place” (311). At this point, Braidotti’s theory becomes relevant to make this connection (More on this will be explored in 2.4).

Indeed, the ongoing argument about hybridity, nomadism and lack of origins brings the discussion to a new ground. This dissertation takes the concept of diaspora as the social context in which the protagonists live, but uses Braidotti’s nomadic thinking and subjectivity to explain their subject formation. The increasing interest in the studies about people who migrated or who were scattered / dispersed from their homelands led to the transformation of the concept of diaspora. In a postmodern world where the stiffness of grandnarratives is no longer possible, even the concepts of ‘home’ and ‘the imaginary homeland’ are in a constant change. Thus, the modern immigrants are not after ghettoized diasporas, but they enact in transnational spaces having unique cross geographical and translocal experiences.

2.2 Transnationalism

The transformation of the concept of diaspora leads to a new term: ‘transnationalism.’ In fact, some terms such as globalization, glocalization, diaspora, migration, and transnationalism are organically related to each other, and their definitions do not have clear-cut distinctions as they share a common epistemic ground. Although the

current understanding of the terms diaspora and transnationalism is almost similar, diaspora is an old concept, which has considerably transformed. As stated above, it referred to the forced dispersal of the Jews and the Armenians as a historical experience, and recently it can define the Palestinians' situation. Recently, diaspora is used to define any kind of dispersal such as Chinese 'trade diasporas' and Turkish and Mexican "labour migration diasporas" (Cohen qtd. in Faist 12). While the older versions of diaspora were characterised by a desire to return to homeland, newer forms support unceasing interaction and connection between the homeland and the hostland. Arjun Appadurai (1996) widens the uses of diasporic experience of all mobile persons as 'trans-nation' (qtd. in Faist 12). Thus, with its new form, the diaspora experience almost equals the transnational experience. Faist wraps up the present take of these two terms:

While the term 'diaspora' always refers to a community or group and has been heavily used in history and literary studies, concepts such as transnationalism – and transnational spaces, fields and formations – refer to processes that transcend international borders and therefore appear to describe more abstract phenomena in a social science language. By transnational spaces we mean relatively stable, lasting and dense sets of ties reaching beyond and across borders of sovereign states. Transnational spaces comprise combinations of ties and their substance, positions within networks and organisations and networks of organisations that cut across the borders of at least two national states. (Faist 13)

Faist's definition suggests the fluidity of transnationalism and its capacity to transgress borders. Likewise, Quayson and Daswani emphasize how transnationalism "focuses on various flows and counterflows and the multistriated connections they give rise to" (4). They believe that "[a]gainst the stress on borders, transnationalism examines their permeability, transcendence, or irrelevance" (5). Thus, it becomes relevant to observe women's transnational experience in the selected novels as the women characters are not situated in the centre by leading a stable, frozen life;

in contrast, their experiences are porous and marginal in patriarchal societies.

Being an old concept, diaspora has been widely studied and explored in with different implications for years. In today's world, when better chances of moving around the world are considered, the increasing interest in diaspora studies seems to be inevitable. The postmodern world nurtures the discussions in this field as an essentialist understanding of homeland loses its firmness, and homeland also becomes an ever-changing site. The increasing interaction between home and host countries thanks to better opportunities to travel and technological advancements makes studies on transnationalism popular in a new light. As Tedeschi also states, transnationalism involves an active 'relation-building' process which is constantly changing and 'becoming' by enriching people's multiple sense of belonging. Looking at Linda Basch et al.'s definition of transnationalism will highlight how these concepts evolve:

We define "transnationalism" as the processes by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement. We call these processes transnationalism to emphasize that many immigrants today build social fields that cross geographic, cultural, and political borders. (8)

Here, the emphasis is on the ongoing relation between the homeland and the host country. Transnationalism and "its derivatives such as transnational social spaces, fields and formations" are useful tools to examine the everyday practices of the migrants who engage in various activities (Faist 11) such as carrying out familial bonds, starting new businesses, taking part in political activities and bringing the national traditions to a new land. Basch et al. refer to these people whose lives span borders as 'transmigrants' (8). Instead of trying to belong to one place, they participate in connecting and connected activities.

This study deals with the cultural transfer by taking the transnational spaces as abstractions rather than actual borders. It has a transformative nature challenging the dualistic categories, blurring the lines between binaries and offering fluid ways of becoming. As Steven Vertovec confirms, transnationalism, which encompasses “sustained cross-border relationships, patterns of exchange, affiliations and social formations spanning nation-states,” (2) owes its popularity to the increasing interest in globalization. The claims of a borderless world allowed more possibilities to move, to make trade and to travel more easily between the countries.

Remarkably, it is possible to see a smooth world led by transnational experience in fiction as Basch et al. claim. They state that despite the already settled interest in diaspora studies and the growing interest in transnational studies “individuals, communities, or states rarely identify themselves as transnational”(8). They think that the hegemony of the nation states prevents the actualization of the transnational identity, and the state of in-betweenness is best voiced in fiction. They also highlight the puzzling transformation of the concepts of home and host: the migrant tries to rehome in the host country, while being in the host country signifies that they are in a foreign land as guests. Avtar Brah also mentions this contradiction: “Paradoxically, diasporic journeys are essentially about settling down, about putting roots ‘elsewhere’ ” (182). In line with their claims, this study focuses on the protagonists’ processes of transforming the host country into their home country and reveals how the subjectivity of the characters is shaped in the fictional world. In addition to creating a meaningful context to belong, the characters build nomadic subjectivities, which allow them to surpass limiting qualities of nationality or locality.

Consequently, this study deciphers the function of transnationalism in subject formation, and demonstrates how the protagonists transgress national limitations and engage in transnational experience. This

transgression can also be explained by referring to translocalism, which develops along with the cultural space of transnationalism.

2.3 Translocalism

There are no readily available definitions of transnationalism or translocalism, and they function as broad terms that people employ to clarify their own perspectives on human mobility. Instead of trying to differentiate these terms from each other and provide a clear-cut definition, I will state how they work together to explain migratory experience. In the current course of things, migration does not connote rupture in a negative sense anymore, which requires new terms to explain human experience. Thus, translocality becomes a useful conceptual tool to illuminate the interrelations between home and host countries by connecting geographically different places and people, regardless of their migration reasons such as better employment opportunities, education, research, political refuge, wars or love affairs.

The notion of “dwelling in travel” is a good way of explaining translocalism as used in this dissertation. James Clifford in his *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* revisits Amitav Ghosh’s autobiographical novel *The Imam and the Indian*, and focuses on how people have always been on the move for centuries and names this movement ‘dwelling in travel’ (2). He claims that movement is an essential aspect of an unfinished modernity. Human location is founded by dislocation as well as by stability. He also emphasizes the concept of culture underlining the impossibility of escaping the claims to coherent identity in a world driven by ethnic absolutisms. Nevertheless, his approach to travel- experiences of crossing and interaction- destabilizes the firm ground of established cultures. In European culture, dwelling was taken for granted as “the local ground of collective life, travel a supplement; roots always precede routes.” Clifford asks mind-opening questions: “what would happen ... if travel were untethered, seen as a

complex and pervasive spectrum of human experiences?” (3) The answer to this question simply forms the theoretical basis of this study: “Practices of displacement might emerge as *constitutive* of cultural meanings rather than as their simple transfer and extension.” His perspective turns the common assumptions upside down and shows how cultural centres subordinate the practices of movement: “Cultural centres, discreet regions and territories, do not exist prior to contacts, but are sustained through them, appropriating and disciplining the restless movements of people and things.” Thus, a stable locality is defined against the background of a constant movement.

Ghosh’s story shatters the clichés about a classic quest- “exoticist, anthropological, orientalist” (5). In his work, travel becomes the norm so dwelling needs to be explained. The reasons why people stay home and do not move become matters of discussion. Ghosh’s story leads us to observe these dynamics in particularly men’s lives. But the differences between how men and women experience “migration, pilgrimage, emigration, exploration, tourism, and even military travel” (5-6) should also be explored. The everyday practices of countries vary; for example, the fact that driving is forbidden for women in Saudi Arabia created a significant difference for the female US soldiers in 1991 Persian Gulf War. This condition is labelled as translocality by Appadurai, and this dissertation attempts to lay bare how translocal experience enables women to transform their subjectivities in the process of appropriating the host country as their own by bringing the aspects of their locality with them.

For a start, it will be helpful to define locality to elucidate what translocality is. Locality denotes actual borders and territoriality for which neighbourhood is an example. While the simplest way to define neighbourhoods is to mark its settlement area by taking natural borders such as forests or rivers into consideration, formation of settlement is more complex. The actual borders are insufficient to explain diverse

mobile experiences. At this point, it is useful to refer to Appadurai's emphasis on the relational and contextual quality of neighbourhood / locality production. A locality gains its qualities thanks to inhabitants of a particular area and also thanks to the relationships built between different localities. As the world becomes more and more global as a result of advancements in science and technology, the concept of locality has to be reconsidered. It is no longer possible to talk about the qualities of distinct localities in such a mobile world, which makes it more meaningful to contemplate on the connotations of translocality by accentuating its interconnectedness.

While locality refers to actual places and is directly related to territoriality and borders, translocality signals transgression. As Gupta and Ferguson state, "[r]epresentations of space in the social sciences are remarkably dependent on images of break, rupture, and disjunction" (6). Appadurai's theory also draws attention to this fluidity in his delineation of locality, which also involves a discussion on neighbourhoods. Instead of perceiving locality "as scalar or spatial," he sees locality as "primarily relational and contextual" (178). He thinks it is "a complex phenomenological quality, constituted by a series of links between the sense of social immediacy, the technologies of interactivity, and the relativity of contexts." Thus, Appadurai dwells on the fluidity of the concept of locality.

Translocalism, despite referring to an interaction between bordered places, is a contextual experience. Even the definition of neighbourhood, as suggested as an example of locality by Appadurai, highlights the contextual quality of local experience. It is impossible to control the local subject's experience through the established norms of the locality. Since the local subject engages in social interactions such as marrying someone from a new village, fishing expeditions, hunting expeditions or trading, s/he is doomed to change. These interactions will possibly lead to changes "in language, worldview, ritual practice, and collective self-

understanding” (185). With the local subject’s interactions, the context of neighbourhood is continuously reproduced. This context-generative nature of neighbourhood can be taken as a starting point to understand the relationship between the local and the global. The processes of making and remaking of neighbourhoods necessitate the formation of an ethnospace, which is unavoidably nonlocal. Neighbourhood has a fixing tendency, but the local subject whose actions and identity are shaped in the neighbourhood carry these aspects out of the locality, and this ends up in interaction with other neighbourhoods. The practical and discursive production of neighbourhoods needs the unceasing construction of an ethnospace as local practices are imagined to take place against these nonlocal ethnospaces. Thus, a translocal interaction is inevitable.

In the contemporary world, it is easier to be part of translocal experiences as a result of the advancements in technology. As Anja Peleikis claims: “[D]ue to global technological communications, people can virtually be involved in struggles about locality, despite living their everyday lives in different places all over the world”(16). Like Appadurai, Peleikis also thinks that producing translocality is a constant struggle, and the translocal is never a fixed, stable or bounded social reality. Her claim that the “shared and contested struggles over place contribute to the overall process of producing translocal social fields” (17) indeed signifies how contexts unceasingly produce other contexts. In the contemporary world, thanks to the digital technologies, different localities can be accessed any minute. However, the events in the novels take place during the 1960s and 70s when the technology to connect two places was poorer, but this does not weaken the elements of translocality in the novels since this study takes translocality as the transmigration of certain qualities of the country of origin to the country of settlement.

While some thinkers like Appadurai, Deleuze and Guattari treat translocality as deterritorialized ‘imagined communities,’ some others like Brickell and Datta believe that the situatedness of the migrant subject is

important. They strongly criticize Appadurai for disregarding actual places:

Appadurai (1990, 1993) defined nationalism less by territorial sovereignty, and more by the multiplicity of mobile practices enacted among refugees, tourists, guest workers, transnational intellectuals, scientists, and undocumented migrants whose lives are experienced through identities and aspirations which are not always rooted in, or to, national coordinates. (8)

In contrast to Appadurai, Brickell and Datta focus on a grounded transnationalism. They spare a place for nomadic agency, but they strongly relate it to locality in contrast to fluid understandings of nomadic experience. Michael Peter Smith also supports them in *Translocal Geographies*:

Brickell and Datta reject the representation of translocalities as purely imagined communities or as globalized spaces of hyper-mobile flows. Rather, they define translocalities as *[sic.]* interconnected spaces of “locatedness” spanning multiple sites of material life both within and across borders. They treat migrating subjects as irrevocably situated, moving across multiple spaces that re-locate them within shifting power-knowledge venues, against which, and sometimes through which, they act to shape the conditions of their own mobility and existence. (188)

Smith criticizes the tendency to discuss translocality in terms of deterritorialization and nomadism, and offers a more locally situated approach. He believes that Brickell and Datta’s viewpoint not only saves translocality from the restricting metaphysics of Deleuze & Guattarian nomadism, but also offers ways to transgress sedentarism. He concentrates on the importance of “*situated subjectivity* and *emplacement* as key elements in the making of translocal connections” (189) rather than romanticizing nomadic experience or giving credit to “dwelling in motion.” At this point, to connect the importance of locality with individual differences, I find it useful to refer to Rosi Braidotti’s understanding of nomadic subjectivity as she highlights the necessity of acknowledging the ‘embeddedness’ i.e. the situatedness of the nomadic

subject. Thus, her perspective presents the new concept of nomadic subjectivity breeding out of localities in which the nomad is embedded.

In my view, translocal experience is dynamic since it extends the limits of both the host and home countries. Bringing objects, ways of living, qualities of language from homeland to the host country changes the essence of the host culture and engages it with constant transformation. The process disrupts the hierarchy between the host and home countries by placing the experience on a productive ground. Translocality, I believe, instead of fostering melancholic and nostalgic feelings about home, helps recreate a sense of home in a new land. Thus, it is a productive site, and it owes its productivity to its power to disrupt the hegemony of the nation states. What the characters eat, wear and which linguistic attributes they bring to the host country play a role in creating their home. The porous and fluid quality of translocal experience becomes a useful conceptual tool to analyse what the characters go through in their homelands and in the host countries.

The importance of translocality in this dissertation also lies in the way the linguistic qualities are transferred to a new language and location. The novels under discussion exemplify how the qualities of the characters' native language are transferred to the language of the host country. The linguistic translocation plays a role in nomadic subject formation by allowing different ways of thinking and acting together to co-exist, which enriches both the language of departure and the target language.

Consequently, this study takes the translocal as an ever-changing site and examines the diasporic experiences of woman protagonists in the host country to decipher how their subjectivities work in different locations, which we can call contexts in Appadurai's sense. His theory accentuates that natural borders, the borders of countries and neighbourhoods cannot stabilize the inhabitants' identity since there is a

constant interaction between different localities. It is even impossible to keep local qualities as they are because of the contextual quality of locations. At this point, to delineate the relation between one's locality and subjectivity, looking at the idea of nomadic subjectivity by Braidotti will be helpful.

2.4 Nomadic Subjectivity by Rosi Braidotti

Rosi Braidotti's concept of nomadic subjectivity is important to understand the formation of women who have gone through migratory experiences. This dissertation does not foreground the unfortunate events the writers and the protagonists have gone through because of migration, but focuses on how they find ways to achieve their individuation with affirmation. The protagonists, rather than focusing on the feeling of 'lack' and the tension between the home and the host, the migrant and the settler, man and woman, adopt nomadic thinking which empowers them relieving the stress that binary thinking creates. Living in a century when wars, terrorism, natural disasters and so on kill masses of people or ruin the lives of many, focusing on the affirmative requires a conscious and a demanding effort. Braidotti, basing her philosophy on Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas, presents an affirmative alternative form of subjectivity, which focuses on the value of agency instead of the feeling of lack. In her philosophy, there is an emphasis on ruptures, as in the poststructuralists' way of thinking; however, she shuns away from focusing on the negative, unlike the philosophers of the theoretical turn. The novels to be analysed in this dissertation present women characters who make the most of the alternatives available to them, and the protagonists adopt a hopeful rather than an agonizing tone yearning for a chance to turn back to homeland. Thus, referring to Braidotti's concepts of nomad thought, nomadic subjectivity, counter-memory (borrowed from Foucault) and rhizome (borrowed from Deleuze and Guattari) will demonstrate how the women characters with transnational experience remember their homes, and how they engage in endless production of

identity (subjectivity in Braidotti's theoretical framework). Identity, in this study, is used as an ever-changing, evolving concept signalling Braidotti's subjectivity.

Rather than taking the transnational experience as a limited and a hierarchical dialogue between the home and the host, the transnational experience of the protagonists will be observed in a non-hierarchical frame. This study focuses on how subjectivities evolve in deterritorialized spaces also called 'plateaus' by Deleuze and Guattari. Transnational experience is rhizomatic, and takes place on a plural level; there are relationships which are uncontrollable as they do not follow a certain path but occur at lines of flight disrupting the hierarchies. There is a rhizomatic connection among different locations, experiences and individuations. To make these points clearer, Braidotti's take on nomad thought / nomadic thinking, nomadic subjectivity, counter-memory and rhizome will be explored in more depth.

In her *Nomadic Subjects*¹⁴, Braidotti states that "[her] nomadic subject project constitutes an act of resistance against methodological nationalism and a critique of Eurocentrism from within" (2011 7). Nomadic subjectivity inflames and retains a criticism of prevailing understandings of "subject, identity, and knowledge, from within one of the many 'centers' that structure the contemporary globalized world" (7-8). Gayatri Spivak, Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Avtar Brah, Helma Lutz, Philomena Essed, Gloria Wekker, Nira Yuval-Davis as postcolonial and antiracist feminist thinkers with their works on "power, difference and politics of location" play an important part in Braidotti's nomadic project. Moreover, although they are not specifically feminist thinkers, Deleuze and Guattari's ideas revealed mostly in *A Thousand Plateaus* shape Braidotti's understanding of the nomad.

¹⁴ I quote from two different editions of *Nomadic Subjects*. That is why, I indicate the the date of publication. (1994, 2011)

As an alternative to strengthening the claims to a unified self, Deleuze and Guattari underline the importance of achieving subjectivity. They denounce the Cartesian self which is complete, coherent and unitary, and criticize the Cartesian assumption which prioritizes the mind over the body. In fact, this is a poststructuralist stance shared by many other philosophers, feminist thinkers and psychoanalysts such as Derrida, Foucault, Barthes, Lacan, Irigaray and Cixous. The difference Deleuze and Guattari add to poststructuralist thought in dissolution of the essentialist identities is to focus on the affirmative rather than the lack. Although the representatives of the theoretical turn focus on ruptures and dissolution of identity, Deleuze and Guattari still think that linguistic turn operates within “a central grid” that shapes and constructs the subject. It “leaves little room for negotiation and instils loss and melancholia at the core of the subject” (*Portable* 5).

Nomadic thought does not intend to dismiss others. Deleuze and Guattari think that the function of the symbolic in psychoanalysis, phallogocentrism in Derrida or the heterosexist matrix in Butler is limiting and marginalizing others. Braidotti believes that recently emerging subject positions in social theory which are thought to be challenging the dichotomous oppositions between the centre and the margin through “hybrid, contested, multilayered figurations” fail to do so, as what they do is only to create more positive “others” instead of destabilizing the binary thinking. Deleuze and Guattari, in contrast, offer an understanding of desire that connotes a positive state like plenitude, multiplicity, fluidity and exercise. As Braidotti puts it, “[r]epresentational thinking and the linguistic turn are outdated models to account for the kind of subjects we have already become” (*Transpositions* 41). She also states: “Nomadic thought rejects the psychoanalytic idea of repression and the negative definition of desire as lack inherited from Hegelian dialectics. It borrows instead from Spinoza a positive notion of desire as an ontological force of becoming” (*Portable* 2). Thus, leaving the marginal others with either a positive or negative positioning, nomadic thinkers

offer non-hierarchized subject positions which allow each subject to speak from where s/he is.

For Deleuze and Guattari, nomad thought is a war machine to fight against the state apparatus as it functions beyond the limits presented by the state grids. The state apparatus designates borders, separates individuals into territories, and constructs boundaries creating possibilities for sovereignty. This controlling device produces spaces of interiority. However, as Brian Massumi, the translator of *A Thousand Plateaus*, puts it in his “Foreword” to the volume: “‘Nomad thought’ does not immure itself in the edifice of an ordered interiority; it moves freely in an element of exteriority” (xii). Nomadic people do not fit in these categories and they live outside these interior territories. Thus, nomad thought becomes an attitude of exteriority, which is devoid of the restrictions set by the state apparatus. It functions as a source of exteriority surpassing the tendencies of state apparatus to suppress the free nature of nomad thought, which is always in a constant condition of becoming. Brian Massumi also states that nomad thought “does not repose on identity; it rides difference. It does not respect the artificial division between the three domains of representation, subject, concept, and being; it replaces restrictive analogy with a conductivity that knows no bounds” (xii). Thus, for the state, nomad thought is destructive as it does not comply with its rules and boundaries. The concepts generated by nomad thought “are immersed in a changing state of things” rather than “reflecting the world.” Nomad thought’s tendency is to experience its alternatives of becoming outside the limitations of the striated places, but not to become a war machine. However, its nature, which is highly related with creative thinking and freedom of thinking inevitably turns it into a means of resistance to state dominance.

Braidotti’s nomadic philosophy is not an idea from nowhere. It is “a discursive practice” similar to “mobility of intelligence” since it is “both physical, material and yet speculative and ethereal” (*Portable* 3). As she

states, “nomadic thought stresses the idea of embodiment and the embodied and embedded material structure of what we commonly call thinking” (2). Thus, nomadic subjects build their subjectivity within their unique situatedness / embeddedness.

Nomad thought offers an alternative to identity which is a “bounded, ego-indexed habit of fixing and capitalizing on one’s selfhood” (4). As Zeina Al Azmeh affirms, Braidotti offers a way to avoid “phallogentric vision of the subject” (99) on the “premise that nomadism entails a total dissolution of the notion of a centre and consequently of imaginary sites of authentic identities.” Braidotti clearly explains that:

Identity is not understood as a fixed, God-given essence - of the biological, psychic or historical kind. On the contrary, identity is a process: it is constructed in the very gesture that posits it as the anchoring point for certain social and discursive practices. Consequently, the question is no longer the essentialist one: what is national or ethnic identity? , but rather a critical and genealogical one: how is identity constructed? by whom? under which conditions? for which aims? As Stuart Hall put it: who is entitled to claim an ethnic or national identity? who has the right to claim that legacy, to speak on its behalf and turn it into a policy-making platform? These are questions about entitlement, agency and subjectivity which rotate around the issue of cultural identity. (“Difference”)

As I stated elsewhere, “Braidotti’s definition of identity and the questions she raises about identity and subjectivity can be taken as a starting point to see how her work explains ways to overcome stasis” (“Female Subjectivities” 192) thanks to “a subjectivity that is heterogeneous, transgressive, deterritorialized, performative and affirmative” (Al Azmeh 99). According to Braidotti, nomadic state generates new possibilities “for life and thought, especially for women” (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 8). Foucault’s understanding of human subjectivity and the death of the subject posits an important place in Braidotti’s thinking, but before dwelling on this issue, explaining how Braidotti’s stance is different from

the Enlightenment ideology in relation to Descartes and Kant and psychoanalysis in relation to Freud and Lacan will be helpful.

Braidotti's concept of subjectivity stands in opposition to the Cartesian understanding of the self, which ignited the proliferation of the Enlightenment ideology. The Cartesian claim to a unified, coherent, whole identity which prioritizes the mind over the body, annihilates the possibilities of subjectivity according to Braidotti. Elizabeth Grosz explains how dysfunctional Cartesian dualism is in explaining human subjectivity. She criticizes the "common view of the human subject as a being made up of two dichotomously opposed characteristics: mind and body, thought and extension, reason and passion, psychology and biology" (*Volatile* 3). As Grosz also states, thinking through binary oppositions results in hierarchizing the polarized categories. While one leg becomes the powerful one, the other inevitably becomes "its suppressed, subordinated, negative counterpart" (3). This also proposes a thinking through negativity as the weak leg is always defined through what the powerful leg is not. Thus, dichotomous thinking defines body as "what is not mind, what is distinct from and other than the privileged term" (3). The body is there to be subordinated by the mind as it needs to be directed, judged and suppressed to tame its unruly nature. Mind/body dualism has bred other oppositions such as "reason and passion, sense and sensibility, outside and inside, self and other, depth and surface, reality and appearance, mechanism and vitalism, transcendence and immanence, temporality and spatiality, psychology and physiology, form and matter, and so on" through which what might be considered as positive aspects of the body are subordinated to the mind. This opposition is mutually exclusive and exhaustive cutting the interaction between the body and the mind, and enforcing a reductionist approach to the human subject. Grosz highlights how dichotomous thinking, which started with Plato much earlier than Descartes has been the starting point of many philosophical discussions. While many philosophers followed Cartesian thinking some others found alternative ways of contemplating on the

human subject. Nietzsche and Spinoza are two of them influencing the work of Deleuze and Guattari, Elizabeth Grosz and Rosi Braidotti among many others.

Grosz argues that Cartesian thinking still shapes the contemporary understandings of the body, and creates misconceptions about it, and explains three of them emphasizing how the body is subordinated to the mind. Firstly, natural sciences such as biology, medicine, physiology take the body as an object, “an organic system of interrelated parts, which are themselves framed by a larger ecosystemic order” (8). Humanities also diminish the body to “a fundamental continuity with brute, inorganic matter” (8). The two approaches are clearly distinct, but they have a similar tendency to deny “the distinctive complexities of organic bodies, the fact that bodies construct and in turn are constructed by an interior, a psychical and a signifying view-point, a consciousness or perspective” (8).

Secondly, the body is metaphorically taken as “an instrument, a tool, or a machine” (8) when consciousness is removed out of it. Taking the body as a property of the subject deprives the body of its carnality and function to make decisions. Thus, the body is treated “as a self-moving automaton, much like a clock, car, or ship” (9).

Thirdly, the body is reflected as “a signifying medium, a vehicle of expression” (9) to transmit what is basically private such as “ideas, thoughts, beliefs, feelings, affects.” Thus, it functions in two ways: first, the information from outside the organism is transmitted through the body, second, it is a tool to express psyche which would have stayed incommunicable otherwise. Considering the body as a signifying medium of expression removes it from the process of gaining information, again separating the body from its agency. This tendency disregards the function of specific experiences of the body in the subject’s agency, and perceives it as a corporeality which must be almost transparent in “its

constitutive role in forming thoughts, feelings, emotions, and psychic representations” (10). The body’s engagement in human subjectivity is brutally ignored in this mode of thinking. These three perceptions of the body are adopted even by some feminists, and in such a context, Grosz marks her opposition to the reminiscences of Cartesian approaches to the body.

Like Grosz, Braidotti states that Cartesian project “is against the alternatives which have been judged inadmissible, and therefore non-philosophical” (*Patterns* 51). The matter-spirit distinction is the key to the order of knowledge signalling the difference between “*res extensa*, raw matter, and *res cogitans*, thinking substance.” This binary thinking situates the cogito as the guarantor and conveyor of reason obtained from God. Cogito possesses the “thinking substance” as a divine principle. Thus, the body is subordinated to the mind. Cartesian thinking takes the body as a territory to be combated against as passions originate from the body, which stand as threats to reason. Braidotti attacks Cartesian dualistic thinking foregrounding the importance of bodily experience in human subjectivity.

The Enlightenment as a product of Cartesian thinking also stands as a threat to the human subjectivity with its tendency to locate the mind over the body, and human above all other living things. Kantian moral thinking as an amalgamation of consciousness and rationality in search of universal norms leaves almost no room for subjectivity with its strong emphasis on objectivity, and it is inevitably criticized by feminist thinkers for its inapplicability. Among all the schools of feminist thought, feminist poststructuralists are the severest critiques of moral universalism as they privilege “human affectivity and passions” over “the moral content of intentionality, action or behaviour or the logic of rights” (*Transpositions* 13). Poststructuralist ethics foregrounds “alterity, otherness and difference” (13). Kant’s critique of pure reason paradoxically solidifies the strength of one way of thinking through universalism. Deleuze has

brought the project of criticizing reason to its fullest by overthrowing “the Kantian project of transcendence and the centrality of consciousness, replacing it with his dynamic and rhizomic subject-in-becoming” (14).

Braidotti thinks that Kantian tradition is not practical to explain human subjectivity “in a world that is technologically and globally mediated” (15). To prove how poststructuralist philosophy is more apt in elucidating nomadic subjectivity, she focuses on Martha Nussbaum’s ideas of moral universalism, which stand in direct opposition to the fluidity of poststructuralism. Nussbaum takes fragmentation and relativism as problems to be solved, and she thinks that universalism is the tool to overcome fragmentation. She obviously supports the formation of “fixed identities, steady locations and ties that bind” (15). Dichotomous relationship between the self and the other is unproblematic in her thinking. Braidotti concludes that “For Nussbaum, the individual can only be conceived as either part of a global entity – family, state, nation, humanity, the cosmos – or, on the contrary, as splintered off and atomized” (16).

By referring to Homi Bhabha’s comparison of Nussbaum’s type of cosmopolitanism and Adrienne Rich’s transnational feminist ethics, Braidotti consolidates her own criticism of Nussbaum’s moral universe. Homi Bhabha questions the values Nussbaum attributes to ‘humanness’ and the way she perceives the notion of the ‘self’ as a spatial concept, which sets “the self at the centre of a series of concentric circles that move through the various cycles of familial, ethnic and communal affiliations, to the largest one, that of humanity as a whole” (qtd. in *Transpositions* 16). Bhabha’s own politics of location stands in opposition to Nussbaum’s, which he thinks is “‘provincial’, in a specific, early imperial sense” (16). Bhabha highlights the necessity of considering the challenges of the current world rather than trying to fit contemporary human situation to a backward-looking philosophy. While Nussbaum’s cosmopolitanism worked through “the traditional sense of commonality,”

Bhabha prefers to address the “specific problems of refugees, migrants, victims of global disruptions caused by war and ecological disasters” (16). Adrienne Rich’s perception of locality and time is different from Nussbaum’s ways to found a transhistorical memory. Rich takes the historical events such as “[h]olocaust, slavery, war, migration and diaspora” into account, but also appreciates the functions of a countermemory respecting the uniqueness of the effect of each historical event on the individuals. Historical events are the source of accountability; however, each individual has a different experience and perception of those. Rich’s transnational cosmopolitanism allows diverse human subjectivities to occur instead of forming similar and fixed identities. Moving from Nussbaum’s ‘concentric cosmopolitan’ to ‘transnational’ cosmopolitanism allows the unitary and ‘home-bound’ subject to be “redefined in terms of multiple belongings, non-unitary selfhood and constant flows of transformation” (17). Nussbaum’s theory is based on two notions which are incompatible with nomadic philosophy: the first one is the incontestable claim of the power of the history of philosophy, and the second one is “the exercise of philosophical reason as a moral crusade” (17).

Nussbaum’s ideology has almost nothing in common with poststructuralist thinkers, whom she calls relativistic. Consequently, she does not give any credit to thinkers such as Foucault, Deleuze and Derrida, who try to disengage the human subject from the limits of Marxist confinements. Their engagement with psychoanalytic theory in explaining subjectivity becomes also relevant at this point. Freud’s and even Lacan’s way of thought also falls in the traps of dualistic thinking according to Braidotti. Freud’s emphasis on the unconscious is revolutionary; however, his treatment focuses on repressing the irrational desires of the unconscious. Promoting socially accepted behaviour, Freud’s psychoanalysis disrupts the possibilities for human subjectivity. Explaining women’s subjectivity through penis envy is another problematic side of Freudian psychoanalysis. As Braidotti expresses in an

interview, Freud “had a pretty linear vision: the past is traumatic, the trauma repeats itself in the present, you get to work on the memories, and arrive at a more or less sustainable future” (Posman).

Linearity is inevitably a threat to human subjectivity. Freud’s legacy is not fully rejected by poststructuralist thinkers. They re-read the bulk of the unconscious so as to free the subject from its readings which confine the subjects to a unitary and hegemonic place. Indeed, his ideas activated the philosophy of Foucault, Irigaray and Deleuze, who rejected humanistic traditions by “unhinging the subject, freeing it respectively from the dictatorship of a libido dominated by Oedipal jealousy, and from the linearity of a historical *telos* which had married reason to the revolution, both of them vowing violence” (*Transpositions* 25).

Lacanian psychoanalysis has also been ground-breaking. Braidotti acknowledges one of the dictums of Lacanian analysts: “the unconscious is structured like a (foreign) language” (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 36); since she is a polyglot herself, she can personally relate to this kind of an approach. She thinks that high theory¹⁵ especially philosophy adopts the ideals of exclusion of “nonmen, non-white, nonlearned.” Psychoanalytical thinking on the other hand makes nomadic thinking possible as it throws doubts on the discussions of “phallogocentrism, ethnocentrism and positivity of difference.” While ‘high theory’ turns out to be the theory of normativity, psychoanalysis is the philosophy of desire and complexity, for Braidotti. Psychoanalysis has taught Braidotti the value of “the advantages of the nonunitary structure of the subject and the joyful implication of the unconscious foundations of the subject” (*Nomadic*

¹⁵ Rosi Braidotti does not give a definition of ‘high theory’ but she uses the phrase generally referring to philosophy as she states in her article “Embodiment, Sexual Difference, and the Nomadic Subject:” “I do think that at this particular moment of feminist theory, it is urgent to think about the nature and the status of thinking in general and also of the specific activity known as ‘high theory,’ of which philosophy is an eminent example” (3). In her *Nomadic Subjects* (1994) she uses the phrase several times. She states that ‘high theory’ is Oedipal (29), incapable of reflecting on “phallogocentrism, ethnocentrism, the positivity of difference” (33) and exclusionary (33).

Subjects 2011 25). Embodied experience is shaped through multi-layered affectivities and time-based inconsistencies, “internally contradictory time and memory lines.” Thus, nomadic body becomes a vital negation of essentialism as it is a “threshold of transformations” where there is a complex and free interplay of “highly constructed social and symbolic forces.” In line with the claims of this study, instead of using class, gender, race, ethnicity, age and so on as points of differentiation, Braidotti focuses on the intersection of these elements and interaction among them as the concept of nomad signifies co-existence of these identity markers in the configuration process of subjectivities. Fixed identities lose their firm grounds creating the need to merge subjectivity and gaps with the production of new practices of interrelatedness. Thus, the nomadic subject is a political fiction which allows Braidotti to philosophize through constructed categories with an agency to move across and beyond them. She calls the process: “blurring boundaries without burning bridges” (26). Nomadic subject contests being confined to socially constituted behaviour but is aware of the context s/he is situated in.

Psychoanalysis addresses key issues in both Braidotti’s theoretical framework and her personal nomadic experience (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 36). The notion of the subject which is not one but “split, knotted, and complex” is the first one. The second one is that desire connects us to the other by bringing attraction and fear together in an unconscious process. The third one is taking power as a “productive process of empowerment” rather than something negative. Braidotti finds that “philosophies of difference, sexuality and nonunitary subjectivity” owe much to psychoanalytic theory. Lacanian psychoanalysis forms the solid ground for the discussions of Foucault’s definition of power, Derrida’s deconstruction of phallogocentrism and Irigaray’s concept of sexual difference. Braidotti acknowledges the importance of the way Lacan complicates the picture “by introducing continuities,” however, she also states how he becomes “a rather conservative political thinker” at the end of his life (Posman). She thinks that Lacan is still bounded by past, but

not in a Freudian sense, which signals human history. Instead, language, which Lacan calls the symbolic system, stands for “an immutable, authoritative past.” “Language is what one is made of” (qtd. in *Transpositions* 18) means one cannot escape the boundaries of language s/he is born into, leaving no space for individuality and confining the subject to the history of language. While Lacan’s perception of language fails to shed light on the narrative strength of the novels, Helen Cixous’s theory on feminine language becomes a useful tool to depict the uniqueness of female writing. (The detailed discussion of Cixous’s theories will be given in the related chapter: 3.1 Rewriting Homeland through Feminine Language)

Deleuze and Guattari too in their *Anti-Oedipus* criticize how the concept of temporality works “with the authority of the past” in psychoanalytic theory. They take the unconscious as a constructive force deriving a desire for the future. In contrast to Lacanian psychoanalysis, which explains the continuity of desire with the concept of lack, Braidotti focuses on an affirmative philosophy having its roots in Spinoza. Leaving the Oedipal triangle paves the way for fluid and flexible becomings in rhizomatic spaces.

Foucault also assesses psychoanalysis, the function of history and memory, and builds his own perception of subjectivity. Foucauldian understanding of subjectivity is a point of reference in Braidotti’s philosophy as she believes that Foucault is the first one to offer a thinking without binary oppositions in his *The Order of Things*. Foucault’s subjectivity re-evaluates Cartesian cogito and psychological discourse in a new way, and provides an alternative way of thinking about subjectivity. His work has made it possible to put humanistic / post-Enlightenment approaches into question and made it obvious that individualism was not man’s destiny but a mental disorder. Deleuze, whose nomadic line of thought Braidotti follows, also refers to Foucauldian concept of subjectivity as he is in favour of the dissolution of binary oppositions. In

her revised edition of *Nomadic Subjects*, Braidotti acknowledges Foucault's legacy and revisits his theory so as to show Foucault's contribution to her understanding of subjectivity. Braidotti elucidates different stages of Foucault's works, which relate to his analysis of three main modes of subject formation. For the purposes of this study not the outline of the works but the processes of Foucault's understanding of subject formation will be mentioned.

As Braidotti states: "Michel Foucault is not a system builder" (*Patterns* 46). To give an example, he criticizes the portrayal of the philosopher as "author, sovereign, king and owner of the meaning of the text" in the "Introduction" to *Madness and Civilization*. He disapproves of the role of "the knowing subject" in western philosophy since he thinks that discourses of science and philosophy have a despotic power working for the benefits of hegemony. He emphasizes the necessity of prosperity and multiplicity of "discursive production" opening a space to activate creativity at the heart of philosophical thought against the previous regulating power of established knowledge (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 167).

At his second stage, Foucault focuses on how the subject is formed through "the exclusionary or dividing practices" (qtd. in *Nomadic Subjects* 2011 167). He focuses on social institutions determining embodied subjects' relation to the others and also imposing self-discipline such as mental asylum, army, hospital, prison and factory. These institutions exercise techniques such as "exclusion, hierarchical order, separation, and classification" that harm and abuse the unlimited capabilities of the body as raw material for the purposes of productivity. He believes embodied subjects have to be disciplined to become "docile, productive and reproductive" to meet the demands of the capitalist society. Nevertheless, at the end of the nineteenth century, the status of the knowing subject was shattered, and social sciences started to question the Cartesian dualism mind/body, which disembodies the thinking subject.

Foucault does not totally condemn the dualistic oppositions, but states how they prepare the structure upon which subjectivity and scientific knowledge would be built. Power wants to tame the body and normalize the subject's experience, which results in the death of the subject. However, this authoritative stance also results positively in causing different subjectivities to occur within the boundaries of power relations (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 168).

This idea somehow links Foucault's second and third stages. At his third stage, he focuses on the ways to become a subject; thus, the ways to overcome the death of the subject which is an outcome of institutions keeping the desires of a monopolizing power. The focus on subjectivity results in a redefinition of philosophy as it turns out to be a site of creation as well as a site of critique. In Braidotti's words: "it is a practice of self-styling that entails a relationship to alterity and thus an ethical stance" (169). Foucault shifts the focus of philosophy from conventional to unconventional sites "such as madness, confinement, penal institutions, sexuality as an intricate web of desires and pleasures" and thus he continues to engage with the challenge of a post-Hegelian world: he deals with the possibilities of finding ways to think differently. Our system of thought has been built by inherited 'conceptual categories' within the constraints of which we have to rebuild our thinking. He, at least, wants to find out a way of being "equal to the discursive world of modernity, in which there are no longer any possible globalizing forces" (*Patterns* 47).

Foucault provides answers to his own questions and offers a way to think differently thanks to discursive practices. Being the "technician of discourse," the association between texts and its manifold contexts, between the subject and the rules running his discourse, between the author and his dominance in the meaning of the text, between knowledge

and power have always been never-ending points to question for Foucault.

Underlying the fact that they are not chronological but discontinuous Braidotti summarizes these three stages as follows:

Firstly, the archaeological phase, also called the critique of the human and the social sciences; secondly the genealogical analysis of the practices of domination and exclusion; thirdly, the technological analysis of the modes of internalization, especially in relation to sexuality. (*Patterns* 48)

The impetus behind his work is his preoccupation with “mechanisms of discourse production.” Foucault’s focus on subjectivity is interwoven with his thoughts on sexualisation of discursive practices. His *History of Sexuality* as a product of “the intersection of the archaeological phase with the genealogical decoding of the practices of the self” (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 128) highlights how he becomes more conscious of his position as “a man, a male philosopher.” His first works favour a gender-blind stance where the word *man* exists as a universal form. In his later works, he is aware of the inequality between the sexes in terms of “the system of control of sexuality.” As quoted by Braidotti, while talking about “the practices of the self,” Foucault points out:

Women were generally subjected . . . and yet this ethics was not addressed to women; it was not their duties, or obligation, that were recalled, justified, or spelled out. It was an ethics for men: an ethics though, written and taught by men, and addressed to men – to free men obviously. (qtd. in *Nomadic Subjects* 2011 169-170)

Foucault’s opinion emphasizes the “exclusion of the disqualification of women as ethical agents, and consequently as subjects” and more importantly how they are marginalised when the “rules and regulations of moral life” are concerned. Foucault states that the ‘ethical virility’ is the value upon which the system is built. The coincidence between the anatomical sex-male and the imaginary constructed masculine sexuality

puts the male body in a position that is “all one with the body politic.” As Braidotti highlights, Foucault does not name the concepts of Lacanian psychoanalysis but his project can be viewed as “the critical anatomy of phallogocentric structures in both society and discourse. In a society where ‘ethical virility’ rules, the world is obviously ‘for and by men.’ Women’s subjectivity remains as absence in this kind of discursive practice. “History – rather than anatomy- is destiny” (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 170).

Reading Foucault in this way might mean foregrounding extremely gender-specific rules, which are dominant in philosophical discourse. Against the background of this complicated and diversified heritage of Foucault, Braidotti builds her own reading with the aim first, “to decode specific forms taken by discourses and practices of biopower in the contemporary scene” and second, “to contest Foucault’s hypothesis that power is exercised in liberal democracies through biopolitical forms of governmentality” (171). The repressive and productive qualities of power are thus united constructing the necessary ground for ‘subject formations.’

Braidotti focuses on the women’s experience through ‘feminist genealogies’ which are “politically informed countermemories” (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 207). Countermemory constructs a dialogue between women whose fight for us functions as “support and inspiration.” Feminist genealogy is a cross-generational bond allowing a “discursive and political exercise”; it presents the beauty of thinking across space and time.

In this regard, Braidotti’s reading of Foucault brings her to discuss “power as and in discourse” with a specific reference to women’s experience. Discussion of discourse ties subjectivity with location and history, which signals the function of countermemory. Nomadic thinking occurs “in the transitions between potentially contradictory positions” however it does not come out of nowhere (*Transpositions* 29). “Nomadic subject or the

subject in transition is not pushed out of location, history or time” (“Female Subjectivities” 193). According to Braidotti, location is “an embedded and embodied memory.” She explains further:

it is a set of counter-memories, which are activated by the resisting thinker against the grain of the dominant representations of subjectivity. A location is a materialist temporal and spatial site of co-production of the subject, and thus anything but an instance of relativism. Locations provide the ground for accountability. (*Transpositions* 29)

Locality and translocality have already been explained in relation to Appadurai’s ideas; however, focusing on Braidotti’s understanding of locality will better clarify the vantage point of this study thanks to its feminist consciousness. Like Appadurai, she believes that “‘location’ is not a self-appointed and self-designed subject position. It is a collectively shared and constructed, jointly occupied spatio-temporal territory” (“Feminist Philosophies” 197). For that reason, a political awakening (Grewal and Kaplan 1994) and the intervention of others for the production of politics of location are necessary. This reminds us of Appadurai’s explanation about how neighbourhoods construct themselves against each other and how their interaction inevitably results in the production of locality which is contextual and relational. In Braidotti’s words:

‘Politics of locations’ are cartographies of power that rest on a form of self-criticism, a critical, genealogical self narrative; they are relational and outside directed. This means that “embodied” accounts illuminate and transform our knowledge of ourselves and of the world. (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 16)

Bonfiglioli thinks that “[t]hese insights into the politics of location resonate with the emphasis on *reflexivity* that characterizes the field of feminist qualitative methodologies, including oral history” (200). The feminist exercise of “locating yourself” is not a process of labelling our identity like white, middle-class Italian but it is a process of “acknowledging the discourses of power we are embedded in, and the

intersecting material and discursive boundaries that shape our vision of ourselves and others” (200). Braidotti explains this condition stating that the white women see the limitations of their “locations, truths and discourses” through the black women’s texts. As an interactive process feminist knowledge “estranges us from the familiar, the intimate, the known and casts an external light upon it.” It makes us notice our relation to power. Braidotti acknowledges the importance of multiple and potentially contradictory locations and “differences among, but also within, different women” in feminist theory. Locations are taken “as geo-political, but also temporal zones, related to self-reflexivity, consciousness, self-narrative and memory” (“Feminist Philosophies” 198). Foucault philosophy influenced some feminists (Diamond and Quinby 1988), and it does not aim at rebuilding a dominant memory but constructing “a counter-memory, or an embedded and embodied genealogy” (198). Consequently, Braidotti thinks that feminist philosophy raises questions about ‘individual gendered’ identity with issues related to political subjectivity, the production of knowledge, diversity, alternative representations of subjectivity and epistemological legitimation (198).

Foucault’s concept of subjectivity is handcuffed to discourse, but it is not fatalistic as the subject operates within the givens of (official) history through resistance relying on the power of (personal) memory. In the process of remembering, definition of the formation of the body is very important as sexual politics is a substantial part of subjectivity. As quoted by Braidotti, in his last interview, he elaborated on his stance:

History of thought means not simply the history of ideas or representation, but also the attempt to reply to the question: how is a body of thought constituted? How can thought, insofar as it relates to truth, also have a history? . . . thought has a history too; thought is a historical fact, even if it has many other dimensions besides . . . What I am trying to do is present the history of thought’s relation to truth; the history of thought in terms of its having to do with truth (qtd. in *Patterns* 48).

Thus, the emphasis on history does not limit subjectivity, but activates nomadic consciousness which is similar to Foucault's countermemory by foregrounding bodily experience. "The body or the embodiment of the subject" points at an intersection between "the physical, the symbolic, and the sociological;" it does not signify a biological or a sociological classification (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 25). Being "a radical rejection of essentialism," theory of embodiment has a feminist stance.

Countermemory is a term combining the ideas on locatedness /space and history/time with a focus on gender, and explains the subjectification processes through resistance. Countermemory, like nomadic consciousness, displays ways of rejecting the dominant power's tendency to assimilate and homogenise the representation of the subject. As Braidotti lucidly puts it: "The feminists-or other critical intellectuals as nomadic subjects-are those who have forgotten to forget injustice and symbolic poverty: their memory is activated against the stream; they enact a rebellion of subjugated knowledges" (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 60). Especially, the bodily experience of women plays a role in activating their memories against the grain.

The novels in question in this study are the products of a desire to signify in a world where women are denied recognition. The protagonists of the novels exemplify how nomadic consciousness allows women to become in an endless process in and against the historical background; that is, by remembering all the suppression and resisting it. Braidotti puts it aptly and poetically: "The nomadic tense is the imperfect: it is active, continuous; the nomadic trajectory is controlled speed. The nomadic style is about transitions and passages without predetermined destinations or lost homelands" (60). She thinks that the migrant's favourite tense is the perfect tense having roots in the past and never allowing present time to function. In contrast, the nomad experiences present time, focuses on "transitions and passages" and observes how "transitions and passages" function in women's subject formation process through which the women

disengage themselves from the constraints of homelands and how they re-create the sense of home in an ever-changing / transitory site. Braidotti further explains: "The nomad's relationship to the earth is one of transitory attachment and cyclical frequentation: the antithesis of the farmer, the nomad gathers, reaps, and exchanges, but does not exploit" (60).

The imperfect tense does not separate the nomad's experience from the discursive load especially when feminist discussions are concerned. Braidotti believes that bodily experience of women which directly relates to the workings of the concept of countermemory should be observed by referring to the genealogical relationship among women. While focusing on genealogy, it should be kept in mind that the nomad does not take part in appropriation processes or power struggles but just engages in becoming. Braidotti believes that under the repression of patriarchy, countermemory not only works in relations between men and women but affects the relations among women, too. The instability of power relations in the post-industrial world results in unexpected rivalry among women. Braidotti thinks that women should free themselves from what she calls "Oedipal jealousy." Her suggestion is to unite as "[s]exual difference is a political alliance of women, in the recognition of their respective differences" (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 207). To disengage themselves from the "phallogocentric modes of thinking and teaching" alliance among women can be a starting point. Feminist genealogies, evaluating and thinking through the work of other women, are central to Braidotti's theory. She calls these genealogies "politically informed countermemories" which enable a bond among women whose resistance becomes "a source of support and inspiration" for other women.

Braidotti also contemplates on what the appropriate genre for feminism is and states that it is neither the academic nor the creative texts, but a combination of those as nomadism surpasses generic-boundaries by creating destabilizing effects. She criticizes high theory for excluding women's voice and experiences. As a result, she proposes to revisit the

texts written by women of different times and places, which present fluid paths to us. This study tries to decipher how women's experience from different parts of the world reveals similarities in subject formation processes, and how these creative texts allow academic reading through which both the writer and the reader have an inclination to reevaluate her / his subjectification processes. I share Braidotti's enthusiasm about feminist texts which create a sense of justice and recognition to get rid of the unpleasant position of not being recognized.

Although Deleuze's understanding of becoming operates against the dominant canon, it is still a project within philosophy. Feminist thinkers focus on an extensive transformation through bringing life and theory together. Reminding Homi Bhabha's concept of mimicry, which is a repetition with a difference in postcolonial contexts, Braidotti highlights how feminism runs through "creative mimemesis" as a way to stimulate counter-memories. In Braidotti's words: "Memory thus activated is a time-bomb placed under the driver's seat of phallocentrism; it will undo the main effects that this system has upon its minority subjects: wilfully instilled amnesia, symbolic misery, lack of self-representation" ("Nomadism with a difference" 312). A counter-memory allows women's longing for alternative ways of subjectivity to come true as it is "the process of refusing to forget, or forgetting to forget."

The concept of counter-memory is highly useful to analyse the novels in question as they are the products of women who write against the grain. As Lisa Baraitser puts it in her article "Nomadic Subjects and the Feminist Archives:" "part of Braidotti's method . . . is retentive, without this having anything to do with repetition. Her memorization is an active rewriting of the place of women and of feminist thought, in order, like the impulse that drives Luce Irigaray's work, to bring women into speech"(179). The works to be analysed in this dissertation present both the situatedness of women and fluidity of their subjectivities. The novelists tell the stories of women with a female accent and consciousness. However, the protagonists are not

presented as the weaker leg of the dichotomous thinking. Their sexual difference is a positive one releasing /freeing the women from the limitations of Western philosophy's binary thinking. This positivity works in Braidotti's perception of difference making it meaningful to approach these women's characterisation through her theoretical universe. Baraitser appreciates Braidotti's teaching for theorising difference as a positive concept. As she states, rejecting the binary thinking, Braidotti offers:

[a] different difference, not a difference thought of as what is different from the abject other, or difference as endless deferral, or difference between two binary terms that, of course, turn out to be only one term, but difference from what is also like you, difference as a form of multiple becomings, difference "released from the hegemonic framework of oppositional, binary thinking within which Western philosophy has confined it." (179)

The dissolution of binaries leads to a genuine free interplay of signifiers in a non-hierarchical manner. In such a context, the direction of human subjectivity is never pre-determined or is never subject to limitations.

Difference results in fluid subject positions. This fluidity, which is devoid of borders and dichotomous thinking, owes its strength to the concept of rhizome, too. Braidotti borrows this term from Deleuze and Guattari, and the notion of rhizome functions hand in hand with nomadic subjectivity and counter-memory. Deleuze and Guattari consider the rhizome as an assemblage, which works outside the boundaries of dichotomous thinking. It is an "anti-genealogy." They clarify their take on rhizomatic thinking in the discussion of subjectification processes, by contrasting it with the concept of mimicry. Mimicry necessitates something to be mimicked in essence, but human agency cannot be reduced to imitating what is already there. They use the Pink Panther example to clarify their stance: "The Pink Panther imitates nothing, it reproduces nothing, it paints the world its colour, pink on pink; this is its becoming-world, carried out in such a way that it becomes imperceptible itself, asignifying, makes its rupture, its own line of flight, follows its 'aparael evolution' through to the end" (*Thousand*

11). While mimicry restricts alternatives, rhizome presents limitless possibilities of becoming.

Deleuze and Guattari illuminate what rhizome is more clearly in the image of a plant as it is already a term borrowed from botany. A plant despite being rooted in the soil, interacts with the wind, human beings and animals in a rhizome. It is not a hierarchized but a rhizomatic contact exemplified by the relation between the wasp and the orchid:

The orchid deterritorializes by forming an image, a tracing of a wasp; but the wasp reterritorializes on that image. The wasp is nevertheless deterritorialized, becoming a piece in the orchid's reproductive apparatus. But it reterritorializes the orchid by transporting its pollen. Wasp and orchid, as heterogeneous elements, form a rhizome. (*Thousand* 10)

Deleuze and Guattari reject the idea of imitation / mimicry in this relationship, but underline the state of “a becoming-wasp of the orchid and a becoming-orchid of the wasp.” Each becoming deterritorializes one and reterritorializes the other. This is not imitation or resemblance but “only an exploding of two heterogeneous series on the line of flight composed by a common rhizome that can no longer be attributed to or subjugated by anything signifying” (10). They evolve in parallel without having “absolutely nothing to do with each other” as Remy Chauvin also puts it (qtd. in *Thousand* 10).

The image of the rhizome stands in opposition to the image of the tree which has dominated “Western reality and all of Western thought, from botany to biology and anatomy, but also gnosiology, theology, ontology, all of philosophy” (18). While the tree has a hierarchical shape with its branches and twigs extending from its trunk, rhizome grows sideways avoiding hierarchisation. It functions to connect not to separate. Rhizome is about parallelisms, multiplicities, co-existence, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. It is not an arborescent model, but a plateau which is “always in the middle, not at the beginning, or the end” (21). Deleuze and

Guattari list several principles of rhizome in *A Thousand Plateaus*. The first two principles “connection and heterogeneity” link their discussion of the arborescent model with Chomsky’s linguistic trees, and they criticize confining the language in dichotomous thinking through which multiplicity becomes impossible. Chomsky’s S symbol results in linguistic models that are not abstract enough to connect “a language to the semantic and pragmatic contents of statements, to collective assemblages of enunciation, to a whole micropolitics of the social field” (7). A rhizome, on the other hand, “ceaselessly establishes connections between semiotic chains, organizations of power, and circumstances relative to the arts, sciences, and social struggles” (7). It decentres the language creating various ‘dimensions and registers.’ A language can only be closed upon itself when it intends to work as ‘impotence.’ The women’s semi-autobiographical novels to be discussed in this study present connections through their memories (counter-memories) rather than the dichotomous thinking. Deleuze and Guattari believe the short term memory, part of which contains forgetting works in a rhizomatic way as “it merges not with the instant but instead with the nervous, temporal, and collective rhizome” (16). They define long term memory as “family, race, society, or civilization” which “traces and translates,” but its translation acts in an untimely way from a distance lacking instantaneity. Short term memory, on the other hand, enables the women writers to write against the constraints of long term memory.

Multiplicity as the third principle of the rhizome rejects any kind of contact with the One as either subject or object. In Deleuze’s and Guattari’s words: “A multiplicity has neither subject nor object, only determinations, magnitudes, and dimensions that cannot increase in number without the multiplicity changing in nature” (*Thousand* 8). While the concept of unity signals the triumph of a signifier and its tendency to form a structure, multiplicity as a feature of rhizome underlines the fact that “[t]here is not even the unity to abort in the object or “return” in the subject” (8). Problematizing the relationship between the signifier and the signified

relates to the fourth Deleuzoguattarian principle of rhizome, 'asignifying rupture,' which stands in opposition to "the oversignifying breaks separating structures or cutting across a single structure. A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines" (9). It does not separate but brings together various signification processes. The ruptures will always find a way to tie back in a multidimensional way.

Rosi Braidotti, like Deleuze and Guattari, believes that rhizomatic thinking is a means to escape "the linguistic-semiotic vicious circles of absence and negativity" ("Intensity" 178). 'Cartography and Decalcomania' as the fifth and sixth Deleuzoguattarian principles of rhizome also deny "any structural and generative model" starting with Chomsky's tree and restating the mutual relationship between the wasp and the orchid standing in contrast to it. They once again criticize the teleological structures, which are taken for granted as readily available. While "[t]he tree articulates and hierarchizes tracings; tracings are like the leaves of a tree" (*Thousand* 12). Unlike the structure of a tree, a rhizome "is a map, not a tracing." It has several entrances and exits; it does not trace a predetermined path. These principles dethrone psychoanalytical cartographies, which intend to define human experience according to 'ready-made tracings.' Deleuze and Guattari exemplify the failure of psychoanalysis by referring to Melanie Klein, who confines Little Richard's experience within Oedipal tracings. They believe psychoanalysts break human beings' maps and once someone's rhizome is broken there is no desire left. Thus, trying to categorize human experience is the death of their possibilities taking the power of agency from them. As an alternative to psychoanalysis, they offer schizoanalysis which "treats the unconscious as an acentered system, in other words, as a machinic network of finite automata (a rhizome), and thus arrives at an entirely different state of the unconscious" (18). Instead of deciphering the already structured unconscious, "the rhizome is precisely [the] production of the unconscious" (18). 'New statements' and 'different desires' are welcome in this production process.

These ideas are relevant to the claims of this study as the protagonists of transnational writers are after their possibilities to *become* by getting rid of the boundaries of tracings. The works of the women writers in question display rhizomatic writings proving the Deleuzoguattarian claim: “There is no difference between what a book talks about and how it is made” (*Thousand* 4). Each writer gives shape to their subjectivity through their work, but this study will only focus on the formation of the protagonists leaving the biographical discussions aside. As Deleuze and Guattari voice it, we should focus on “what [a book] functions with, in connection with what other things it does or does not transmit intensities, in which other multiplicities its own are inserted and metamorphosed, and with what bodies without organs it makes its own converge” (4). This dissertation intends to analyse the novels by appropriating this attitude to reading the texts by focusing on how each protagonist’s unique experiences have been brought together as assemblages functioning as anti-genealogies. For the transnational writer, rhizomatic thinking is a necessity displayed through agreement between the form and content. Rosi Braidotti’s *Transpositions on Nomadic Ethics* presents an example for how ‘zigzagging’ thoughts are presented in a zigzagging format. In her prologue, she states that her “book tracks the zigzagging transpositions of multiple differences across the global landscape of a mediated World” (8). Not only her content but also her style is rhizomatic.

Braidotti’s theory is nomadic, rhizomatic, fluid, and works against the grain. Her work bears similarity to her philosophy in organization. As Deleuze and Guattari wrote their *A Thousand Plateaus* in the form of a plateau revealing their thoughts on a line rather than hierarchizing them, Braidotti’s *Nomadic Subject* turns into a feminist theory archive “that is neither institution nor law, not static.” As Braidotti herself puts it in her *The Posthuman*:

the most striking feature of the current scientific redefinition of 'matter' is the dislocation of difference from binaries to rhizomatics; from sex/gender or nature/culture to processes of sexualization/ racialization/naturalization that take Life itself, or the vitality of matter as the main target. This system engenders a deliberate blurring of dichotomous differences, which does not in itself resolve or improve the power differences and in many ways increases them. In other words, the opportunistic postanthropocentric effects of the global economy engender a negative cosmopolitanism or a sense of reactive pan-human bonding by introducing the notion of 'Life as surplus' and of a common human vulnerability. (96)

Braidotti's *Nomadic Subject* is " 'transpositional' in the way it leaps without ever being chaotic" in addition to being "rhizomatic, performative, transformative" (Baraitser 177). The concept of rhizome binds all concepts of Braidotti's framework and offers nonphallogocentric, Spinozan, Nietzschean and Deleuzoguattarian affirmativity to explain human subjectivity.

Consequently, as I indicated at the beginning of the introductory chapter, this dissertation aims to reveal the subject formation processes in four novels: Buchi Emecheta's *In the Ditch* (1972) and *Second-Class Citizen* (1974) and Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Özdamar's Life is a Caravanserai with two Doors, through one of which I came, and through one of which I left* (*Das Leben ist eine Karawanserei hat zwei Türen aus einer kam ich rein aus der anderen ging ich raus*) (1992) and *The Bridge of the Golden Horn* (*Die Brücke Vom Goldenen Horn*) (1998). Since the social contexts of the novels necessitates understanding diaspora criticism, I tried to elaborate on the concept of diaspora along with the newer terms it breeds such as transnationalism and translocalism. To delineate the dynamics of migrant characters' subjectivity, I consulted Rosi Braidotti's key concepts such as nomadic thinking and subjectivity, counter-memory and rhizome. Also, in deciphering feminine writing Helen Cixous's theories helped me clarify my point. The theoretical tools in this study do not have clear-cut definitions so they are used in different contexts by different scholars. In this chapter, I intended to formulate my own perception of these theories, which will be

in a dialogue with the following chapters. My aim here is not to offer restrictive definitions of the terms in question, but to designate my way of reading the novels by referring to concepts that I believe are “good to think” (Levi-Strauss 89) with.

CHAPTER 3

REMEMBERING HOME IN BUCHI EMECHETA'S *SECOND-CLASS CITIZEN* AND EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR'S *LIFE IS A CARAVANSERAI*

This chapter argues that the way the protagonists of Buchi Emecheta's *Second-Class Citizen* and Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Life is a Caravanserai* revisit their homelands in their imagination displays the reasons behind their migration from their homelands to a host country. Each protagonist has gone through different circumstances forcing them to leave their homelands. These women face patriarchal oppression in their homelands, and this creates the desire to move to another country. Buchi Emecheta's protagonist Adah suffers the results of being born a girl since her society favours boys over girls; she is deprived of basic human rights, and to be accepted as an individual she struggles to go to England to set up a new life. Her escape mainly seems to be in reaction to patriarchal oppression. Likewise, Özdamar's unnamed protagonist, although not explicitly criticizing Turkish society, depicts how her alternatives are limited by patriarchal ways of living. With her desire to become a better actress she thinks that moving to Germany is the best solution. While discussing their conceptualisation of homelands, Rosi Braidotti's term counter-memory will be consulted. Since Braidotti borrows the term from Foucault and builds most of her theory on Deleuze and Guattari, their understanding of memory too will be consulted. Also, the treatment of language in both novels in this remembering process will be discussed since the employment of language creates a sense of home.

Second-Class Citizen is written in third person singular, and the narrative speaks through the protagonist Adah's mind. *Caravanserai* is a first person narrative told by the unnamed protagonist. Each protagonist

recollects her personal memories of homeland without passing judgement on their native culture, and in the process they also reflect on the experiences of the older generation of women, which turns these novels to a feminist genealogy. Although the protagonists do not identify as feminists, Braidotti's theories place the novels in a feminist context. Braidotti believes that "the notion of feminist genealogies ... is the process of thinking backwards through the work of other women" (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 207). She states: "Genealogies are politically informed counter-memories, which keep us connected to the experiences and the speaking voices of some of the women whose resistance is for us a source of support and inspiration." Therefore, how Braidotti interprets and appropriates the Foucauldian sense of counter-memory becomes relevant to explain the protagonists' reality. Consequently, this chapter reveals how the memories of women characters can surpass the subordinate status allocated to them by the patriarchal society. They create their own chances to ceaselessly *become* by referring to Braidotti's understanding of memory, keeping in mind that she builds her perception on Deleuze's minoritarian memory and Foucault's counter-memory. The memory of the minority is written against the memory of the majority. While minoritarian memory signals becoming, the memory of majority has a tendency to overpower the voices of the minority. Likewise, the emphasis of the counter-memory on the specificity of the locations and embodied experiences functions as a threat to the centralized, dominant memories and foregrounds the individual practices of each woman.

Memory studies present numerous understandings of the concept, but exploring these different vantage points is beyond the scope of this study. This study will adopt a Braidottian approach so as to underline how "embedded and embodied memory" plays a role in subject formation processes. Memory is not only about the past, but it is also about the living present. As Rosi Braidotti claims: "Remembering is about repetition or the retrieval of information" (*Transpositions* 165). Basing her argument on Deleuze, she states:

In the human subject, that information is stored throughout the physical and experiential density of the embodied self and not only in the 'black box' of the psyche. In this respect, Deleuze's distinction between a 'majority' and a 'minority' memory is useful in illuminating the paradoxes and the riches of repetition as the engine of identity and coherence of the self. (*Transpositions* 165)

Deleuze states that the centralized knowledge of the phallogocentric subject speaks for the "majority of white, heterosexual, property owning males" (*Transpositions* 165). He has the say in drawing the frame of the central memory and the histories of "women, natives, animals" are disregarded. The protagonists of these novels align with the minority discourse and present the potency of ontological becoming instead of aligning with the majority which represents the power of historical records. As Deleuze and Guattari state: "Of course, the child, the woman, the black have memories; but the Memory that collects those memories is still a virile majoritarian agency treating them as "childhood memories,' as conjugal, or colonial memories" (*Thousand* 293). As Braidotti puts it:

In reaction to this centralized, monolithic memory, Deleuze activates a minority-memory, which is a power of remembrance without *a priori* prepositional attachment to the centralized data bank. This intensive, zigzagging, cyclical and messy type of remembering does not even aim at retrieving information in a linear manner. It simply intuitively endures; it also functions as a deterritorializing agency that dislodges the subject from a unified and centralized location. It disconnects the subject from his or her identification with logocentric consciousness and it shifts the emphasis from being to becoming. (*Transpositions* 167)

Thus, Deleuze's minoritarian memory functions like Foucault's counter-memory by disturbing the sense of one's "unified or consolidated identity" through a deterritorializing agency adopting a non-linear way of retrieving memories. It is not part of the dominant memory, and it highlights the possibility of the human subject to relieve herself / himself from 'logocentric consciousness' to go through a becoming process as the protagonists in *Second-Class Citizen* and *Caravanserai* do. Emecheta's

Second-Class Citizen is written against the background of colonial history and decolonization process; and Özdamar's *Caravanserai* is written against the background of political turmoil in Turkey and Turkish migration to Germany. In these novels the focus is not on the memory of majority, in other words, on official history, but on the personal memories working against "the dominant representations of subjectivity" (*Transpositions* 29). Thus, the protagonists' representation of homeland¹⁶ is a product of their own situatedness, which is inevitably unique and personal.

To portray the protagonists' memory focusing on how the writers use language might be a good starting point as both writers produce their work in a foreign language. More importantly, the language of the novels in question is corporeal, a language growing out of female body and experience which empowers female subjectivity. Rosi Braidotti points out the function and significance of corporeal language:

The starting point for most feminist redefinitions of subjectivity is a new form of materialism, one that develops the notion of corporeal materiality by emphasizing the embodied and therefore sexually differentiated structure of the speaking subject. Consequently, rethinking the bodily roots of subjectivity is the starting point for the epistemological project of nomadism ... The body, or the embodiment, of the subject is to be understood as neither a biological nor a sociological category but rather as a point of overlapping between the physical, the symbolic, and the sociological. (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 3-4)

The protagonists of the novels are embedded in the history and culture of the country they were born in, but they write against the grain by putting their individual involvement into their stories; thus, each novel is a

¹⁶ It should be kept in mind that although this dissertation refers to homeland and host country, it focuses on rhizomatic spaces in Braidottian sense, trying to prove that there is no hierarchical relation between home and host. This study tries to demonstrate how it is possible to create the sense of home in various locations.

product of a unique female subjectivity, which inevitably becomes an example of counter-memory. In the formation of subjectivity, the need for women's solidarity is obvious in both novels, and the presence or absence of female solidarity plays an important role in the protagonists' development. This chapter, while trying to decipher how conceptualisation of home presents the reasons why the protagonists leave their homelands, takes language itself as home or a psychic space of belonging and becoming. Both Özdamar's and Emecheta's protagonists give voice to people from the different segments of community, which enables different discourses to co-exist on an equal footing. The novels with their unique styles and themes highlight the multiple practices of different women, and exemplify the diversity of subject formation processes through which the workings of memory play an important role leading the protagonists to freedom. Reconceptualization of home will be discussed under three subtitles, all of which are interrelated and hard to separate. The first part on "Rewriting Homeland in Feminine Language" will be in dialogue with the following sections of the chapter as it stylistically explains the way the writers construct the image of their homelands.

3.1 Rewriting Homeland through Feminine Language

I had to leave home so I could find myself, find my own intrinsic nature buried under the personality that had been imposed on me. (Anzaldua 16)

Language is a homeland.
(Anzaldua 55)

Language is the means to reflect on memory, and the way it is employed is closely related with how counter-memory is activated since the

employment of language is unique to each subject. Women need to transform the hegemonic language to actualize and give expression to their subjectivity. To overcome the subordinate status the “high theory” allocates to women in Braidotti’s words, they have to create a language of affirmation. She acknowledges that “Lacanian psychoanalysis shows us that there is no such a thing as a mother tongue that all tongues carry the name of the father and are stamped by its register” (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 11). Since all languages are patriarchal and sovereign, acquiring any language causes an “irreparable loss of a sense of steady origin” (11). Braidotti also finds Lacan’s conceptualization of language useful as the unconscious shatters the exclusionary attitudes of “high theory” and opens a space for the marginalized such as “the nonmen, non-white, nonlearned” to experiment with and express their subjectivities. Being a polyglot, Rosi Briadotti borrows from Lacan’s concept of language and extends her theory of nomadic consciousness by focusing on the polyglot’s capability to sceptically evaluate the “steady identities and mother tongues” as “a person ... in transit between the languages” (12). Thus, the position of being a polyglot aligns Rosi Braidotti’s theory with poststructuralist thought, which questions the normativity of ‘high theory.’ Dissolution of steady identities is only possible through creating an alternative affirmative language which will free thought and action from the limitations of binary oppositions. Therefore, women’s language is a product of minoritarian / counter-memory working against the sovereign.

The women protagonists’ memory is activated thanks to the implications of their position of being a polyglot. They move between linguistic sites and create their sense of home by appropriating certain aspects of the languages they have been exposed to. Instead of being limited by the boundaries of a language, they have the ability to enrich their employment of language by borrowing the appealing aspects of the linguistic sites they occupy. The freedom to move between the languages enables them to engage in endless formations and recreate a sense of

home through language. Rosi Braidotti aptly explains the skills of a polyglot:

There are no mother tongues, just linguistic sites one takes her/his starting point from. The polyglot has no vernacular, but many lines of transit, of transgression; some common habits are lost on her/him-for instance to be able to recall in what language s/he chants nursery rhymes, in what language s/he dreams, loves, or fantasizes. The complex muscular and mental apparati that join forces in the production of language combine in the polyglot to produce strange sounds, phonetic connections, vocal combinations, and rhythmical junctions. A sort of polymorphous perversity accompanies a polyglot's capacity to slip in between the languages, stealing acoustic traces here, diphthong sounds there, in a constant and childlike game of persiflage. The shifts are untranslatable, but not less telling. The best gift to give anyone, but especially a polyglot, is: a new word, a word s/he does not know yet. (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 13)

This quotation presents the theoretical background to how this study treats language in both novels, in a nut shell. In many ways, Buchi Emecheta's and Emine Sevgi Özdamar's novels seem to be a fictionalized version of these theories as two polyglot protagonists waver between languages, and both protagonists use a language which is not their linguistic starting point. However, the traces of their 'native tongue' are revealed in songs, nursery rhymes and poems. Different languages take their place in narration in the way the protagonists recall them. The novels portray how protagonists borrow different acoustic qualities from different languages and bring them together. The way they use language also displays an example of nomadic consciousness. They try to achieve the feeling of at-homeness by translocating the linguistic elements of their native tongues to their second languages. Translocation of words, songs, or any linguistic qualities transforms both native and second languages. In this part of the study, I argue that the protagonists' employment of language in the novels is closely related with the process of remembering home, and the rest of the study will follow the discussions in this section to develop the argument.

3.1.1 Bodily experience in *Second-Class Citizen*

Second-Class Citizen is a product of feminine writing exemplifying how the female subject's memory constructs the concept of home through personal involvement. Adah, the protagonist of the novel, consciously makes an effort to re-build herself with a strong will and power to engage in becoming processes. The instances of Emecheta's personal life inevitably appear in the novel; however, the writer and the protagonist are not the same as Emecheta herself declares. In her "Foreword" to *In the Ditch*, the sequel to *Second-Class Citizen*, Emecheta affirmed that "Everything in this book really happened" to her (9), but she focalized on Adah's life as if she was an outsider by using the third person narrator. As I stated elsewhere, by changing the names including her own, "she warn[s] the reader against the confusion between Adah the fictive heroine and Emecheta the writer" ("Personal History" 506): "Adah's eyes are my eyes, her thoughts are my thoughts – but they are the thoughts of some time ago and the thoughts of a younger woman living as Adah was. They would not at all necessarily be the same as my thoughts today" (9). Emecheta, keeping her distance to the story, shuns away from commenting on the events, and objectively reports the events rather than discussing their political correctness. The novel also exemplifies the bildungsroman conventions showing how Adah proceeds to her maturation, and becomes a strong and an emancipated woman who manages to integrate into the social world of London.

Emecheta's "Foreword" to *In the Ditch* highlights the crucial foundations of this study. She states: "My experiences were not, I feel, much affected by the fact that I came from another country and am black. They might well have been (indeed they were) shared by many women, white and black, living in an over-industrialized society" (9). I agree with Emecheta's claim, and attempt to demonstrate that Adah and the unnamed protagonist of *Caravanserai* face similar problems in different contexts. To start with, Emecheta's Adah protests against being positioned at a

lower status because of her gender in Nigeria and because of her race in England. Her story of resistance against the limitations set by patriarchal Nigeria and racially-biased England takes place in both countries, which presents a comparison between England and Nigeria in Adah's conceptualisation of home.

Being a multilingual equips an individual with new abilities and perspectives. However, mastering new languages might involve painful moments, too. Adah, the protagonist, speaks Igbo as her family is Igbo; she can speak Yoruba as this is the language in the colonial city of Lagos, where she lives with her parents. Moreover, she has learnt English as Nigeria was colonized by the British when she was a child and she went through colonial education. Being able to speak English before she arrives in London and having worked in the library of the American Embassy in Lagos, Adah has no linguistic problems in England. Instead, she resents her present situation of living in the same apartment with illiterate Nigerians who cannot speak or write in English¹⁷. Since English has been almost a colloquial language for most Ibos, she looks down on the ones who cannot speak English. Nevertheless, her little daughter Titi is among the ones who are not able to speak English as she is too young to acquire it. Being a chatter box in Nigeria in her native tongue, Titi upsets her mother with her silence in England. Adah realizes the reason for her silence only when one of her friends visits her and tries to make Titi talk by teasing her. Titi at last bursts out in Yoruba "Don't talk to me. My dad will cane me with the belt if I speak in Yoruba. And I don't know much English. Don't talk to me" (SCC¹⁸ 53). Her inability to express herself in English accompanied with the fear of her father makes her silent and removes her lively energy. Thus, Titi's fear shows how not being able to express one's self prevents him or her from engaging in life. The narrator explains why Francis, Adah's husband, wants her daughter to speak in

¹⁷ Adah plays the upper hand in her relation to the other Nigerians. Her attitude and how it is broken will be discussed in Chapter 4.

¹⁸ Hereafter *Second-Class Citizen* will be abbreviated as SCC.

English. As Nigeria has been under Britain's control for a long time, the way one speaks English has been a sign of his or her intelligence (SCC 54). Therefore, Titi is exposed to cruelty by hierarchizing one language over another.

The cruelty of depriving people of speaking in their mother tongue is also stressed by Gloria Anzaldua- a Mexican theorist and a poet-, who has been forced to speak in English in the way the Americans do in terms of pronunciation, stress and intonation. She quotes Ray Gwyn Smith: "Who is to say that robbing a people of its language is less violent than war?" (qtd. in *Borderlands* 53) and underlines how destructive it is to deprive someone of their native language. Inevitably, after this traumatic event Titi has had problems in acquiring both languages. Luckily, although acquiring languages has taken for her more time than it should, she has not been placed in one of the schools for backward children. The narrator's explanation highlights the so-called dichotomy between the colonizer and the colonized, but the novel as a product of a non-British negates the colonizer's so-called powerful status in using language. Emecheta's work not only destabilises the colonizer's status but also the patriarchal sovereignty in language. She appropriates the male dominant discourse and extends its limits by putting bodily practice to the expression.

Like other transnational writers, Emecheta also carries the qualities of her native language to her second language, especially while talking about food such as *boli* and *gari* and clothes such as *lappas*. Frequent use of Ibo or Yoruba words like *kwashiorkor-ridden* body, *koboko*, *kolanut* shows how words are translocated to a new language. As Braidotti clarifies it in her "Writing as a Nomadic Subject," "[n]omadism ... equals multilingualism. Although this entails large doses of lexical contamination and the occasional syntactical debacle, the real 'creolisation' effects have always been ... acoustic. Accents are the traces of [her] multiple linguistic homes" (167). Braidotti emphasizes the vitality

of “writing with an accent” because it reveals one’s own personal history. Adah’s story is interwoven with Nigerian words that are transferred to English. This is a multidimensional issue since there are lots of African languages, and the protagonist Adah speaks only two of them -Yoruba and Ibo- very well, and they come up in her story at different times. Also, the African languages are transferred to English; and there occurs a translational language which is almost like English ‘but not quite.’ When all these dimensions are brought together, a unique language of Adah’s own comes into existence thanks to what I call linguistic translocation.

In the diasporic space of England, African languages find a new land to exist and sometimes work to create a simulacrum of homeland by bringing the qualities of a specific language to another locality, namely to the host country. As the narrator puts it:

One of the peculiarities of most Nigerian languages is the fact that one could make a song of everything. Native housewives used this method a lot. If an older wife of a polygamous marriage wanted to get even with a younger rival who was the favourite of the husband, she would make up all sorts of songs, which were meant as a kind of psychological pressure on the young woman. (SCC 72)

The rhythm of the Nigerian languages is brought to England, to the diasporic space of the Nigerians, and their local customs are carried to a new land creating a translocal experience. The women in the neighbourhood make up songs to belittle Adah as they are jealous of her education, job and success in keeping her children with her owing to her financial situation.¹⁹ Their landlady does not want them in her place anymore. Adah and Francis have to find a new place to stay, which is very hard for a black family with children:

¹⁹ Adah has gone to the Methodist Girls’ School, a prestigious institution in Nigeria and works at a library with a well-paid salary in London. While it is impossible for most of the Nigerians to keep their children with them because of financial problems, Adah can live with her children like a white middle-class woman.

Of course, at Ashdown Street, neighbours would start singing as soon as they saw Adah coming. Most of the songs were about the fact that she and her husband would soon have to make their home in the street. What use would her education be then? The songs would ask. To whom would she show her children off then? It was all so Nigerian. It was so typical. (SCC 72)

As the songs become more direct and more torturous, Adah wants to answer back. However, she does not have the skill to use language in this way anymore:

All this jarred on Adah's consciousness, almost driving her crazy. She had to bear it without responding in kind because, having lived most of her formative years in a mission fee-paying school, she had long forgotten the art of hurling abusive songs at others. (72-73)

The fact that Adah cannot produce these kinds of Nigerian songs somehow demonstrates how attachment or any relation to language may change in time. Adah is alienated from some aspects of the culture she was born into. As Catherine R. Stimpson avers, "we must be aware of how words and meanings and rhythms get displaced and adapted when we pass through the checkpoints of one language to another" ("The Nomadic Humanities"). Instead of expressing herself with the tools of her Nigerian culture, Adah channels her creative energy to a novel, a product of the Western world proving how the polyglot moves between different languages and discourses. The protagonist as a polyglot is a "linguistic nomad" in Braidotti's words. She avows that "[t]he polyglot is a specialist of the treacherous nature of language, of any language. Words have a way of not standing still, of following their own paths. They come and go, pursuing preset semantic trails, leaving behind acoustic, graphic, or unconscious traces" (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 8). At this point, Nigerian songs follow their own paths and find place in a western genre; however, Adah displays the inability to perform in this oral tradition. The protagonist has the traces of the acoustic qualities of the language but cannot produce it.

Adah's aspiration to be a writer and the sources of her inspiration also show that she has translocated herself to English language. *Second-Class Citizen* is also the story of Adah's becoming a writer by adopting English and enriching it with her individuality and cultural background. Adah as a librarian in England is surprised by long queues to borrow and return fictional texts. The library in Lagos is different, people read only textbooks for occupational development there. Fascinated by these people's interest, Adah also starts reading fiction. This helps her improve intellectually and paves her way to become a writer. Also, her employment first in North Finchley Library and then in Chalk Farm Library gives her the chance to become familiar with a feeling of being a first class-citizen. In John Mcleod's words:

Throughout *Second-Class Citizen* libraries are represented as a salve to Adah's misfortunes. At a practical level they offer her work and money, but they are also places where Adah is free to explore imaginatively the World beyond the affiliative constraints of her life in Kentish Town. When Adah takes a job at Chalk Farm Library she becomes part of an inclusive affiliative community and involved in important acts of reading and writing. (107)

In contrast to her experience in North Finchley Library, where she has avoided interpersonal relationships, in Chalk Farm Library she has a bunch of friends, whose existence is also vital in her process of becoming a writer. Thanks to Bill, who orders a book and passes it to Adah and Peggy, they form a reading community, which is supportive of Adah's development. While Adah only knows the Nigerian black writers like Chinua Achebe and Flora Nwapa, Bill introduces her to other black writers like James Baldwin. As Mcleod puts it, their positive communication nurtures a transcultural relationship since the book exchange is among Bill (Canadian), Peggy (Irish) and Fay (a half-caste West-Indian). He believes:

In this way does the library make possible the crossing of borders of race, nationality and gender for the purposes of politicization. Through reading Baldwin Adah learns about

black power and is further inspired to read the works of Karl Marx. Although Bill might appear to be another male authority figure, in truth his relationship with Adah is supportive and between equals. (108)

Reading Baldwin teaches Adah that “the black is beautiful” and she feels empowered in thought and action. Adah’s life in the library helps her discover her ability to easily make friends with others. Socializing with other people and reading a lot enable her to criticize Francis now. Subsequently, she forces him to work to earn their living on her fourth baby’s arrival. This time she wants to breast-feed her baby since she has read how vital it is for the baby’s development and how it decreases the chance to be pregnant again. That is why, she wants to stay home and look after her children. Realizing that she has some quiet time every day in the afternoon, she decides to spare this time for writing.

In fact, breast-feeding has metaphorical importance for Adah’s writing practice which resonates with Helen Cixous’s comments. She equates breast milk with creative energy for writing: “Write? I was dying of desire for it, of love, dying to give writing what it had given to me. What ambition! What impossible happiness. To nourish my own mother. Give her, in turn, my milk? Wild imprudence” (12). As the milk nourishes the baby, writing nourishes the writer. The mutual nurturing relation between the child and the mother is like the relation between the writer and her product. She claims that “[she] was raised on the milk of words. Languages nourished [her]” (20). Over the course of breast-feeding days, Adah buys the book *Teach Yourself to Write*, and writes the manuscript of the book which she will later call *The Bride Price*. “The more she wrote, the more she knew she could write and the more she enjoyed writing. She was feeling this urge: *Write; go on and do it, you can write*” (SCC 164).

When Adah finishes the novel, she knows it does not have a big message to tell the world, but it is an over-romanticised story to which she has added whatever her marriage lacks. In fact, although Adah humbly comments on the importance of her novel what she has produced is

valuable for women's history. Looking at Cixous's comments will underline the importance of Adah's novel: "Worldwide my unconscious, worldwide my body. What happens outside happens inside. I myself am the earth, everything that happens, the lives that live me in my different forms, the voyage, the voyager, the body of travel and the spirit of travel ..." (47). Each unique involvement and awareness has its own value, and putting it in a literary work always deserves appreciation.

Adah keeps on changing as the situations themselves change, and her choices enable her to engage in different becoming processes. She becomes critical and interrogates Francis's inability to transform his identity after having stayed for so long in England. She cannot decide whether to tell Francis about her book or not since showing her book to Francis is like confronting the embodiment of patriarchy. First, she shows it to her friends in Chalk Farm Library, Bill and Peggy, namely the ones who have fostered Adah's writing ability through their reading community. Their intellectual involvement nurtures Adah's writing. Bill appreciates her success and recommends her that she should get published. Peggy also likes the book and finds it humorous. The narrator, obviously communicating Adah's mind, states: "The words, simple not sophisticated at all, kept pouring from her mind. She had written it, as if it were someone talking, talking fast, who would never stop" (SCC 165).

The story which has flourished from her memory encourages and excites her. She tells Bill: "I felt so fulfilled when I finished it, just as if I had just made another baby" (SCC 165). Bill's reply also supports the claims of this study about the uniqueness of each writer's language and the relation between the subjectivity of the writer and the artwork:

But this is how writers feel. Their work is their brainchild; you are the only one in this whole world who could have produced that particular work, no one else could. If they tried it would be just an imitation. Books tell a great deal about the writers. It is like your own particular child. (SCC 165)

Bill's view of taking writing as one's brainchild reverberates in Helen Cixous's comments on writing:

She gives birth. With the force of a lioness. Of a plant. Of a cosmonogy. Of a woman. She has her source. She draws deeply. She releases. Laughing. And in the wake of the child, a squall of Breath! A longing for text! Confusion! What's come over her? A child! Paper! Intoxications! I'm brimming over! My breasts are overflowing! Milk. Ink. Nursing time. And me? I'm hungry, too. The milky taste of ink! (31)

Adah having produced her own child takes a positive step in achieving her uniqueness and with the language she generates she starts to feel at home.

Due to Bill's and Peggy's positive remarks on her book, and feeling comfortable in the atmosphere of their friendship, Adah starts contemplating on how to develop her writing skills:

She would study harder, then, to be a writer. But where would she start? There was such a lot, and such a diverse lot, one had to know to be a writer. She could not write in any African language, so it must be English, although English was not her mother tongue. Yes, it was the English language she was going to use. (SCC 166-67)

There is no comment on her choice to write in English, but it may be because of her desire to be read by more people. Although Adah has learnt English at an early age at colonial schools in Nigeria, she does not feel confident about her competence in English. "But she would not write those big, long twisting words. Well, she might not be able to do those long difficult words, but she was going to do her own phrases her own way. Adah's phrases that's what they were going to be" (SCC 166-67). She has the consciousness of creating a unique language of her own. Towards the end of the novel, the implied author reveals Adah's relation to language, which is also applicable to Buchi Emecheta's style of writing Adah's story.

In a way, by “do[ing] her own phrases,” Adah *igboizes* English with what Emecheta calls ‘emotional language.’ In an interview with Feroza Jussawalla, Emecheta states that her emotional language is Igbo. Although she also speaks Yoruba, her first language is the one to express her emotions. As Jussawalla also highlights, the translational aspects of Emecheta’s language is obvious especially when a character expresses a strong feeling such as anger or joy. Moreover, while the characters are cursing someone there is a poetic language, and it is translation. Emecheta agrees with her:

These are always a translation of my emotional language. My children don’t have that. They can understand the city’s Igbo language. When it comes to the idiomatic, the curses, they can’t understand them. They don’t know that. So when they speak Igbo, they have the social city style. African languages are spoken at a certain level in the city. In the villages, there is an idiomatic language, so you can say, “this is an Igbo person from this village.” (98)

Emecheta’s experiment with language is different from that of the other writers. Her emotional language enters into the language of the host culture as seen in sentences like “She smiled her thanks” (SCC 109). In her own words:

The way I play with the English language, I translate my thoughts from my own emotional language into English, and try to adjust as much as possible. An example of that kind is I don’t say the child says “thank you,” I will say “she dances her thanks.” That is because it belongs to my culture. If I say thank you, I say “thank you and good.” I show a feeling, “She cried her sorrow,” or “she cried her woes.” And so she mourned, or something like that. The verb shows exactly what you are going through. You say in English, “that man is very sad.” We say, “that man is walking his sadness.” (98)

The characteristics in communicating her thoughts and feelings mark her uniqueness as a writer, too. The acoustics and the style of African languages open up a space for themselves in English. Different aspects of

various languages to which the writer has access are moulded in the writer's mind and body resulting in a unique language, which reciprocally changes the identity of the writer.

Adah, the writer also goes through transformation and comes to feel courageous to ask Francis to read her novel, but he despises Adah's work: "You keep forgetting that you are a woman and that you are black. The white man can barely tolerate us men, to say nothing of brainless females like you who could think of nothing except how to breast-feed her baby" (SCC 178). At the end of the novel, Adah who agrees with Bill about calling her work her brain-child can no longer bear Francis's cruelty to burn her book. Her first accomplishment in writing gives her the courage to leave Francis and walk to the freedom of experiencing her subjectivity without the limitations put by him. As a critic focusing on feminine writing Cixous has statements resonating with Adah's skill of writing:

There is a language that I speak or that speaks (to) me in all tongues. A language at once unique and universal that resounds in each national tongue, there flows milk and honey. And this language I know, I don't need to enter it, it surges from me, it flows, it is the milk of love, the honey of my unconscious. The language that women speak when no one is there to correct them. (21)

Francis as a figure trying to stop Adah from using her own language is left behind due to the empowerment Adah has gained through writing. Thus, her dexterity to create a unique language and a literary product contributes to Adah's emancipation from patriarchal oppression exerted on her by Francis, who has always limited Adah's chances in her formation process.

3.1.2 Feminine language in *Life is a Caravanserai*

Just like Emecheta's *Second-Class Citizen*, Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Caravanserai* is also a product of feminine language bringing the woman's bodily experience into writing and transgressing the limits of patriarchal

language. The body of the unnamed protagonist, along with the stories of other women is inscribed into her writing. As I mentioned earlier on page 29, *Caravanserai* is different from earlier literary works by the Turkish migrants in Germany as its themes are not marginalisation or the problems of adaptation process in the host country. Also, it tells a story with women characters from various segments of the society whose characterization unsettles the Westerners' thoughts about Turkish women whom they believed to be stuck at home with no agency because of Islamic rules and traditional values. Intertwined with the young protagonist's story, a clan of women characters depict the power of female agency.

Like Emecheta, Özdamar uses a direct, descriptive, and an almost unsentimental but still an ironic and humorous language. *Caravanserai* talks about the difficulties the women are exposed to in their becoming processes in the homeland, but the tone is not pedantic at all when displaying the troubles of women. I argue that Özdamar's sense of home is not politicized to offer the Westerners their cliché views on the East. As Regula Müller states: "The key to this novel is not knowledge about the oppression of woman in Islam, but rather an interest in a history of Turkish women, which in itself consists of a web of many stories" (qtd. in Ghaussey 2001 146). Stephanie Bird also thinks that Özdamar does not take sides between Germany and Turkey: "If Özdamar's stories point towards German identity being as ethnic as any other identity, she is implicitly denying the possibility of defining national identity in any way other than as historically, politically, and culturally contingent" (164). This is not because of Özdamar's attempt to be fair to each culture, but "because she is questioning the very notion that identity is immutable, defined and constrained by national borders. There are no sides to take, but there are specific explorations to be made" (164). A Braidottian stance on subjectivity also highlights the importance of 'explorations' as they foster the process of *becoming*. Thus, not confining the agenda of this

novel to the Turkish context might be more insightful as it can be taken as an instance of a woman's becoming as a universal theme.

Similar to Emecheta's narrator, the child narrator of *Caravanserai* only knows Turkey, but the novel:

is structured by a transnational author in her forties, Özdamar, who knows Turkey, its traditions and poetry, as well as Europe, particularly its theatre and literature. But most notably, the authorial aspect of the novel's double perspective comes from a mature woman who knows herself and the values her life's experiences have confirmed, values personified in their germinal state by the protagonist of *Karawanserei*. (Johnson 46)

Thus, "both the narrative voice and authorial perspective of *Karawanserei* are female" (Johnson 47). As Sheila Johnson claims, the maturation of the child narrator into a young adult who discovers her sexual arousal emphasizes the novel's 'female centeredness,' but the novel also transcends the gender boundaries by offering a quest for human freedom (47). It inevitably surpasses national boundaries, too. The protagonist's translocal and transnational experience points at a universal desire for freedom.

Emine Sevgi Özdamar claims that she has lost her mother tongue in her motherland; however, she gives life to the images her language has left in her mind in a new land and new language. Her language is not only transnational but also heavily translational directly translating Turkish idioms into German without presenting any explanation, and deterritorializing the meaning, which adds new dimensions to both German and Turkish language. The Turkish imagery, Turkish history via phrasal verbs and common idiomatic expressions find a new arena to show themselves. The novel is a re-reading of Turkish language, history, protagonist's personal history and Turkish guest workers' history in Germany. In fact, Özdamar's use of language is very important not only because she writes in German rather than in her mother tongue, but also because of the way she uses it. As Flotow highlights: "By taking concepts,

names, expressions and syntactic structures from the minority language Turkish and translating them literally into German, she systematically deterritorializes German, producing a German that is understandable but not grounded in German culture—it has been moved out of its territory” (67). Her translational language presents how Turkish idioms and rituals enter into German without any explanation or introduction, and creates an alienation effect for the German. When a German reader reads the novel, s/he reads a familiar yet a foreign language at the same time. This language has its roots in the narrator’s memories in Turkey, and this embeddedness reveals how she recollects the Turkey of those years.

The translational language sets a barrier to the German reader even at the very beginning of the novel signalling its preferred linguistic style. The narrator starts her story in her mother’s womb in a magical realist way. Her mother is going to her father’s place to give birth to the narrator. The protagonist’s father is then a soldier, and her mother’s friend, whom the protagonist will later call the Cotton Aunt, entrusts Fatma, the protagonist’s mother, to the soldiers in the train. The protagonist sets the scene:

At that time the journey was simple, nobody knew the names of the mountains or the rivers, we knew the train is called the ‘black train’ and all the soldiers are called Mehmet, and when they’re sent to war they’re called Mehmetçik. The ‘black train’ was used to fetch them out of their mothers’ wombs and send them, heads shaved, into the empty fields. (*Caravanserai*²⁰ 2)

The protagonist’s metaphorical journey to self-actualization and freedom starts with a literal journey. In fact, this is also a journey to her personal history starting from her mother’s womb. After having introduced Mehmetçik²¹ to the reader, she visualizes them in the fields: “Up, down, fire. ‘Onion,’ yelled the captain, that means left, ‘Garlic,’ yelled the

²⁰ Hereafter *Life is a Caravanserai* will be abbreviated as *Caravanserai*.

²¹ It’s an affectionate name given to any man enlisted in the Turkish army.

captain, that means right, and evening means cleaning the captain's wooden floor”(*Caravanserai* 2). ‘Onion’ means ‘soğan’ in Turkish, it resonates with the word ‘left’ which is ‘sol.’ Likewise, “garlic” is ‘sarımsak’ and its first syllable rhythmically sounds like ‘sağ’ which is “right” in Turkish. The practice, which Turkish people use to teach left and right, is carried to a deterritorialized language. The German readers do not have access to meaning in this language.

Onomatopoeic words also enter into narration in their Turkish version. They are effective in creating the sense of home through sounds as Deleuze and Guattari explain:

Sonorous or vocal components are very important: a wall of sound, or at least a wall with some sonic bricks in it. A child hums to summon the strength for the schoolwork she has to hand in. A housewife sings to herself, or listens to the radio, as she marshals the antichaos forces of her work. Radios and television sets are like sound walls around every household and mark territories (the neighbor complains when it gets too loud). (*Thousand* 311)

The feeling of home can be created by humming, singing or any sound resonating home; thus, the process of remembering home involves all these sounds. The inability to reproduce and remember these sounds is catastrophic according to Deleuze and Guattari: “A mistake in speed, rhythm, or harmony would be catastrophic because it would bring back the forces of chaos, destroying both creator and creation” (311). In the novel, the sounds luckily bring in harmony: a fly goes “vizzzzzzzz vizzzzzzzz vizzzzzzzz” (21); a rooster crows “keeeeeeeekkkkkkrrrrreeeeeeeeeeeeeeee” (51); the sound of the rain is “tip tip tip tip” (54); the sound of yawning is “heiheiheiheiheiheihei” (71), the sound of ripe sunflower seed is “çit çit çit” (79). These onomatopoeic sounds become the part of this literary work, but not through imitation in the traditional sense. As Braidotti emphasizes “[a]gainst imitation rhizomatic music aims at deterritorializing our acoustic habits, making us aware that the human is not the ruling principle in the harmony of the spheres” (*Metamorphoses*

157). The narrator makes use of the sounds in nature to harmonize her narration unsettling the linguistic power of her language in creating her own life account. Natural sounds, and insects and animals that produce these sounds fulfil the function of the non-human in harmonizing one's becoming.

In addition to using strong visual imagery, Özdamar's narration is full of soundscapes portraying the protagonist's memory of home. Like the onomatopoeic words, the constantly repeated words also help to catch the melody of Turkish language, which becomes the manifestation of the narrator's remembering process and they translocate a replica of Turkish rhythm in German language. The Arabic words which have already become a natural component of Turkish language are also subject to repetition. The most concrete form of Arabic words is the 'Fatiha' prayer from the Koran, which is repeated several times. The protagonist does not have access to its meaning, but she is acoustically familiar with it. She also visualizes the prayer:

Looking into my eyes and speaking her Kapadokia village dialect, Grandmother spoke Arabic words that followed each other like a caravan of camels. The caravan of camels collected in my mouth, I spoke the prayers with Grandmother, and so we had two caravans of camels, her camels which were larger than mine, placed them in front, and taught my camels walk. Sitting there, we swayed like camels too. (*Caravanserai* 37)

Neither of them knows what the prayers mean. She visualizes the words as a 'caravan of camels' and strips the words from any potential signification. As Sohelia Ghaussy claims:

The narrator's imitation of her grandmother's prayers is represented by the distinctly physical imagery of the caravan of camels, without turning this image into a mere metaphor. Instead, the image retains its corporeality-camels remain camels-which dislodges the meaning of the narrator's utterance in a nomadic, deterritorialized sense

while preserving the sounds and body of the words.
("Feminine Language"10)

The words that are incomprehensible for the protagonist create an extra-linguistic space; though the prayer is constructed through language, its incomprehensible nature for the girl adds another dimension to its function. Moreover, the prayer has a rhythm and melody, which is also important to mark a territory in Deleuzoguattarian sense. As the birds mark their territory by singing, human subject also marks its territory through sounds. The Arabic prayers, foreign in terms of meaning and familiar in terms of rhythm, simultaneously occupy the writer's memory as part of Turkish people's daily lives. She keeps the original sound of the Arabic prayer and moves it to a translocal, transnational and translational space.

The ritual of greeting the guests and asking each other how they feel has been written over and over on several pages. Through this excessive repetition, the protagonist might be trying to recall the lively memories of those days. These recurrences create contradictory feelings. Ghaussy asserts that the phrases of greetings are transferred to German "as ever-same expressions like 'how are you,' and 'Praise be to Allah, I'm well'" ("Feminine Writing" 7). She thinks that this over repetition "seems awkward, humorous, exaggerated, and often elicits a sense of impatience and unease" (7). Ghaussy focuses on "the untranslatability of some of the culturally specific linguistic rituals it describes" (7). However, this is a false assumption since this greeting is repeated in the same way in Turkish as well. It is related to remembering home through the melody of words.

Greeting each other also involves Arabic words, which have naturally been transferred to Turkish such as "inşallah, maşallah, amin" with their religious origin, but losing their religious connotations by becoming part of the vernacular language. The untranslated words can be taken as a source of a semantic gap on the one hand, or as a source enriching the

meaning by opening up signification gaps. It can be claimed that the reappearance of the ritual and the similar expressions transport the non-Turkish reader to Turkish language's realm. Thus, deterritorialization is two-fold: Turkish culture is transcribed in German and non-Turkish reader enters into Turkish culture having a translocal, transnational and translational experience. This ambivalence signals the impossibility of fixed identities as cultural identity markers like national rituals lose their firm ground in this narration.

In addition to the rhythm of onomatopoeic words and the repeated words, the integration of poems and songs strengthens the musical quality of language while revealing the memory of the protagonist's childhood. Different sounds are brought together in a non-hierarchical frame. For example, Orhan Veli's poetry in the narration might pose a challenge to canonical literature since it emphasizes the importance of the ordinary. He is a pioneer in starting the poetic movement which represents the daily events by using vernacular language in poetry.

The novel's dialogue with musical arts draws attention. Her father wants the protagonist to sing for him. He likes classical Turkish music having lines like: "Oh, let her be coy and flirtatious. / Where we are together. / Tender and sensitive, spoilt and pampered / my life fire and flame" (*Caravanserai* 96). The protagonist's mother relates that "that song was written by a sultan," and this makes the protagonist think that the sultan and the people around him had a moment similar to theirs. Thus, music brings the past and the present, and the ruler and the ruled together. Still, diverse types of music underline differences in life styles. While singing classical songs they look into each other's eyes, but the protagonist does not look into her grandmother's and brother's eyes as they do not join in singing. This signals a loss of communication between the protagonist, her mother, her father and her grandmother: "Grandmother . . . listened to us as though she was sitting at a table with people who spoke a foreign language" (*Caravanserai* 96). This displays

that even within the official boundaries of a country or even within the same family circle, there are different languages, sounds and rhythms appropriated by people. The songs create a similar alienation effect for both the German reader and the grandmother, who is more familiar with the culture of the central Anatolia. Thus, the same language can also create alienation within the boundaries of a country.

Unlike her grandmother, the protagonist is familiar with the songs and her memory is activated by remembering bodily experiences:

Our voices had to tremble while we sang and fetch other foreign voices out of our bodies to help. We sang, the songs wept and held their eyes over two deep wells. But to make the songs cry we had to do very serious work. The notes that made the songs cry needed new notes every day in order to cry. The notes ran along a weeping rope strung across the sky between two minarets, our bodies and emotions had to let the notes run along this rope without falling off. The last song we sang was always funny. Light-hearted, dancing, unreliable. (*Caravanserai* 97)

While singing, their own voices intermingle with the voices of many others and feeling the song requires an effort. The music provides a means to go through catharsis and relief in the end. The protagonist recalls her childhood memories as soundscapes.

The narrator's memory of Turkish language's musicality is consolidated by the reference to Zeki Müren, a famous Turkish singer and composer, who is called "the Sun of Art." His shimmering stage costumes and heavy make-up transgress the gender boundaries. People think he is 'different,' but everybody likes him. His words are quoted by the narrator: "My mothers, my sisters, here I am. Eat me, devour me, bite me. Have you ever seen a man as sweet as I am?" (*Caravanserai* 132). Zeki Müren challenges the heteronormative gender roles, and his performance creates a relieving psychic space for women, who happily listen to his songs and watch his dance performance. Just after mentioning Zeki Müren's matinee, the narrator talks about the popularity of the military band in

their neighbourhood. The sounds of military band also find linguistic representation: “tist tat tist tat tist tat tatara / tatara tatara” (*Caravanserai* 133). As Braidotti asserts “[i]n music, time can be heard. It is a pure form of time through the mediation of the rhythm. This, in a nutshell, is its relevance for nomadic subjectivity” (*Metamorphoses* 154). Proving Braidotti’s claims, the protagonist recollects times when Turkey had a military government with its strict rules limiting the freedom of people, through different rhythms representing very contradictory things. While Zeki Müren’s performance represents transgression, the military band signifies the power of the military government, and their juxtaposition creates an alternative site of becoming. As Braidotti highlights:

Music increases the intensity of becoming: it is about crossing as many thresholds of intensity as the subject can sustain. All becoming is transgressive; it also aims at approaching the imperceptible, the unthinkable, the audible. Just as writing, for Deleuze, can engender becoming by being intransitive, so music can express affectivity, immanence and dissolution of boundaries. Music is constant becoming in its refrains and rhythmic narrations. It makes audible the irreducibility of in-between spaces, polyphonic hybridization, multiple sonic interferences. (*Metamorphoses* 157)

Here, the hierarchy between Zeki Müren’s performance and the military power dissolves, and the protagonist presents how contradictory sites are brought together. Her family’s dislike of men in uniform and how young women admire them are juxtaposed. The novel skilfully brings the alternative site created by Zeki Müren’s matinee and the military band representing the oppressive rule in the country together. This diversity of perceptions and experiences are influential in the protagonist’s becoming process.

The protagonist’s visit to her uncle’s village and the language she has acquired there also reveal how the pronunciation, cadence and emotion of the words are on a fluid ground. While leaving the village, she states:

“I kissed my uncle’s hand with my mouth, under my tongue I had fastened this city’s dialect, these people’s strange song of life” (*Caravanserai* 35). Her uncle thinks that this city girl will forget them; however, she remembers them in their own rhythm and reflects their language as it is. When she turns back home, what she has been exposed to in the village puts a distance between her and her mother:

I said, “Mother, I’m back.” My mother stood facing me, but I couldn’t put my arms around her. Between us stood a wall made of the strange dialect I had brought back under my tongue from the Anatolian city. My mother said, “Don’t talk like that, you have to speak İstanbul Turkish, clean Turkish, again, understand, school starts in two days. ... “Say Anneciğim! Not Anacığım.” (*Caravanserai* 36)

Despite the protagonist’s mother’s attempt to silence different voices, the narration embraces various dialects and skilfully blends multiple aspects of language. The protagonist has brought the rhythm of the village to the city. Proving that the linguistic shifts can occur even without leaving one’s country, whatever she has acquainted herself with moulds into her identity. The narrator gives the protagonist’s mother’s choices without any commentary, but her subtle criticism of her mother’s elitism in choosing classical songs and forcing her to speak ‘clean’ Turkish draws attention.

Both novels display how each writer employs a unique language by challenging the patriarchal limitations they are exposed to. They create their own ways of speaking, which fosters their unique ways of becoming. The rest of the discussion will be developed by keeping both writers’ nomadic consciousness and language in mind. Exploring “Female genealogy and solidarity in relation to counter-memory” will add up to the discussion of how homeland is depicted.

3.2 Female Genealogy and Solidarity in Relation to Counter-memory

Helene Cixous's call to women to write their bodies becomes more meaningful when we focus on the genealogy of female writing. As Braidotti emphasizes, experiences of older generations of women and their entry into writing pave the way for contemporary women writers. Despite her familiar emphasis on writing the woman's body, Braidotti has a different stance on evaluating the politics of location from Cixous and Luce Irigaray, whose works take Virginia Woolf's dictum: "As a woman I have no country" central to their works. However, Braidotti believes that this ambivalent situation of not having a country disregards the underprivileged women's miserable conditions. That is why, highlighting the importance of politics of location, she focuses on an "embedded and embodied" discourse in defining feminist genealogy, which functions as counter-memory. While observing the feminist genealogy, Braidotti has a broad spectrum to locate the history of woman's writing:

In defending this notion of feminist genealogy, I am collapsing the distinction between creative texts and academic or theoretical ones. It seems to me that the strength of many feminist texts lies precisely in their ability to combine and mix the genres, so as to produce unexpected, destabilizing effects. I would like to propose that we read feminist texts written by others-women of other places and other times-as open-ended paths that are still available to us, still calling out to us. (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 207)

As Braidotti claims, regardless of their genres, all the feminist works become part of the feminist genealogy and enhance the richness of subject formation processes. Tracing the feminist genealogy in the texts demonstrates how counter-memory works and how it creates an alternative discourse. It is a path to self-actualization. Underlining the importance of evaluating each woman's writing within her own specific conditions, I will demonstrate the crucial role that the genealogy of female stories plays in shaping a woman's reconceptualization of home in

Emecheta's and Özdamar's novels. Female writing in the novels and female solidarity among the characters display how the concept of home is reconceptualised.

Neither Emecheta nor Özdamar claims to be feminist writers, but how their protagonists build their subjectivity makes their works apt for feminist discussions. Therefore, referring to the politics of location is necessary while discussing Emecheta's and Özdamar's texts within feminist genealogy since each protagonist showcases different female issues in relation to their local experience. As Braidotti criticizes Woolf for denying locality in her dictum "As a woman I have no country," Emecheta is critical of Western feminism (as explained in Chapter I), which erases the differences stemming from women's localities. Creating a sense of home and belonging to a country is meaningful for Emecheta's and Özdamar's protagonists. Thus, they are embedded in the limitations as a result of location but still have a chance to achieve freedom.

3.2.1 Women's Legacy and the Need for Women's Solidarity in *Second-Class Citizen*

The colonial rule, as a product of Western culture, played a restrictive role in women's lives in Nigeria. Before the colonial rule women were not subordinate to men in Nigeria, but they had a complementary situation. In traditional Igbo society, into which Buchi Emecheta and also her protagonist Adah were born, women and men shared the political power in the precolonial era with dual-sex political system as I stated on page 16. Men and women used to have different responsibilities in different spheres of life that completed each other. Damilola Taiye Agbalajobi acknowledges that there was gender discrimination or oppression of women before the colonial rule, but it is obvious that the imperial rule made inequalities more heard and sharper (qtd. in Erunke and Shuaibu 2). With the colonial administration a new system called indirect rule was set. The traditional leaders, who were generally elected with respect to

their age, wisdom, ability or royal descent, were replaced by warrant chiefs who were appointed by the British rule to each neighbourhood and who were not respected at all as Nigerian people “had no traditional claim to them” (Falola & Heathen 113). Adiele Afigbo emphasises that there were times when the British asked them to elect their own leaders, but they feared that their true leaders would be murdered by the British. So as warrant chiefs, they voted for people who were unimportant to them (qtd. in Falola & Heathen 114). The distress caused by the colonial rule was enhanced by the indirect rule, which caused many riots among Nigerians. In this turmoil, women were able to keep their tradition of living in solidarity, and they protested against the deterioration in their rights and living standards showing the power of their agency.

Adah has been raised by the traditional Igbo society on the one hand, and the colonial rule’s teachings on the other. While the women of Igbo society actively engage in production and earning money, the colonial rule teaches women to be loyal, meek and mild, and proposes that staying at home to look after their children is the best alternative for women. Adah’s characterization also involves these contradictory states. Instead of causing a crisis, this multiplicity teaches Adah how to adapt to the new situations and helps her to beat the moments of crisis. Emecheta’s writing is obviously imprinted with Nigerian oral tradition, and this oral tradition enters into the novel as a Western genre. Thus, she reconciles what she inherits from her elders with the new circumstances she goes through.

Obioma Nnaemeka in her article “From Orality to Writing: African Women Writers and the (Re)Inscription of Womanhood” explains that before written literature there was oral literature in Africa. She states that this oral tradition was women’s. She traces the process of oral culture’s entrance into written culture. As she puts it: “In African oral tradition, women were very visible not only as performers but as producers of knowledge, especially in view of oral literature’s didactic relevance, moral(izing) imperatives and pedagogical foundations”(138). She explores

numerous genres in different African languages performed by African women such as panygeric poetry, elegiac poetry, lullabies, dirges, songs, and love poems. To understand the present status of female writing, this tradition should be recognized. Emecheta explains how this story telling tradition survives in her work:

[T]he Ibo story teller was different. She was always one's mother. My Big Mother was my aunt. A child belonged to many mothers. Not just one's biological one. We would sit for hours at her feet mesmerized by her trance like voice. Through such stories she could tell the heroic deeds of her ancestors, all our mores and all our customs. She used to tell them in such a way, in such a sing-song way that until I was about fourteen I used to think that these women were inspired by some spirits. It was a result of those visits to Ibuza, coupled with the enjoyment and information those stories used to give us, that I determined when I grew older that I was going to be a story teller, like my Big Mother. ("Feminism with small 'f'" 173-4)

As a result of this engagement, she becomes a story teller. The protagonist in *Second-Class Citizen* transfers this oral tradition into written format. Although the novel is written mainly in realistic details, magical realist elements also find their place, most probably as a result of oral tradition and customs the protagonist has been exposed to. Adah's father believes that Adah is his mother's returned spirit:

When Pa's mother was dying, she had promised Pa that she would come again, this time as his daughter. She was sorry she could not live to bring him up. She died when Pa was only five. She would come again, she had promised, to compensate for leaving him so young. . . . Pa did not forget his mother's promise. The only reservation he had was that he did not want a girl for his first child. Well, his mother was impatient! Ma had a girl. Pa thought Adah was the very picture of his mother, even though Adah was born two months prematurely. He was quite positive that the little, damp-monkey like thing with unformed face was his "come back mother". So she was loaded with strings of names: "Nne nna", "Adah nna", "Adah Eze"! (SCC 13)

Thus, there is no straightforward overlap between the names and herself. Right from the beginning she occupies a fluid subjectivity carrying the inheritance of her female ancestry in her body. In a way, female genealogy is inscribed into her body from the very beginning of her life. Her talent to tell stories might be a related fortune. Whenever she is in trouble, she talks about an unnamed but capitalized Presence who she thinks guides her way. In the story, she is not granted with the privilege of going to school or any other niceties of life. However, the Presence inside her tells her that she can actualize her dreams of receiving education and going to England. She feels powerful with the Presence's presence. I believe that the capitalized Presence is her grandmother's soul carrying the aspects of woman lineage in their family as Ashley Dawson also puts it (100-101). In a patriarchal society, women still have the power of agency. Adah inherits the strength of women who initiated the Women's War on the colonial system, which tried to diminish the rights and wealth of Igbo women. Whenever she is in trouble, she feels powerful thanks to this ambiguous Presence, which can be taken as the incarnation of genealogy.

The grandmother does not physically exist in the narration, but her Presence is spiritually transferred to the story. Adah's story starts with a feeling of the Presence, which inflicts her with the idea of going to England and receiving education there. Unfortunately, landing in England frustrates her so much that she loses the Presence at some point:

She wished the Presence was still with her to give her a clue but it seemed to have deserted her when she landed in England. Was the Presence her instinct? It had been very active in Nigeria. Was that because in Nigeria she was nearer Mother Nature? (SCC 55)

As the quotation reveals Adah loses contact with the Presence because of being distanced from her Mother Nature, which provides a comforting space for one's becoming. This alienation weakens the creativity of her inner reservoir as well. Towards the end of the novel, Adah starts to feel the Presence again as she becomes more sophisticated in evaluating her

life. “She was becoming aware of that Presence again – the Presence that had directed her through childhood” (SCC 150). She has connected herself to the sense of continuity in women’s genealogy. The power she gains through the Presence makes her courageous enough to reshape her life.

The Presence seems to be the only support Adah has; however, she needs more than that. Unfortunately, because of her own mother’s negative attitude towards her in early childhood, she does not trust women, and she does not have the chance to enjoy female solidarity, which she yearns for throughout the novel:

She thought that it was these experiences with Ma so early in life that had given her such a very low opinion of her own sex. Somebody said somewhere that our characters are usually formed early in life. Yes, that somebody was right. Women still made Adah nervous. They had a way of sapping her self-confidence. She did have one or two women friends with whom she discussed the weather, and fashion. But when in real trouble, she would rather look for a man. Men were solid, so safe. (SCC 11-12)

When her mother dies without seeing Adah’s first baby, she feels betrayed once again and loses the chance of her mother’s solidarity forever. Although *Second-Class Citizen* refers to oral traditions of Nigerian women and presents alternative ways of feminism, women’s solidarity is absent in the novel. Adah has always been on her own, and she does not have access to what Braidotti calls vital:

The recognition of the sameness of our gender, all other differences taken into account, is a sufficient and necessary condition to make explicit a bond among women that is more than the ethics of solidarity and altogether other than the sharing of common interests. Once this bond is established and the epistemological common grounds of the feminist community are recognized, the basis is set for the elaboration of other values, of different representations of our common difference. (*Nomadic Subjects* 2011 161)

As Braidotti suggests, before focusing on differences, acknowledging the common needs and interests of women is necessary. Only then would it make sense to focus on different ways of *becoming*. In this patriarchal world, an atmosphere where “women support women” is essential. The solidarity between women with an emphasis on their common grounds creates the comfort zone for them.

Accordingly, Braidotti’s understanding of feminism can be related with Emecheta’s ‘small f’ as she talks about Nigerian community having their own ways of easing each other’s lives. Adah unfortunately lacks this comforting zone even in Nigeria with an unsupportive family. Adah has had some help in the early days of her marriage from her husband’s family whom she has supported financially in return. Her extended family treats her as a source of income, and they do not show any affection to Adah and do not recognize her individuality. Seeing that all the decisions about her life are taken by Francis’s father and mother, she chooses to escape this limiting life she is exposed to. As Lisa Marie Carlson puts it, Adah sees going to England for education as a good excuse, which will enable them to get rid of patriarchal suppression (82). However, in London she is on her own and yearns for the help of an extended family while raising her children, not particularly Francis’s family, but any embracing and affectionate family. Francis is not willing to look after their children. Even her relationship with Francis requires the extended family’s intervention as he becomes extremely irresponsible upon getting rid of his family’s restrictions. In Nigeria, he could not beat Adah as the elder women would have hit him back, but in London free of traditions, he puts Adah in trouble.

Just as in Nigeria, she is the breadwinner of the family in London, too. Francis does not want to look after their children or work and earn money, which puts Adah in a miserable situation. She compares bringing up children in England and in Nigeria:

Most Nigerian wives would say that they had to send their children away because they lacked suitable accommodation for them, and there was a great deal of truth in this. But what they would not admit was that most of them were brought up in situations, far, far different from the ones in which they found themselves in England. At home in Nigeria, all a mother had to do for a baby was wash and feed him and, if he was fidgety, strap him onto her back and carry on with her work while that baby slept. (SCC 46)

In Nigeria it is easy and simple to look after children, and generally surrounded by big families women can receive a lot of help in the process:

But in England she had to wash piles and piles of nappies, wheel the child round for sunshine during the day, attend to his feeds as regularly as if one were serving a master, talk to the child, even if he was only a day old! Oh, yes, in England, looking after babies was in itself a full-time job. This was difficult for a Nigerian wife to cope with, especially when she realized that she could no longer count on the help the extended family usually gave in such situations. So most Nigerian children born to the so-called “students” were condemned to be fostered away. (SCC 46)

Adah is so busy with mothering several²² young children that she does not focus on her own sexuality. Her gender-specific bodily experiences include labour and breast-feeding, but not sexual pleasure. Francis wants her to see a doctor to deal with her frigidity as he realizes that she does not enjoy making love with him, but she does not know what he talks about. She sometimes manipulates Francis before they have sex, and other instances of their love-making are dominated by Adah’s fear of falling pregnant again.

Adah realizes that Francis hunts for other women, and she behaves as if she did not care; however, on realizing that Trudy, their child-minder, sleeps with him she becomes almost mad. In fact, her anger seems to stem from Trudy’s neglect of Adah’s children. Her trouble with Trudy again reminds her of her desperate need for female solidarity:

²² She arrives in England with her two kids and immediately gets pregnant. The fourth one immediately follows the third, and before leaving Francis she is pregnant with the fifth one.

Among her people, she could have killed Trudy, and other mothers would have stood solidly behind her. Now, she was not even given the joy of knocking senseless this fat, loose-fleshed woman with dyed hair and pussy cat eyes. She belonged to the nation of people who had introduced 'law and order.' (SCC 66)

Trudy neglects Adah's children and is guilty, but her uncontrolled behaviour puts Adah in trouble. She knows that she is overreacting, but she feels alone: "In England she could not go to her neighbour and babble out troubles as she would have done in Lagos, she had learnt not to talk about her unhappiness to those with whom she worked, for this was a society where nobody was interested in the problems of the others" (SCC 66). She lacks the help of the family and the support of female community which she could find in Nigeria. "You don't have the old woman next door who, on hearing an argument going on between a wife and husband, would come in to slap the husband, telling him off and all that, knowing that her words would be respected because she was old and experienced" (SCC 66).

Luckily, her friends at North Finchly library help her create a supporting transnational intellectual space, which enhances her way to mental emancipation. Adah's characterization presents the daily concerns of a young black woman with several young children in London instead of presenting sophisticated theories on feminism. However, the incorporation of oral tradition in Adah's story and her emphasis on the importance of female solidarity underline the importance of the genealogy of female writing.

3.2.2 Women's Tradition and Solidarity in *Life is a Caravanserai*

As Buchi Emecheta integrates the oral tradition of Nigeria to the novel as a Western genre, Özdamar integrates the stories of older generation Turks to Western, namely to German bildungsroman. Her entrance into the

genre extends the limits of it as she hybridizes it with her native language and style. The text's hybrid quality creates a rhizomatic space where the protagonist recollects the memories of her homeland in a non-hierarchical way, and what she has in the end enriches her possibilities for *becoming*. Having a similar stance to Emecheta, Özdamar does not claim to be a feminist. She does not dislike or criticize the feminists, but she believes that to be called a feminist one has to invest energy in it and should live like a committed feminist. She thinks feminism is an ideology, which should be respected, and states she would be happy if everyone could become feminist including men; however, she defines her works as novels about women (*Chronicles*). Nevertheless, I believe that a novel can be regarded as feminist despite the writer's claims. *Caravanserai* obviously raises questions about the feminist genealogy with its stories about women by a woman.

The title of the novel and the first scene starting on the train present the overused metaphor of life as a never-ending journey. Despite the cliché metaphor, the novel is innovative in its handling of that journey. This is an incessant passage whose agents are women, whose story is told by a woman. From the first pages to the last, female solidarity shows itself, which plays an influential role in the protagonist's development. The importance of a supportive female community to set the ethical values is also highlighted by Braidotti, and the protagonist's progress proves how she enjoys the advantages of having reference points to accept, extend and surpass. Cotton Aunt appears at the beginning of the novel while helping Fatma- the protagonist's mother- to get on the train and advising the soldiers to take care of her. An aunt helping the pregnant mother signals that it is going to be a women-centred novel. The protagonist "los[es] consciousness and only [wakes] up one August morning and crie[s] immediately" (*Caravanserai* 3). She wants to go back to the mother's womb, and watch the films with soldiers as she wonders where they are and what they are doing.

For the protagonist, looking at life from the mother's womb is safer and more comfortable than experiencing it. Fatma gives birth to the protagonist at her father's place populated by many women since her father has five wives, one of whom was Fatma's dead mother. The protagonist finds herself in a world of women at the beginning of her life. Özdamar mixes the corporeal experience of giving birth with an abstract journey, and concretizes it through writing about the bodily experience. The absurdity of a narrating embryo is presented in a natural frame combining the fantastic with the real. As she is sucking her mother's breast, a bee stings Fatma's hand and she cries out: "Mother, I'm on fire!" (*Caravanserai* 4). The sentence uttered out of pain gains a sexual connotation in the other women's mouth as they say "Every woman's on fire if her husband has been a soldier for four years." While the baby and her mother are crying, the other women are laughing at the joke. The baby's continuous crying makes these women think that the child has an incurable illness, and they advise Fatma to "take her to the graveyard and lay her into a freshly dug grave and wait." They believe if the baby cries she will live. Fatma takes her daughter to the graveyard with the coachman called crazy Hüseyin whose constant swear words disrupt the atmosphere of their seemingly spiritual but superstitious experiment. When the infant is put to a freshly dug grave, wondering whether keeping quiet or crying is better, she pees and sleeps. Luckily, her grandmother Ayşe appears in the graveyard and takes the infant out of the grave. Her grandmother saves her from death, realizing that the baby has wet herself and this superstitious attempt is cut off.

Starting with her first appearance in the graveyard, the grandmother Ayşe becomes a very influential figure in the protagonist's formative years. She saves the child from death and provides an intergenerational bond through her knowledge, beliefs, practices of religion and rituals. She is more intimate in her relation with the protagonist than her mother Fatma. While Fatma represents the woman yearning for modernization and has a forward-looking perspective on the education of girls, Ayşe is more

conservative. It is Ayşe's bond with the past and tradition that shapes the protagonist's identity. The protagonist's recollection of home is filled with memories of her grandmother since she functions as the embodiment of intergenerational knowledge. Despite her nostalgia for sticking to the past, Ayşe's way of foregrounding bodily pleasure works in the process of the protagonist's liberation from the bodily shame, and guides her granddaughter regarding corporeality.

Grandmother Ayşe transfers the female legacy to the protagonist, which allows for bodily pleasures and helps her get rid of bodily shame. She liberates the protagonist from any repression regarding sexual pleasure starting from her childhood. When it rains heavily for days, the children cannot play 'seksek' (hopscotch) any longer in the street, and they meet in one of the four girls' house every day and play games indoors. They lie on one of the parents' beds and pull up their skirts and pull down their pants and touch each other's genitals. They enjoy it, and before they leave each other they promise to do it the following day, too. When the rain gets heavier and prevents the girls from getting together, the protagonist who stays at home tells her grandmother about their games in shame. However, hearing what her grandmother says, she gets rid of guilt and shame: "That's nothing, when I was as little as you are I used to do shap shap with the girls in the village too" (54). The protagonist is happy to learn that the play of 'box-touching' has a name. As Soheila Ghaussy puts it:

This practice of erotic touching between the girls is not only recognized and condoned by the narrator's grandmother, to whom the girl confesses, but furthermore identified as an activity which her grandmother onomatopoeically labels "Schap schap" to imitate the sound of the action. Sexual awakening is thus put in the context of a female history of (auto- and homo) eroticism which repeats itself over generations. Instead of outlawing the girls' erotic explorations among themselves, *Karawanserei* represents their actions as completely accepted and well-known (though this knowledge is shared among women only). (*Writing the Feminine* 153)

Establishing this intergenerational bonding with her grandmother, the protagonist feels safer by being embedded in female history. As Ghaussy claims, the text is also important for inscribing female sexuality:

Furthermore, and perhaps more important for “writing the feminine” into narratives of female sexuality, Özdamar’s novel makes room in her text for a female version of sexual identity by giving female eroticism and sexuality a (humorous) name, therefore inscribing it into the text of patriarchal denotations, and literally lifting the veil of this repressed narration to show that the version underneath can be shaped from an “other” perspective. (153-4)

The way Özdamar writes challenges the limits of phallogentric language as she unveils the story of the repressed. This onomatopoeic word challenges the patriarchal power in two ways: first by foregrounding the female sexual pleasure, and second by disrupting the hegemony of patriarchal language through the sounds.

There is another occasion where the grandmother Ayşe eradicates bodily shame. At school in İstanbul, having learnt that the girl is from Malatya²³, the teacher calls her a Kurd with a tail behind. The narration does not overstress the event, but only records it. As Hülya Adak puts it:

Das Leben is a bildungsroman that emphasizes the growing emotional, sexual, and political awareness of the female protagonist. More specifically, it is about coming to terms with being a Kurd and a woman in Turkey. In most instances, as the protagonist unsettles, questions, and confronts sexism and racism, she uses sexist and racist expressions against themselves, parodying them, testing their limits, and sometimes appropriating and celebrating them. Hence she explicates how her “Kurdish tail” situated her immediately in the east of Turkey and how she aspired to being a “whore” on seeing that the “whore” of the hamam (Turkish bath) was the most beautiful woman in town. (109)

As Adak highlights, the protagonist compromises with the circumstances in Turkey. She finds ways in order not to be controlled by the dominant

²³ A city in Eastern Anatolia

ideologies, though not necessarily in an explicit manner. She chooses to sit at the back in the class after this event and starts telling the stories her grandmother has told her. This time the teacher scorns her for talking a lot, and she almost becomes a trouble maker in the class in the eyes of the teacher. Once, she raises her index finger to ask for permission to go to the restroom, but the teacher tells her to be quiet, and in the end not being able to restrict herself anymore she suffers from incontinence. She also defecated, and rather than yelling at her, her grandmother explained that “shitting is a gift of Allah” (*Golden Horn* 23). Here, the grandmother acts as a mediator helping her granddaughter relieve herself in a moment of crisis.

As Stephanie Bird claims: “[r]eferences to the body and its functions are ubiquitous in the text. Within the narrator’s family, there is no false shame attached to urination, defecation, farting or awareness of genitals” (191). Bird’s comments highlight the role body fluids play in the construction of subjectivity. Elizabeth Grosz, whose appreciation of the body and bodily knowledge share common grounds with Rosi Braidotti, explains how bodily fluids are the marginalized extensions of the body:

They are engulfing, difficult to be rid of; any separation from them is not a matter of certainty, as it may be in the case of solids. Body fluids flow, they seep, they infiltrate; their control is a matter of vigilance, never guaranteed. In this sense, they betray a certain irreducible materiality; they assert the priority of the body over subjectivity; they demonstrate the limits of subjectivity in the body, the irreducible specificity of particular bodies. They force megalomaniacal aspirations to earth, refusing consciousness its supremacy; they level differences while also specifying them. (*Volatile Bodies* 194)

The marginal status of bodily fluids is evaluated from a different angle by Grosz. She integrates bodily experience in the knowledge formation process, and disrupts the hierarchical supremacy of the mind over the body. She highlights that in their culture “they are necessary but embarrassing. They are undignified, nonpoetic, daily attributes of

existence, rich or poor, black or white, man or woman, that all must, in different ways, face, live with, reconcile themselves to" (*Volatile Bodies* 194). The protagonist's grandmother normalises the marginal status of the bodily fluids in the mainstream discourse and empowers the protagonist in asserting her body. Without explicitly criticizing the system, with an observing eye, the narrator provides a textual ground to show the deficiencies of Turkish educational system on the one hand, and presents a character who appreciates the health and pleasures of the body on the other.

The grandmother does not shun away from talking about sexuality. She talks to her grandchildren about her intimate moments with her three husbands. She tells how her third husband has put her on top while making love, and she felt: "My legs flew up off the ground, then a fire shot like an arrow from my feet through my body and out of my head. My life jumped into the fire with its whole heart. Men's flesh twitched in front of my flesh" (*Caravanserai* 14). The protagonist remembers the grandmother Ayşe's love affairs as an adolescent. Ayşe is articulate about her sexuality, and she also recognizes the children's and the adolescents' sexuality. Seeing that her granddaughter is growing up, she says: "You've gotten big, your blood is boiling. You should wrestle with boys" (*Caravanserai* 205). However, she is still too young to be aware of sexuality, and thus wrestles with her brother. Also, while playing with her little sister, the protagonist sucks her finger, and the grandmother says: " 'Fatma, when are we going to marry her off?' Mother said, 'May a bee sting your tongue, Grandmother.' But Grandmother kept on, 'She's out of control. Someone should put out her fire'" (*Caravanserai* 257). Ayşe with her common sense and maturity becomes aware of bodily needs as explained by Braidotti: "The body is not only multi-functional but also in some ways multilingual: it speaks through temperature, motion, speed, emotions, excitement that affect cardiac rhythm and the like" (*Metamorphoses* 230). The grandmother reads the signs coming from the protagonist's body, and she thinks it is time to let her marry someone. She even talks about the

nephew of the fruit store owner as a good candidate. Ayşe always foregrounds the bodily needs, and celebrates bodily experiences similar to Braidotti, who defends the 'vitalistic materialism' as a product of embodied self. Ayşe plays an important role in the formation of the protagonist's embodied memory.

Although the grandmother Ayşe is a more dominant figure in shaping the protagonist's identity, her mother is also a substantial part of the process. The grandmother Ayşe comes across as a character who is at peace with her roots, body and traditions. Fatma, in contrast, admires Western ways of living, and she herself is in a constant change as their conditions such as the city they live in or their economic status change. Fatma does not want to marry her daughter off, but insists that the protagonist go to school. Raising a child who admires the mad women and the prostitutes, namely the marginal, Fatma also eases the protagonist's way to liberation.

In the novel, diverse life styles in Turkey are presented like the conservative side of the country on the one hand, and the marginal female characters such as prostitutes and mad women on the other hand. While discussing the implications of madness in a radio show, Foucault asserts that madness is a product of language, and even in silence of madness the signifiers of language are still at work. The line between sanity and insanity is blurred in literature as in the example of Don Quixote (*Language* 11); and so is the line between fiction and fact. The women in the neighbourhood seem to be criticising the mad; however in accordance with Foucault's comments, the mad women are part of their lives, which makes it hard to separate the insane from the sane:

Pearl's mother said, 'Ah, Fatma Hanım, your daughter is going to find it hard to get a man, she's too long, too thin.' My mother said, 'She has her eyes open like a crazy woman. My daughter, a girl is supposed to have a languid gaze, why do you open your eyes like a mad woman. The men will be afraid of you.' Then the two of them said, 'The girls learn that from crazy Ayten, no, from crazy Saniye, no, maybe

from that crazy Muazzez, who stands at her window all day too with her eyes wide open, shouting at the men and their goods.' (*Caravanserai* 168)

This quotation does not focus on what these *mad women* say, but focuses on their gestures, which refers to Foucault's emphasis on madness manifested through 'the body itself' which functions "like a language node" (*Language* 38). Foucault interprets Freudian understanding of the role the body plays to make up for the insufficiency of the mind:

Freud, that great listener, clearly understood that our body, much more than our mind, was a wit, that it was a kind of master craftsman of metaphors and took advantage of all the resources, all the richness, all the poverty of our language. (26)

Here, the 'normal' women try to define which gestures make their daughters seem 'abnormal.' The bodily potential the mad women have enables them to transgress the social norms as Stephanie Bird puts it:

Here madness provides an easy framework for explaining a woman who does not confine herself to the norm, given the absence of other explanations, for with puberty even the excuse of the narrator's boyishness seems inappropriate. Yet this absence of explanation is in itself a feature of the narrator's situation; she does not attempt an explanation and does not reflect upon the reasons for or meaning of her reactions. (197)

The protagonist chooses to learn from the mad women; also, she wants to be like a prostitute whom she sees and admires in a Turkish bath.

The protagonist unsettles gender norms with her daily practice. Her desire to go around the streets and come back home late is taken as a boyish habit, and her father asks whether she has become a boy. With her childish naivety she denies having become a boy, but cannot comprehend the gender discrimination in this utterance (*Caravanserai* 110). Transgression of gender boundaries is represented in tune with madness. Her mother scolds the protagonist when she insists on whiling

away the time in the streets: “You’re going to grow a willie, you’re going to grow a willie” (*Caravanserai* 111). Her grandmother too thinks that she has learnt to “throw [herself] into the street” from crazy Saniye. Madness is not marginalized but located at the heart of narration. While trying to save Gülerlina’s ball which rolled down to the river, she hears a boy singing:

“Crazy woman, crazy woman
She’s got earrings in her ears”

Deli, Deli,
Kulakları, küpeli

She thought the boy was singing to her, but then realized that they were yelling at Crazy Ayten. She naturalises being named crazy by her neutral tone, and disrupts the hierarchy between ‘madness’ and ‘sanity’ once again. Here, one remembers Braidotti’s evaluation of Foucault’s ideas on madness: “The proximity of the normal and the pathological demonstrates the point Foucault made in relation to madness and reason: scientific rationality is implicitly normative, it functions by exclusion and disqualification according to a dualistic logic” (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 84). In direct opposition to reason’s tendency to marginalize the different, the narration embraces the marginalized, which allows the protagonist to engage in different ways of *becoming*.

The two sisters who live together in the protagonist’s neighbourhood are said to be mad, too. “People said, ‘One of those sisters is crazy, the other one isn’t, but since one of them is crazy, the other one is crazy too’” (*Caravanserai* 131). The uncertainty about who is mad and who is not dislocates the mind’s superior hierarchical position. Being insane does not stand as a binary opposition to being sane but insanity offers an alternative way of *becoming*. As Deleuze and Guattari aver:

It is wrongly said (in Marxism in particular) that a society is defined by its contradictions. That is true only on the larger scale of things. From the viewpoint of micropolitics, a society is defined by its lines of flight, which are molecular. There is always something that flows or flees, that escapes the binary organizations, the resonance apparatus, and the

overcoding machine: things that are attributed to a “change in values,” the youth, women, the mad, etc. (*Thousand* 216)

Mad people challenge the ‘overcoding machine’ and their stories signal a vibrant counter-memory contesting the monopoly of history. As one of the neighbours says: “In Bursa, crazy people grow on trees” (*Caravanserai* 134). There are also crazy men like the crazy Hüseyn and the old man. The policeman’s neighbour visits this crazy man and the protagonist accompanies them. They find him crouching and holding his penis in his hand, and he calls it ‘goods.’ The protagonist does not understand what he does to ‘his wife with his goods,’ but she knows other words used for penis. She names them and states, “[t]here [are] not many words for woman’s parts” (*Caravanserai* 136). She mentions three slang words used to denote woman’s genitals. Foregrounding a vulgar language to name the male and female sexual organs once again disrupts the memory of the majority / official history since it enables the unofficial / marginal to find representation in the novel.

Some part of the protagonist’s childhood is shared by Seher, the daughter of a construction worker. She is the same age as the protagonist, and her characterization highlights how the protagonist lives outside the norms even as a little girl. Seher starts living with the protagonist’s family to learn how to sew, do the laundry and cook as she is going to marry. Seeing Seher’s bridal trousseau, the protagonist asks her mother whether she will have one, too. Her mother’s answer underlines how the protagonist transgresses gender boundaries:

[S]he said I would probably not become a wife, just a woman, because I wouldn’t sew, or cook, or crochet, and my eyes only looked outside. ‘All you do is to take your little box for walks,’ she said, ‘A girl is supposed to sit over her little box and work.’ ‘What about the boys?’ I asked. ‘The boys can take their goods for walks.’ (*Caravanserai* 170)

The protagonist is critical about gender discrimination and hints that she will turn out to be a woman whose becoming will be shaped by her agency not by the social limitations. Instead of joining cooking tutorials at school,

she is willing to go to the market and buy the ingredients for the recipes. Her mother resents her daughter's lack of interest in cooking and desire to go out and walk all day. Ironically, the mother yearns for living like the westerners, which might somehow signal her desire to remove the limitations of the society she lives in. However, she still wants her daughter to live in accordance with the gender roles. She is not aware of the western values such as gender equality but admires the way they dress up and act in the films.

In some pages, the women are heard in Turkish in both German and English versions of the novel. For example, while the protagonist is leaving a neighbour's house after playing with her friends, the neighbour calls out to her mother through the window, announcing that the girl is on her way home in Turkish: "Fatma Hanım, çocuk geliyor" (93). Although the narrator / protagonist does not use her native language Turkish as a medium of narration, the novel is still weaved by bits and pieces of Turkish language: "I ran along her voice, and along my answering mother's voice like over a small bridge that was there just for me. I heard my own steps, saw her eyes looking through the window at me" (93). The words / the sounds create an intimate impression through which Saniye's words construct a bridge of safety between her house and theirs. This bridge and intimacy can only be built through an emotional language (Turkish), not a language of experimentation (German): "In a sweat because of the separation from Saniye and the longing for my mother, I arrived in our room on the third storey. Some of Saniye's shadows came along and attached themselves to the walls of our rooms." On her arrival home Turkish words are heard again:

Grandmother said, 'Did you shake out your worms with Saniye?' and she laid a newspaper on my sweaty back like folded over Şavkı Dayı used to. ... Their voices said AKŞAM OLUYOR (evening is coming). Outside, the world died, only the brief crying of a baby and the evening ezan from one of the minarets slipped into our rooms like the last words of a dying man and went away again. The world shrank to the size of a walnut shell, that was our room. I said very

often, 'Mother, Anne, Anne, Anne, where are you Mother?'(Caravanserai 93-94)

Using the Turkish words demonstrates how one's native language (the language of departure) plays a role in remembering one's homeland. The narrator tries to recall the women's voices in their tone, rhythm and maybe most importantly, affection. Like directly translating the Turkish proverbs into German word by word without translating their connotations, using Turkish words also creates soundscapes.

In later life, the protagonist not only connects with her mother and grandmother, but also with numberless women as the scenes in the Turkish bath reveal. In her grandfather's village, she visits a Turkish bath with her uncle's wife and her grandfather's old wife for the first time. All the women are veiled before going to the bath including the protagonist. While talking about the bath, she remembers her home through the women's bodies:

We stepped into the bathhouse, a planet of pussy, a sunny mother's belly. We took off our veils, kilometres of hair, kilograms of breast and belly, centipedes, we walked over the marble floor covered with water. Sun came through the glass in the roof and dissolved into forty colours on the water. Our voices rose and immediately returned to our feet as echoes. The water spirits washed for hours, rubbed each other's bodies with silk clothes, the old skin came off our flesh like dry tobacco and left the bathhouse with the water through the holes. (Caravanserai 34)

The protagonist depicts the tie among women through different body parts such as hair, breast and belly belonging to an entity. This world of women is described as "a sunny mother's belly" which appreciates the beauty of it. The women not only clean their bodies but also have joyful moments together. Meanwhile a very beautiful woman whom they call a whore arrives in the bathhouse, and her beauty and charm fascinate the protagonist, who swears that she will be like that whore one day. The narrator once again attacks the traditional conceptions of virtue by presenting a young girl who admires a prostitute.

Years later, she “re-entered the planet of pussy” (*Caravanserai* 201) in her own words. Her impressions shed a fascinating light on women’s history:

The women looked like stars that no longer knew their addresses. I washed the old women’s backs, their skin spoke of death, and the stars trembled about their bodies in the water flowing over the marble floor. With one eye I saw the trembling stars, with the other I saw my mother, she was washing the women’s backs too, they were praying and moaning, and the halls of the bath echoed with their prayers and their ah-saying voices. I thought all these women are my grandmothers and great-grandmothers because my mother had five, six mothers because my grandfather had many wives, and each one of them had five, six mothers, too. The mothers, grandmothers and great-grandmothers of our clan alone could fill a sultan’s bath. I counted all the women so that when I prayed for the dead in the night, I would know for how many more dead fathers and mothers I could pray. (*Caravanserai* 203-204)

By touching and seeing the old woman’s bodies, the protagonist feels the souls and experiences of them in her own body, which is a concretized version of embodying the female history. In the Turkish bath the rituals create a bridge between the protagonist and the older women.

The grandmother, the most influential of all women in her life, is aware of the protagonist’s sexual awakening. Disregarding her education, she insists that they should marry her off. She has her first period and learns that “[t]he first time a girl got her period, her mother struck her lightly on her cheek. From then on, whenever the blood came, I had to say, ‘Mother, my aunt’s arrived’” (*Caravanserai* 253). In detail, she explains her experience:

Mother sewed me pads out of cotton and strung clotheslines in a very small room where watermelons and muskmelons were stored. I had to hang up my aunts pads in this room, separate from the other laundry, far from the eyes of our men. Once the aunts pads were hanging in this watermelon room, I began sleeping there. At night I’d light candles, sit in bed, write, hang the sheets of paper up on the line between the aunts pads that smelt of soda, the wash smelt

clean, I smelt of melons. I liked my smell, I liked the smell of the paper. (253)

The protagonist makes up the word *auntpad* as if to mock the way she is asked to say “my aunt’s arrived” when she has her menstrual period. She is taught not to make her experience public, but instead of feeling self-disgust and shame, she seems to enjoy this new situation. She does not want to leave the room where her *auntpads* lay, and she likes her smell and the smell of the room. On her way to becoming a woman, she blesses the transformation she is going through, and her attitude points to the substantial role of the body in meaning-making processes. She does not learn about life only through the intellect – what is told her by elders; her bodily experience also contributes to her becoming. This transformation makes her feel peaceful rather than distressed, which might be taken as a sign of appreciating what her body is capable of.

The protagonist’s grandmother eases her way in going into adult life and sexuality, and removes negative feelings such as anxiety, fear and shame from this process. As Necia Chronister puts it:

With the help of her grandmother, the child learns to navigate the often comical, often frightening world of adult sexuality. As the child begins to enter adolescence toward the end of the story, she finds comfort in a community of women who help normalize her development for her. In all-female spaces like the Turkish baths, the narrator learns to groom and care for her developing body. She soon learns, however, that this community of support and normalization is also a community of regulation and that she must travel away from it in order to seek out her own individual identity and her own relationship with her body. (141).

The protagonist is fortunate to have this supportive female community in her childhood, which gives her a sense of security. She is also lucky for realising the tendency of this reassuring bond and being able to escape it by moving to Germany.

3.3 The Representation of Religion, Tradition and Education (as Counter-memories) in the Reconceptualization of Home

This section, by keeping the discussions about counter-memory and the use of feminine language in mind, claims that religion, tradition and education, which have the tendency to monopolize people's identity, shape the protagonists' reconceptualization of home by underlining the fact that they have the ability to overcome the limitations set by the ideology of majority. Obviously, the protagonists' memories work through ruptures and functions as counter-memories by resisting the hegemonic powers of the society. Nigeria in Adah's memory and Turkey in *Caravanserai's* protagonist's memory present selective, unique, subjective and diverse reports. The atmosphere reflected in the novels displays why the protagonists feel the need to leave their home countries to escape the restrictions of patriarchal subjugation.

3.3.1 *Second-Class Citizen*

The first two chapters of *Second-Class Citizen* titled "Childhood" and "Escape into Elitism" reveal Adah's childhood and the elements working in her formation. The third person narrator obviously speaks from Adah's vantage point and reveals Adah's concept of home in both a realist and a magical realist tone. Her encounters with the British, the traditions of Nigeria, the negative and positive sides of two cultures are portrayed in an objective yet sarcastic tone. They also display the culture Adah is embedded in, and the rest of the novel presents how this embeddedness empowers her to achieve subjectivity. Her story is not part of the official history; hers is a product of minoritarian memory which works against the grain and allows the marginalized to make their voices heard. The way she insists on receiving education and actualizes her dream makes her an active agent of her own life. Her will to make her own decisions at an early age hints at her future self, which is in constant transformation as she experiences new spaces, places, and gets to learn a new culture.

The question of home is at the heart of the novel from the very beginning. Adah as a child is always told about the “virtues of Ibuza”, her family hometown before they moved to Lagos. She is perplexed about home and being at home at a very early age (“Personal History” 506):

Ibuza, she was told, was a beautiful town. She had been taught at an early age that the people of Ibuza were friendly, that the food there was fresh, the spring water was pure and the air was clean. The virtues of Ibuza were praised so much that Adah came to regard her being born in a God-forsaken place like Lagos is a misfortune. (SCC 8)

Being charmed by a place unknown to her, Adah gets confused about the concept of home. Even moving from one city to another within the borders of Nigeria makes her and her family nostalgic. Since Lagos is a city where colonial rule, which is alien to their native culture, prevails, they cannot feel at home and yearn for their habitual ways of living. In the narrator’s words:

[Lagos] was bad because it was a town with laws, a town where Law ruled supreme. In Ibuza, they said, you took the law into your own hands. If a woman abused your child, you went straight into her hut, dragged her out, beat her up or beaten up, as the case might be. So if you didn’t want to be dragged out and beaten up you wouldn’t abuse another woman’s child. Lagos was bad because this type of behaviour is not allowed. You had to learn to control your temper, which Adah thought was against the law of nature. (SCC 8)

The narrator indicates that the colonizer’s law is not ideal to put life in order in Nigeria. The colonial rule with its claim to improve the indigenous cultures so as to make them ‘civilized’ falls short of making Nigerians from Ibuza happy. The practices of ‘modern’ Europe and ‘indigenous’ Nigeria stand as almost binary oppositions, but the novel rather than foregrounding the advantages of ‘a modern world’ critically evaluates the privileges and handicaps both ways of living provide. Whenever Adah finds herself helpless in England, she objectively observes both societies

and is critical of both the home and host cultures. The female characters (not only Adah but also *Caravanserai*'s protagonist) as nomadic subjects do not foreground one location over the other and do not situate their experience between the centre and the periphery. Multiple counter-discourses flourish; as Braidotti asserts: "The counter-method starts from the politics of locations" (*Transpositions* 92). By quoting Haraway, Braidotti underlines the qualities of a location:

Location is not a listing of adjectives or assigning of labels such as race, sex and class. Location is not the concrete to the abstract of decontextualization. Location is the always partial, always finite, always fraught play of foreground and background, text and context, that constitutes critical enquiry. Above all, location is not self-evident or transparent. Location is also partial in the sense of being for some worlds and not others. (qtd. in *Transpositions* 92-93)

The location is a product of personal experience, and the relation between home and host is not hierarchical but rhizomatic. Adah's minoritarian memory carries her home culture's elements and experiences to England. As Braidotti claims:

[T]he sense of the home country or culture of origin is activated by political and other forms of resistance to the conditions offered by the host culture. As a consequence time is not frozen for the postcolonial subject, and the memory of the past is not a stumbling block that hinders access to a changed present. Quite the contrary, the ethical impulse that sustains the postcolonial mode makes the original culture into a living experience, one that functions as a standard of reference. (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 25)

Adah's and the unnamed protagonist's memories in *Caravanserai* are recalled in host countries, and these memories define their living present in host countries.

Adah, unlike many other girls in Lagos, yearns for going to school although mostly the boys have the privilege of receiving education in Lagos. Adah is not lucky enough to be supported by her family, but she

can dream of going to England and continuing her education there. She does not know what has ignited her dream to study in England, but she remembers how the women of their society welcomed the first lawyer of their town Ibuza. Lawyer Nweze was coming from England, and her people were eager to welcome him and celebrate his success. At that time, she thinks she was eight. As her birth was insignificant for her people who wanted to have a boy, her birthdate was not noted down. Born into a patriarchal culture, Adah experiences discrimination starting from her birth. However, instead of becoming a submissive child, she was a child with the power of agency. The respectful, deep and mysterious way her father mentions the United Kingdom makes Adah think that “[g]oing to the United Kingdom must surely be like paying God a visit. The United Kingdom, then, must be like heaven” (SCC 8).

People of Ibuza are aware of the importance of education believing that only it can save them from poverty and diseases. However, it is only the privilege of the boys, not the girls. While Adah is eight, there are still discussions about whether to send her to school or not. Even if they send her, how long she will stay at school is also an issue. They think it is enough for her to learn how to write her name and count. Meanwhile, Adah’s younger brother starts school, and she has the duty of accompanying him every day to school. She is fascinated by Ladi Lak Institute, her brother’s school. She resents being prevented from receiving education. She becomes envious and disobedient. Although she is very young, she has the power to make decisions and acknowledges the importance of agency at such an early age. Instead of what is presented to her as the only option, that is, learning to sew and cook and become a wife and a mother, she shapes her own life. Knowing that she will not be sent to an expensive school like Ladi-Lak, she chooses to attend classes at the Methodist School, which is cheaper. She believes that Mr Cole, the teacher, will help her. Overcoming her fears of being mocked and humiliated by the other students, she goes to the school. Confirming her expectations, Mr Cole welcomes Adah in the classroom, informs her that

if her parents do not send her to school, he will still teach her how to read the alphabet and makes her sit next to a boy who shares “a bit of pencil” (SCC 11) with her. The narrator informs that this boy becomes a lecturer in Lagos City Hospital, which makes Grace Bavington believe that “This seemingly casual juxtaposition of paradoxical images of poverty and resultant disease with the image of a prominent doctor, creates a powerful political statement and suggests the possibilities offered by education” (43). What education promises is an important issue in Adah’s formation and she does not yield to constraints of gender binaries.

Adah’s uninformed absence causes a crisis at home. Through the turmoil caused by her absence the reader learns about Nigerian habits, priorities and implementation of laws in Lagos. Mr Cole buys *boli* – roasted plantain in Yoruba language- for Adah. While she is away from home, her mother is accused of child neglect, and the policemen force her to eat *gari* – “a tasteless sort of flour made from cassava. When cooked and eaten with soup, it is delicious. But when uncooked, the watered type Ma was forced to drink, it became a torture, purgatorial in fact!” (SCC 12). This is presented with a focus on gustatory even regurgitating moment which makes Adah question how these unwritten laws have been formed. Her mother is warned not to neglect her child again; otherwise, she will be sent to court and prison. On her husband’s request they forgive Adah’s mother before she finishes the whole bowl of *gari*. Although she is afraid of the policemen, she is proud to hear that the policemen suggest Adah’s mother to sell one of her *lappas* (women’s dress) and register Adah to school, because she seems eager to learn. Even her father’s friends advise him to let her go to school. Despite giving a few strokes to Adah with a cane to soothe her mother’s anger, her father allows her to go to school, not to the inferior Methodist School but to the more prestigious Ladi Lak Institute, where her brother also goes. With her own will and effort, Adah reaches a point to meet her cultural needs underlying its importance as well as “basic and concrete necessities, such as food, shelter, health, safety” (*Posthuman* 49). Braidotti believes that “universal needs are

amalgamated to universal rights” and “higher cultural needs like education, identity, dignity, knowledge, affection, joy and care” are as necessary as the basic needs. Adah earns her right to education by her will and determined effort.

Having started school, Adah is not allowed to meet the lawyer who is turning back to Lagos after completing his education in England at the dock. “School – the Ibos never played with that! They were realizing fast that one’s saviour from poverty and disease was education” (SCC 9). Her mother reminds Adah of how she has made her mother drink *gari* because of her enthusiasm to go to school. Although she is not there to welcome Lawyer Nweze, she has seen the rehearsals of the dance show to honour his arrival. She remembers what the women of the town wear with their shapes and colours showing how her memory works through extralinguistic devices such as dance, costumes and rhythm. On Lawyer Nweze’s arrival, the women of Ibuza, who live in Lagos, want to look European so they dye their hair, and using hot combs they straighten it. They believe it will be nice to hail him in a European look. He is of great importance to them as they think he will be their voice by going into the politics and speaking for their rights. The women sing and dance in their costumes, and the Europeans are appalled by this celebration. Two different cultures naturally meet on the colonized’s land. Lawyer Nweze’s arrival is magical for the Ibos living in Lagos. The naivety and happiness of people are evident in the narrator’s tone. These naïve and almost superstitious comments and feelings of Ibos on his arrival present a slice of life in Nigeria.

The men’s visit to Nweze on the following Sunday reveals more about him. Having lived in the UK has changed his eating habits so he no longer likes the local food. Luckily, he does not have a white woman with him, otherwise, Oboshi would infect him with leprosy. In the narrator’s words:

Remembering all these taboos and superstitions of the Western Ibos of Nigeria, Adah could not help laughing to herself. She had been brought up with them, they were part of her, yet now, in the seventies, the thought of them amused her. The funniest thing about all these superstitions and beliefs was that they still had such a doleful grip, on the minds of her people. No one dared ignore any of them. Leprosy was a disease with which the goddess of the biggest river in Ibuza cursed anyone who dared to flout one of the town's traditions. (SCC 15-16)

The narrator obviously talks through Adah's eyes, and we learn how Adah in her mature years remembers and evaluates her homeland's traditions. She does not make fun of them, but being aware of these superstitions she appreciates the function of these memories in her formation process. The adult Adah witnesses how this river has lost its status of power and the ability to keep traditions:

Oil was discovered very near [Oboshi], and she allowed the oilmen dig into her, without cursing them with leprosy. The oilmen were mainly white, which was a surprise. Or perhaps she had long been declared redundant by the greater gods. That would have not surprised Adah, for everybody could be redundant these days, even goddesses. If not redundant, then she must have been in a Rip Van Winkle sleep, for she also allowed the Hausa soldiers to come and massacre her sons, and some Ibuza men had married white women without getting leprosy. Only last year an Ibuza girl graduate had married a white American! So Oboshi was faster than most of her sons and daughters at catching up with the times. (SCC 16).

Emecheta's language is clear, sarcastic and objectively critical of both cultures with a distance. The narrator reveals how Adah conceptualizes her home against the history of colonization and decolonization. Nweze's arrival is important for Adah as she is impressed by the idea of going to England and studying there. She does not share her dream with anyone since they will think she is out of her mind, but she believes that she will actualize this dream.

Unfortunately Adah's comparatively liberal father's early death brings another obstacle to her education since her mother is inherited by her paternal uncle, and Adah has to live with her mother's elder brother as a servant. Her uncle is convinced that sending a girl to school is a waste of time and money. However, she is only nine-too young to marry someone- and with the hope of getting more bride price for Adah, her uncle allows her to go on with her education. Adah and her brother are relocated in an inferior school. Although she does not like the new institution as much as she liked Ladi-Lak, Adah still pursues her dreams. She can go to school only if she finishes daily chores. She wakes up at 4.30 in the morning to fill the water container by going to the public pump for ten to twelve times. To the Western ears it sounds quite cruel to make a child work as a servant, but Emecheta's narrator steps in to explain the situation:

One might think on this evidence that Africans treated their children badly. But to Adah's people and to Adah herself, this was not so at all; it was the custom. Children especially girls, were taught to be very useful very early in life, and this had its advantages. For instance, Adah learned very early to be responsible for herself. Nobody was interested in her for her own sake, only in the money she would fetch, and the housework she could do and Adah, happy at being given this opportunity of survival, did not waste time thinking about its rights or wrongs. She had to survive. (SCC 18)

These ironic statements highlight the fact that Adah has to look after herself and find ways to go on with her education. When she is eleven, the funding for Boy's education decreases, and people ask when she will stop going to school.

Her mother wants her to contribute to the family financially, but Adah only thinks about continuing her education. Meanwhile, she has a lot of aged suitors as they are the only ones to afford to pay the high bride price her mother asks for. However, Adah does not consent to marry one of these 'baldies,' and discourages them by either singing native songs about bad old baldies or by bursting the tyres of the suitors' bicycles. She is to leave the school at the end of the academic year, but her dream has not

totally been destroyed yet. The school master's announcement about the secondary schools they could go to enlivens her dream again. Two shillings are enough to take the examination to the school she dreams of, and she has no way of finding it except for stealing from her family. Instead of buying steak, she gives the two shillings to take the exam. Her belief in Christianity makes her feel guilty, but she soothes herself by underlining the fact that her cousin could afford two shillings but would never give it for Adah's education. Her cousin beats Adah almost to death with *koboko*, a cane used for horses. Adah does not tell why she has stolen the money, and she luckily passes the examination earning a full scholarship. She has four happy years at the Methodist Girls' School.

After the fourth year Adah has to choose how to carry on her life. Her family thinks she should be a doctor as she has been able to finish her secondary education, but they have no idea about what it takes to go to a college. They never think of supporting her and never realize what she needs: "To read for a degree, to read for the entrance examination, or even for more 'A' levels, one needed home. Not just any home where there would be trouble today and fights tomorrow, but a good, quiet atmosphere where she should study in peace" (SCC 23). This reminds us of Virginia Woolf's argument on the importance of having a room of one's own with a lock on the door, which "means the power to think for oneself" (115). Living alone is not an option at that time in Lagos, without her family's support. Adah's only chance is to marry someone to have a room of her own.

Instead of marrying for bride price, Adah marries a poor but seemingly ambitious boy, Francis, with whom she thinks she can go to England to study. Although she is very young and inexperienced, she is wilful enough not to marry an old man whom she would serve on bended knees. Her patriarchal family, particularly her uncle, sees women either as a servant at home or a commodity to sell through marriage to earn money. But she wants to change her destiny by marrying Francis, who, she believes, will

accompany her in her desire to have a respectable career. This choice, in fact, exemplifies a strategy of using a patriarchal institution like marriage against itself as it is the means of emancipation in Adah's anticipation. Unfortunately, things do not go as smoothly as she planned. Adah luckily finds a job in Lagos in the American embassy as a librarian, which allows her to earn almost three times as much as most of the men do. Her in-laws are happy with Adah's income as she financially supports them. Adah talks to Francis about going to England and studying at university there. He mentions Adah's suggestion to his father as in this patriarchal system it is Francis's father who decides about their lives. Adah finds all this ridiculous as she is the one who earns money. Francis's father does not allow Adah to go to England because she already earns a lot in Nigeria. Although Adah is the breadwinner of the family, she does not have the freedom to choose what to do with her own life. The verdict is, Francis will go to England and study there for three years while Adah keeps working in Lagos.

Very disappointed, Adah seems to agree with the plan. Quoting from the Bible she intends to "[b]e cunning as a serpent but harmless as a dove" (SSC 28). She seems to yield to the plan, but she is determined to find a way to go to England, where she can make her own decisions rather than experiencing a limited life in this patriarchal society. Relying on her money, Francis goes to England for education, and Adah thinks of saving enough money to go there, too. However, Francis' family prevents Adah from quitting this job as she earns a lot. Her desire for education in England comes with a huge bulk of problems, which she overcomes one by one. She cleverly convinces her mother-in-law saying that she will go to England only for a few months and turn back with the chance of earning more than she earns now. What she does is not approved in Christianity, but she has no other alternative. Going to England does not open the gates for an easy liberation as the customs of her native country survive in her marriage with Francis. She never yields to her husband's cruelty. While going through hardships in England, she remembers the

sight of her homeland, which sometimes results in a feeling of longing. However, she mostly appreciates the alternatives that living in the UK offers her.

3.3.2 *Life is a Caravanserai*

Caravanserai's protagonist, unlike Adah, is surrounded by the love of family and friends, but she still feels distressed because of the powerful patriarchal traditions in Turkey. Her memories are intertwined by the memories of her grandmother, who increases the protagonist's interest in the past and death. She fears death, but also knows that it is part of everyday life. Braidotti's concept of death and its connection with nomadic subjectivity will reveal the narrator's relationship with death:

[D]eath is not the teleological destination of life, a sort of ontological magnet that propels us forward: death is rather behind us. Death is the event that has always already taken place at the level of consciousness. As an individual occurrence it will come in the form of the physical extinction of the body, but as event, in the sense of the awareness of finitude, of the interrupted flow of my being - there, death has already taken place. We are all synchronized with death- death is the same thing as the time of our living, in so far as we all live on borrowed time. The time of death as event is the impersonal ever-present *aion*, not the individualized *chronos*. It is the time span of death in time itself, the totality of time. (*Portable* 343)

Braidotti believes that death is the source life as it "frees us into life. Each of us is always already a 'has been'; we are a mortal being. Desire (as *potentia*) seduces us into going on living" (211). That is why living requires a conscious effort. It is not a pre-given. Such an understanding of death, which is combined with the desire to live and commemorating the dead at the same time is visible in *Caravanserai*, too. In the early pages, the protagonist senses "the smell of dead and not-dead soldiers," which bridges up the gap between life and death. Having a different view, Stephanie Bird thinks that "the smell of dead and not-dead soldiers, establish[es] the point that being alive is no more than being not yet dead" (204). Referring to Braidotti's understanding of death contradicts with

Bird's statement as Braidotti highlights living as a project. However, Bird's remark on how the protagonist adopts an affirmative approach to death is agreeable since the protagonist constantly refers to death as part of life.

This obsession with death might be related to the protagonist's early proximity to death as an infant in *Caravanserai*, and her desire to keep her memory fresh. Both the fear of death and a conscious desire to defeat it are recurring themes in the novel. When the grandmother and the child protagonist bring lice home from the peasants, her mother locks them in a room, but they escape by knitting the sheets together and climbing out of the window. They go to a graveyard and burn their sheets. Grandmother says that the fire in hell is seven times stronger than this one. Walking around the graveyard "strange letters [come] out of [her] grandmother's mouth" (*Caravanserai* 8): this is Fatiha, a prayer in Arabic which Muslims generally recite after the dead people to heal the dead's soul. This prayer is strange words for the narrator, but later on these words become so familiar that the narrator uses the prayer to complete the image of Turkey at that time.

The Fatiha prayer from the Koran appears several times in the novel, and the protagonist has a ritual to pray for the dead signalling her desire to integrate into personal history. The first tribute to death comes all of a sudden when she is with her grandmother in the graveyard. The Fatiha prayer is only a group of strange words for the protagonist, but it creates a "lovely image in the graveyard sky" (8). She learns that the dead needs this prayer, and these strange words create a positive image:

I saw the letters, some of them looked like birds, some like hearts with arrows in them, some like caravans, some like sleeping animals, some like a river, some like trees dashed apart by the wind, some like running snakes, some like trees shivering in the rain and the wind. (8)

The Arabic alphabet with its picturesque form disrupts the hegemonic power of the Latin alphabet. Remembering home through 'picture words' is quite important in Lacanian terms. The protagonist goes beyond the limits of the linguistic to the pre-symbolic realm by remembering her home, through the images instead of the signifiers. The effect of the prayer implies unity with nature in a non-hierarchized form. It is like escaping the dominance of the symbolic order. Images and associations dominate this section of the novel.

Although the Koran with its Arabic alphabet, which presents a picturesque form, offers an alternative to the Latin alphabet as a tool of patriarchal power, it has also hegemonic power in Muslims' lives, as a Muslim holy scripture. In addition to offering guidance on how to live, showing respect to the Koran implies truthfulness. Mustafa, the protagonist's father, kisses the Koran, and claims that he is innocent after his wife sees him with twin actresses in his car. He uses the credibility of the Koran to convince his wife: "Look, I'm kissing the Koran, if I'm telling a lie, may Allah pull my mouth sideways" (17). That night grandmother Ayşe has to fix his son's mouth as his mouth goes sideways. This scene created by a sense of humour unsettles the Koran's hegemony by stripping it of its serious discourse, and presents how counter-memory destabilizes the firm ground of religion. It is not religion or religious practices that hold this family together, but the protagonist's memory exemplifying how counter-memory is "structured via montage; the accumulation of heterogenous things" (Tello 5) without creating a hierarchy.

The importance of counter-memory lies in the fact that it functions to dissolve rather than solidify. Another example of bringing together different discourses is the protagonist's prayers for all the dead souls she knows. The critic Sheila Johnson says that: "Her prayers are transnational and transcend social status" (44). Atatürk, Isadora Duncan, the Armenian lady are mentioned in the same sentence. Also,

Stephanie Bird aptly states: “The prayers often produce some surprising and amusing juxtapositions, neatly proving the point that death is a great leveler” (146). At this point, the narration is very successful in bringing the heterogeneous segments of society together.

Obsessed with the idea of death, the protagonist asks about the warning signs of death, looks for the ways to deceive death, and asks her grandmother how to do it. Using what she learns from her grandmother, she tries to defeat the death of the poor quarry workers in Yenişehir. Ayşe offers many superstitious practices, and the protagonist chooses one of them:

[Y]ou make a doll out of barley flour and you give the doll the name of the person death may be stalking. You have to cry for the doll as though it were crying itself, then you have to rip open the belly of the barley flour doll, take it to faraway place, bury it, say the name of the person aloud, weep, weep loudly so that death hears you and thinks the person it wanted to come and get is already dead. (*Caravanserai* 65)

The protagonist makes dolls by chewing the bread and spitting it out. She follows her grandmother’s instructions to prevent the quarry workers’ possible death. Stephanie Bird comments on this as follows:

The narrator then attempts to deceive death on behalf of each of the forty quarry workers, listing them individually and weeping inconsolably. Her sorrow is finally alleviated by finding one of the Prophet Mohammed’s eyelashes in the Koran with Ayse, evidence of his own weeping. This is a significant episode for two reasons: it shows the ways in which the narrator comes to terms with the fear and sorrow that death engenders, in a cultural context in which the effects of death are not palliated or denied; furthermore, it is the first time that the narrator responds to death by listing individuals, a response that soon gains in ritual importance. The narrator learns that death is an inseparable part of life, and that the affirmation of life and love enables her concurrently to affirm death and the dead. (204)

As Bird puts it, a ritual learnt from the grandmother helps the protagonist get rid of the fear of death. As this example proves, the rituals are not

always oppressive but sometimes helpful in dealing with hard moments of life. Reminding Braidotti's stance of death as a life force, Bird also states: "Past lives are considered central to the present, and this natural inclusion of the dead in the activities and thoughts of the living brings with it the potential for a history which emphasizes the specificity of the ordinary life" (205).

The Arabic prayers, foreign and familiar at the same time as part of Turkish people's daily lives, are embedded in the protagonist's memory. The readers read the script of the Fatiha prayer and learn when and where to say *bismillahirrahmanirrahim*²⁴. The child narrator tells how saying *bismillahirrahmanirrahim* saves her twice in her adulthood. When she is eighteen or nineteen years old, her Algerian friends give her the address of another Algerian friend who lives in Paris. She finds the building but cannot find the boy because there is a party in the building. The Algerian doorman takes her into his place, and she escapes a possible sexual abuse by saying *bismillahirrahmanirrahim* as she is sure the Muslim Algerian will know. In the morning the Algerian student comes, and with signs he implies that they can make love until her girlfriend comes home. She again says *bismillahirrahmanirrahim*, and he says *bismillahirrahmanirrahim* too. Their conversation is as follows: "Moslem, yes, you too Moslem?" Yes, you too Moslem, elhamdülillah²⁵, Allah allahüekber²⁶, selamünaleyküm essalamünaley²⁷" (40). The Arabic words are used without their actual meanings, but they help the protagonist escape two unwanted situations. Stripping the words of their meanings once again proves that religion is a practical part of the protagonist's life instead of offering a spiritual path.

²⁴ An Arabic expression used by Muslims: "in the name of Allah, the compassionate, the merciful."

²⁵ An Arabic expression which means "thank Allah."

²⁶ An Arabic expression which means "Allah is great."

²⁷ An Arabic expression to greet people which means "peace be with you."

She learns what *bismillahirrahmanirrahim* means years later: “in the name of God, or in the name of Allah who protects and forgives” (40). As Soheila Ghaussy asserts, religion is not the centre of this family’s life, but has become part of their daily rituals:

In *Karawanserei*, learning the prayers from the Koran is depicted as part of the narrator's personal quest for individual (gendered) expression within her family tradition, where the narrator's unintellectualized repetition of her grandmother's Arabic prayers becomes an almost intuitive process which stands for the intimate relationship between grandmother and granddaughter instead of the narrator's acceptance of a sacred doctrine as part of her religious identity. (“Feminine Writing” 10-11)

Her grandmother familiarizes the protagonist with different aspects of life from sexuality to religious rituals, but their lives are not overwhelmed by the religious doctrines.

The details of fasting in Ramadan are also given. What fasting is, who can fast, the excitement of waiting for Ramadan cannon are explained in detail: during fasting eating, drinking, kissing each other, making love, smoking, putting on lipstick are all forbidden. The women having their periods do not fast, and they can pay their debts to Allah after the month of Ramadan. While the mother states that all children over the age of seven can fast, Ali, the protagonist’s brother, does not have to do that as “if he feels like eating and isn’t allowed to, his willie will fall off” (*Caravanserai* 41). The protagonist is not granted the same privilege of not fasting, and she draws a picture of a Ramadan day in Turkey as follows:

I woke up with the adults around four in the morning, a man with a large drum was walking by outside, pounding the drum, dumm dumm da dumm dumm. ... Before the morning cannon of Ramadan went off you had to wash your mouth, Ramadan started with the cannon. Then the evening came. We came together in the room. The food was already on table, the olives were waiting in a dish, the food was waiting, and the hodjas were waiting in the minarets to sing

esan, the evening prayer, the people were waiting and the evening canon went off. The old people who couldn't hear well would always ask children, "Top patladı mı?" (Has the cannon gone off?) (41)

Although most of them fast, the protagonist does not judge her father who does not fast. She does not condemn anyone, but accepts every one with their uniqueness. "My father Mustafa did not fast because he was a rakı drinker, he had to drink rakı every evening, he said, otherwise he would make the holy people who had died from drinking rakı sad" (41-42). The novel embodies a fair distance to different ways of living. This is a panorama of diversity in Turkey. A family can be religious, but they can also tolerate a rakı-drinker during Ramadan. During his absence after one of his several bankruptcies, they talk about Mustafa:

"Mustafa is naïve."
"Mustafa is honest."
"Mustafa is a Casanova."
"Mustafa is holy man" ...
The word Mustafa became our bismillahirrahmannirrahim.
(*Caravanserai* 44)

These contradictory remarks about Mustafa testify to the novel's sympathetic attitude to different ways of life. Their several moves between cities because of bankruptcy and the need to establish another business prepare the ground for them to get to acquire different views of Turkey. In the aftermath of one of the financial crises, the family moves to a conservative neighbourhood. The mother starts to cover her head. The girl is amazed to see her mother in headscarf and asks why she wears it. Fatma says, "This is a religious street. You mustn't upset people" (47). She learns that when her father finishes building their villa, her mother will not wear a headscarf anymore as they will be living with bureaucrats in the new neighbourhood. Religion is part of daily life and culture, and the family is not strict about how to deal with religion. Their preferences change as the circumstances change, which highlights the power of counter-memory to allow different discourses to occur simultaneously. The novel does not tend to fix identities, but points to their dissolution

resonating with Foucault's understanding of history (Here, history can be taken as memory of the majority):

The purpose of history, guided by genealogy, is not to discover the roots of our identity, but to commit itself to its dissipation. It does not seek to define our unique threshold of emergence, the homeland to which metaphysicians promise a return; it seeks to make visible all of those discontinuities that cross us. ("Nietzsche" 386–387)

Following a Foucauldian stance, the novel presents the sacred and the profane on an equal footing, and genealogy is constructed by focusing on individual experiences rather than erasing the differences.

The child protagonist raises big questions in a seemingly naïve perspective. While the narrator is naïve and ignorant, the implied author is an adult who has already contemplated enough on the concept of freedom and the existence of God. However, the child protagonist questions God's existence through her childish experiments, and her attempts indeed open the firm grounds of religion to discussion. Upon hearing from her teacher that Allah is everywhere in the religious instruction lesson, she cannot understand how Allah can see her mother at home and herself at school. "But I'm sitting in school and the school has a roof, and at home there's a roof too ... If Allah's in the classroom, he can only see me. Or if Allah's at home in the wooden house, he can only see my mother" (*Caravanserai* 163). She tries to experience the existence of Allah and appeals to him: "If you exist, make my eyes blind" (163). She sees that nothing has happened to her eyes. To receive a sign from Allah she goes to the toilet, where she knows the devil dwells and says: "Allah, I shit on your mouth, with the devil" (164). Seeing that nothing happens and having no sign from God, she asks his forgiveness, but her struggle to find out Allah triggers her to ask philosophical questions such as: "How can I think about what the world is, who I am? How can a brain think about that? Where do words come from? The mouth asks 'why?' How can the mouth ask that? Who am I? Where was I

when I wasn't here yet?" (164). Although formal education as a tool of dominant ideology tries to monopolize the ways of believing and thinking, the protagonist resists being controlled. Whatever she has seen, heard, experienced and finally remembered makes her who she is. She writes her own story through an active counter-memory, which is written / activated against the grain.

Özdamar also writes about her country through art and a strong sense of visual artistry. She frequently integrates music and literature into her narrative. The history of Turkey is also presented through poetry written on the gravestones:

When this world I left
Let's not talk of owning a caravanserai and baths
sharing the daylight was enough for us
let's not talk of owning a caravanserai and baths
sharing the daylight was enough for us
let's not talk of being happy
hoping was enough for us
we found nothing
melancholy is what we created for ourselves
it didn't comfort us
or maybe
we were not of this world. (*Caravanserai* 4)

The poem is by Orhan Veli Kanık - a Turkish poet who wrote for the first time about common people and events rather than about gratifying historical events as I pointed out on page 112 - is quoted here so as to remind the literary history of Turkey. The second and the third poems also belong to Orhan Veli, "Death is Allah's command, if there were not this separation" (4). And the last poem by Orhan Veli is:

It was no problem for him
To be or not to be
one evening he slept, did not wake up,
what a wind, he has disappeared
his name has gone with him. (*Caravanserai* 4)

These poems remind one of the implied author's perception of death. Choosing poems which trivialize death and presenting it as an ordinary part of life by Orhan Veli Kanık reveal the cultural attitude in Anatolia to death itself. People in villages do not philosophise on the phenomenon of death, but accept it as it comes, and Orhan Veli's poetry is not different in attitude. Özdamar chooses to highlight this aspect of the Anatolian people through poetry. She weaves the memory of her childhood to literature. As Azade Seyhan in her *Writing Outside the Nation* puts it:

Art provides a counterweight to manufactured and monologic memory: Art is often more effective in embodying historically specific ideas than the history-writing on which it may draw. Scientific historical research, however essential it is for its negative virtues of rectifying error and denouncing falsification, has no positive resource to lessen grief, endow calamity with meaning, foster a vision of the world, or legitimate new groups. But art remains in touch with or revives traditionary materials that satisfy our need for community without repressing individualist performance. Tales where personal destinies meet historical forces are often the most powerful guardians of public memory. (141)

Proving Seyhan's comments, Özdamar integrates a lot of folk tales such as "Zümrüt-ü Anka," "Karagöz and Hacivat" and "Koroğlu" in her narration. These stories help Turkish people create a communal memory in which the individual can feel embedded. Of course, being embedded in a communal memory does not annul the formation processes of the protagonist. Remembering Braidotti, we can see that embodied experiences of the protagonist which are unique, wilful and active are foregrounded. When we focus on the protagonist's views on these stories we see that her attitude to embrace the marginal becomes one of her identity markers.

Karagöz and Hacivat as part of Turkish literary history find their place in the narrative. These marginal figures are no longer marginal in the narrative. The dominant power wanted to silence them; however, no one

remembers the tyrants who executed them, but their tradition still survives and their voices are heard. Karagöz and Hacivat also enter into praying for the dead list. Tradition, religious beliefs, literature are revived together in Karagöz's and Hacivat's memory. Their story based on hearsay is ambiguous. The novel adopts the following version:

These men had been construction workers hundreds of years ago and had worked on a mosque the sultan was paying for. The men kept telling each other so many funny stories that the other workers laughed so hard they couldn't do their work. The sultan heard about this, got angry and had the construction workers' head fall under the knife. But then he asked the other workers what the two men had talked about. The other workers told the sultan, he sultan laughed until he cried, held his belly, said: "Oh, what have I done, they were holy men," and he had holy gravestones set up in front of the mosque for Karagöz and hacivat, the men he'd beheaded with his mouth. Grandmother and I lit candles for Karagöz and Hacivat, and stuck them onto the other candles that lay piled there burnt down to their ends. (*Caravanserai* 118-9)

They visit the graves because her grandmother says that visiting the holy men will ease their way out of the troubles. These marginal figures were first brought to the shadow theatre, became very famous and later they were accepted as holy men by the locals in Bursa, Turkey. Their marginal status is somehow canonized in shadow theatre. However, shadow plays are still critical and satirical of the people in power.

Tom Mix is another literary influence for the protagonist. The protagonist and her brother are fans of Tom Mix comics, and this makes their mother anxious as she believes that it is a "heathen human-flesh-eating shadow game" (144). She fears that her children are becoming the soldiers of Tom Mix, but children keep buying them. The protagonist introduces the women characters in the comic book: Jane Kalemiti who always wears men's clothing and Sue who "wait[s] at home for her fiancé Tom Mix" (143). She states that she likes Jane Kalemiti which hints at her desire to transgress gender boundaries. To make their mother happy, sometimes

they burn their Tom Mix copies themselves. To get rid of Tom Mix, Ayşe brings the comic book of “The Son of the Blind Man.” Now, the children are busy with reading a story from their own culture, and Ayşe feels safer. The story of rich ‘bey²⁸’ and Koroğlu are introduced, and some of the poems are located in the narration. Thus, Koroğlu becomes another story functioning as the memory of Turkish society.

While talking about female genealogy, the protagonist’s negative experiences in school such as being called a Kurd with a tail behind, or peeing and defecating in the classroom since her teacher does not care about the girl’s needs have already been mentioned. Due to the implied author’s critical distance to each institution, each establishment is portrayed with an ironic distance. Mehmet Ali Bey – one of Aunt Sıdıka’s friends – is a teacher, and his characterization also hints at criticism of the Turkish education system. Mehmet Ali Bey and his wife are marginalised figures who are sent to a small village since Mehmet Ali Bey votes for the opposition party. He asks questions about Turkish history to the children and makes them question what freedom is. The protagonist cannot answer the question. Her inability hints at the insufficiencies of the Turkish education regarding abstract concepts. Mehmet Ali Bey highlights the problematic past of the concept of freedom in Turkey. He explains how the wrong choices of Abdülhamit and Enver Pasha complicate the concept of freedom in Turkey: “When the high-ranking officers, Enver Pascha and Cemal [sic] Pascha, brought us freedom, the first thing they did was marry the sultan’s daughters” (*Caravanserai* 151). While the protagonist seems ignorant of what freedom is and how it is situated in the Turkish context, the implied author is critical of the lack of freedom. When the Young Turks dethroned Sultan Abdülhamid, they claimed to have brought freedom. However, “[f]reedom was a book of statutes, and the English and French and Russians and Germans and Austrians shook hands and built side by

²⁸ Former title of respect for Turkish dignitaries.

side, so they could split up the Ottoman Empire between them afterwards” (152). Having learnt about the First World War, the protagonist adds this story to her repertoire which reflects the cultural diversity of the land she was born into. She wants to include the four million people who died in the war in her prayers, and once again her prayers bring people from different segments of the society together showing the vanity of hierarchical thinking.

By way of conclusion, the protagonists of both novels generate their own language nourished by the discourses they belong to with an emphasis on their individual experience. This unique language is explained and analysed with references to Braidotti’s understanding of “embedded and embodied language” which functions as an element of counter-memory. The grandmothers function as a link between the past and the future, for both protagonists. Although Adah’s grandmother only exists as a spiritual presence, she provides the most igniting energy residing in Adah, and paves her way for freedom. In the case of Özdamar’s protagonist, her grandmother is central to her formation and introduces her to life during her growth. Recollecting experiences of the grandmothers and other women whose solidarity is functional helps the protagonists to present how their homelands are projected in their minds.

The portrait of Turkey presented through religion, nationalism, gender discrimination and politics reveals the reasons why the protagonist wants a new place and space on her way to liberation. The same thing applies to *Second-Class Citizen*’s Adah, too. This chapter has aimed to draw the pictures of Adah’s Nigeria and Özdamar’s protagonist’s Turkey to decipher their reasons for wanting to migrate to another country. The desire to free themselves from the patriarchal constraints is their main motive. The next chapter will try to untangle how their reconceptualization of home will play a role in their subject formation. The protagonists’ counter-memory displays their readiness to experience

multiple ways of formation, which will showcase the deconstruction of binary thinking with its tendencies to monopolize power and being.

CHAPTER 4

BECOMING IN BUCHI EMECHETA'S SECOND-CLASS CITIZEN, IN THE DITCH AND EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR'S THE BRIDGE OF THE GOLDEN HORN

This chapter argues that Adah, the protagonist of *Second-Class Citizen* and *In the Ditch*, and the unnamed protagonist of *The Bridge of the Golden Horn* free themselves from the limitations of the countries they were born in and migrated to by appropriating the places and spaces they live in thanks to the power of their nomadic subjectivity. Their translocal experience paves the way for a transnational dimension in which process explorations and experimentations defy the boundaries and borders. This study keeps the discourses the protagonists are embedded in in mind and underlines that achieving subjectivity and enjoying the power of nomadic thought require a conscious effort. Both protagonists are born in patriarchal societies, and the countries they migrate to also place them as the weaker leg of the binary for being black, migrant and woman. However, being a subject in process necessitates problematizing and denying a thought through binary oppositions and offering rhizomatic ways of becoming and thinking. The process of how the protagonists liberate themselves from dualistic thinking will be discussed against the background of Braidotti's concepts of rhizome, nomadic thinking and nomadic subjectivity. As she borrows ideas from Deleuze and Guattari, their theoretical conceptions will also be consulted while discussing how these characters achieve the feeling of at-homeness.

This study is not about migrant or diasporic experience in general, but about female subjectivity set in nomadic experience. Although Özdamar does not claim that she is a feminist, and Emecheta claims to be a feminist with a small 'f', their protagonists display traits which invite a

feminist discussion. The protagonists' migrant experience and nomadic thinking have a lot in common with transnational feminism. Braidotti, whose ideas on transnational feminism are helpful to understand the novels, explains the importance of nomadism for feminist intellectuals by quoting Caren Kaplan:

We must leave home, as it were, since our homes are often sites of racism, sexism and other damaging social practices. Where we come to locate ourselves in terms of our specific histories and differences must be a place with room for what can be salvaged from the past and what can be made new. (qtd. in *Nomadic Subjects* 1994 172)

Both protagonists go through the route Caren Kaplan suggests as compulsory for a woman in actualizing her subjectivity: they leave their home to find a new location where their lives can be shaped according to what they choose to bring from their homelands and what they choose to adopt in the host countries.

Apparently, leaving home does not immediately bring a state of nomadic thought and subjectivity. In the host countries, too, the dominant ideology is patriarchal and works through dualistic discourses. The protagonists go through dualistic relationships, which place them as the weaker leg of the binary. However, being embedded in these discourses does not and cannot stop their formative process. Although they also reproduce binaries in their becoming process, they are able to employ the tools of dualistic discourses against themselves. Being empowered by nomadic thinking and subjectivity, their becoming allows them to set their life goals by erasing the restrictions of the dominant discourse. This process involves adaptation, transformation, despair, hope, appropriation and liberation from the binary thinking showing itself in migrant experience, gender, place and class consciousness. Since feeling at home is necessary for nomadic thought and subjectivity, I will first try to discuss the women characters' engagement with places and spaces, and then their efforts to remove binary thinking from their lives.

4.1 Feeling at Home: Rhizome

4.1.1 Remaking Home in *Second-Class Citizen* and *In the Ditch*

The sense of home is a recurring and dominant issue in transnational literature. This study takes the women protagonists' homing and re-homing experiences as constructive practices and focuses on how they appropriate the places they live in, which in the end emancipates them from the confinements of the social environments they are exposed to. It does not dwell on the restricting qualities of place but explores how the protagonists make the new places their own and defy the psychic borders to actualize their subjectivities, by referring to the framework of Braidotti's nomadic subjectivity. Braidotti's understanding of space is not centralized, hierarchical or stable. On the contrary, she draws attention to "the spaces in-between and their interconnections, without stopping at any one centralized concept: a nomadic style of thinking which is open to encounters with others - other systems of thought or thinking environment" (*Transpositions* 139).

Braidotti highlights that different 'discursive communities' such as "feminists, environmentalists, anti-racists, pacifists, anti-nationalists and anti-militarists" should engage in discussions offering new forms of subjectivity without essentializing the concepts. By quoting Gilroy, she also warns against rewarding the once oppressed leg, creating a new hierarchy. The core of nomadic thinking is not empowering the weak, but enabling different intersectional modes to exist on an equal footing without creating hierarchies. Intersectional modes of race, gender and class are acceptable for Braidotti as long as they do not impose unitary subjectivities. She emphasizes "the subject's capacity for multiple, non-linear and outward-bound inter-connections with a number of external forces and others" ("Affirming the Affirmative"). This capacity becomes meaningful through what she calls synchronicity:

The synchronicity among the different claims or variables is not flat equivalence, superficial comparison, easy parallelism or hierarchy of oppressions, but a way of operationalizing the politics of location. It provides a missing link between binary opposites and criticizes the excesses of identity politics. To synchronize the different moments and claims to subject-position is a balancing act, linked to the quest for thresholds of sustainability. (*Transpositions* 139)

Here, Braidotti denies over-generalization about one's subjectivity through identity markers of dichotomous thinking regarding gender, race and class. Instead, she offers an emphasis on one's own circumstances, which she calls politics of location – a point of reference to explain how the female protagonists re-home themselves in different times and spaces.

As Braidotti states, nomadic thinking focuses on not centralized concepts but encounters, interconnectedness and dialogic relations. However, she also emphasizes the embedded situation of the subject and adds that “one cannot deconstruct a subjectivity one has never been fully granted control over” (*Metamorphoses* 82). In the novels, the migrant women seem to be restrained by the state apparatus, mansions in Adah's case and the hostel for guest workers in *Golden Horn*'s unnamed protagonist's case; however, the confines of their locations cannot stabilize the identity of the female protagonists. Their body and mind transcend the boundaries of what is offered to them, and their quest involves endless negotiations, which are part of their subject formation process. At this point it is helpful to remember how Deleuze and Guattari explain “smooth space” as a product of nomad thought and “state space.” Brian Massumi explains this in his “Foreword” to *A Thousand Plateaus*:

The space of nomad thought is qualitatively different from State space. Air against earth. State space is “striated,” or gridded. Movement in it is confined as by gravity to a horizontal plane, and limited by the order of that plane to preset paths between fixed and identifiable points. Nomad space is “smooth,” or open-ended. One can rise up at any point and move to any other. Its mode of distribution is the *nomos*: arraying oneself in an open space (hold the street),

as opposed to the logos of entrenching oneself in a closed space (hold the fort). (xiii)

By appropriating these striated places, the protagonists have the ability to turn them into smooth spaces, and this process ends with the empowerment of the subject achieving a rhizome, which is devoid of any hierarchies. Thus, neither the situatedness of the protagonists nor their unique ways of *becoming* should be overlooked. The state apparatuses like the official history, law and religion are effective in one's development and have the tendency to explain all migrant experience under labels. As Deleuze and Guattari put it: "History is always written from the sedentary point of view and in the name of a unitary State apparatus, at least a possible one, even when the topic is nomads" (23). However, in this official history "[n]omadology, the opposite of a history" is lacking (23). The protagonists of the novels in question exemplify the formation of nomadology with their attitude, which resists being an insignificant part of official history; they write their individual stories against the state apparatuses. They create a rhizome which destroys binary thinking, and grasp the power of subjectivity in a line of flight, "a creative alternative space of becoming that would fall not between the mobile / immobile, the resident / the foreigner, but within these categories" (*Transpositions* 60). Having the alternative of moving between subject positions without being limited by them enables the protagonists to turn new places into home.

In Adah's Nigeria, 'centralized concepts' such as gender, religion, reminiscences of colonial rule and tradition prevail, and they are inscribed into her body and mind shaping her becoming process. However, her experience is different from that of the Westerners as different localities and traditions bring distinct priorities. In fact, Priya Raghav indicates this dissimilarity in her dissertation:

Second-Class Citizen (1974) does not signify an end but continuity because unlike what was argued by European feminists her problems do not end with monetary control and education. Emecheta's fiction is deeply rooted in the

contrasting sense of place and displacement. Several of her female characters are concerned with the development or recovery of an effective relationship between their selves and the place where they live or where they were born. (80)

As Raghav puts forward, as a non-European, Adah has more challenges to deal with than earning her life and having the chance to be educated. The struggle to create a place of her own is central to both *Second-Class Citizen* and *In the Ditch*. However, her perspective in this home-making process disagrees with the claims of this study. Raghav asserts:

Emecheta's female protagonists are often caught between two worlds, to neither of which they can fully belong in the wake of continuing imperialism, their sense of self is challenged by dislocation resulting from multiple factors which includes migration, yet the return to the homeland is described as an emotional crisis. The attempt to translate personal experience into a sociological interpretation of black womanhood has proved problematic for Buchi Emecheta because it does not resolve into larger holistic frames argued by European feminists and homogenized blackness. (80)

Despite her agreeable comments on the difference between the mentalities of the Western and non-Western world, Raghav's ideas are presented in a dualistic discourse. This study, instead of perceiving Adah's life "caught between two worlds," takes it as enriched with different experiences. To underline the inconveniency of dualistic thinking, Braidotti refers to Glissant whose "position includes a sharp critique of the West, which is based on the ontology of Sameness or the rule of One. This includes a dualistic relationship to the rest of the human race" (*Transpositions* 68). Thus, as a citizen of a non-European country, Adah is positioned as the other by the Western colonial discourse. Braidotti states,

[t]here exists a dominant mode of nomadism in Western culture - in the form of epic journeys of discovery, which find their historical apogee in colonialism. The power of Sameness in the west is best described in terms of

monolingualism, or the illusion of a single cultural and linguistic root. (*Transpositions* 68)

However, it is possible to “play the rhizome against the root” as Glissant also suggests. In such a context, Adah does not confine her life to what is presented to her by the Western ideology and shapes her life with a quest to find / create a homely space, which she has lost at an early age with her father’s death.

To feel at home, one’s physical conditions are inevitably important, and Adah has always struggled to find a place to live in safely. Her self-confidence wavers from time to time in her efforts to protect her personal dignity. She is driven into marriage with Francis to find a place to pursue her education. Although her marriage with Francis has created a sense of home for a short while, she is disturbed by Francis’s parents’ intervention in their life. They ignore the fact that Adah is the breadwinner of the family, and Francis’s father is the one to reign over their life. No longer feeling at home with Francis’s parents, Adah struggles hard to start a new life in England as already mentioned in the previous chapter.

Unfortunately, owning a homely space becomes harder when Adah is in England. She thinks that the room Francis arranges for his family is in a terrible state. She does not feel a sense of belonging in that place; the worst comes when her landlady forces them to leave their room. Adah, despite her strong will and desire to go on with her studies in England, is very much frustrated with what is presented to her in England. As Lucinda Newns puts it:

Despite the fact that Adah’s migration to London is intended to be an escape from the various events in her life which have kept her from achieving her own homely space (the death of her father which leaves her as a dependent in her uncle’s house, the pressure to get married in order to secure a home for herself and then the influence of her in-laws over her life-decisions), she quickly learns that ‘home’ is not

something easily attained as a black immigrant in 1970s London. (80)

Moving to England introduces Adah to a racist discourse, which she has not been exposed to in Nigeria. She enters into a dualistic world as the weaker leg of the binary, but she has not been codified in this Western discourse.

The anxiety and frustration Adah goes through triggers her desire to create a homely space beyond the limitations of the Western ideology, and she achieves a rhizomatic feeling after all the struggle. The physical spaces Adah encounters in London are not welcoming in the least due to buildings “jammed against each other” (SCC 37), and the places she has to live in are suffocating, and lack necessary sanitary conditions. She cannot feel at home in the rooms Francis has arranged for them. As Agnes Györke explains:

Adah is not used to the sight of crowded streets; they are in sharp contrast with the roomy places she inhabited in Nigeria. There is no veranda, no room for communal life; those spaces that mediate between the swarming streets and the private flats and which play an important role in the everyday life of Nigerian communities have no place in the city. Instead, what we see is an endless row of solid blocks, with doors opening directly onto the street. Their serious, gloomy atmosphere reminds Adah of monasteries, suggesting the feeling of seclusion and indifference are the first emotions she experiences in Britain. (14)

In addition to her dislike of English housing, Adah is not able to find a decent flat in London. Newns claims that “Adah’s and Francis’s experience in the housing market shows the importance of the home as a symbol of belonging and unbelonging in Britain” (81). To achieve finding a place to live in is not enough; Adah and Francis also need to belong to that place to build a sense of home. While living with Francis, Adah can never feel comfortable, secure and in peace. Likewise, the problems of housing and not being able to easily rehome herself go on after she leaves Francis and sets up a new life with her five children. Despite her struggle

not to lead a life of a second-class citizen, her attempts to find suitable lodging for her family are always interwoven with many obstacles, challenges and frustration, which makes her feel underrated.

Adah's experiences as a single mother are told in Emecheta's first novel *In The Ditch*. Like Emecheta's other novels, *In The Ditch* also deals with the concepts of home and host country, a woman's education and emancipation in a patriarchal society, and underlines the performative quality of subjectivity. The novel starts with Adah's struggle with rats in her flat and her landlord, who charges the rent twice as much the house is worth since he is aware of Adah's predicament as a lonely black woman with five children. He knows that she will not easily find lodging without a husband and with five children all under six. In addition to cutting off electricity and making Adah afraid of being poisoned by his hostile attitudes, the landlord now tries magic Juju²⁹ carrying the traditions of his Nigerian memories to England.

However, Adah is not afraid of this magic 'Juju' in England. The narrator says "the Juju trick would not work in England, it was out of place, on alien ground. God dammit, Juju in England, you're surrounded by walls of unbelief!" (*Ditch*³⁰ 14). In fact, as Katherine Fishburn thinks, "in being transported to England, Juju has been secularized and thus loses its power" (55). 'Juju' is emptied of its resonances ("Personal History" 510). As Fishburn puts it: "Because our reality is constructed through our interaction with others, it stands to reason that once Adah Obi moves to England, the power of the Juju would wane" (53). Adah is aware of the fact that the home and host countries have different dynamics, and ways to survive in these different lands differ, and one's identity is shaped in accordance with different experiences. As the narrator relates: "Ibo people seldom separate from their husbands after the birth of five children. But

²⁹ Juju is either the object which is loaded with magical power or the belief system, which includes objects and magic in the process. It is common in Nigeria.

³⁰ Hereafter *In The Ditch* will be abbreviated as *Ditch*.

in England anything could be tried, and even done. It's a free country" (*Ditch* 16). England becomes a space of opportunities for Adah despite the challenging circumstances.

After having been mistreated by her landlord so many times, Adah is informed about council flats by one of her neighbours, Mrs. Devlin. Although the conditions in the council flats are miserable, she decides to move to a flat in the mansions immediately without waiting for it to be mended. Not having any beds, curtains and floor coverings, she feels the happiness of having acquired three important things on her first night: "her independence, her freedom, and a peace of mind" (*Ditch* 25). In this new flat, despite the poor conditions she feels relieved and safe.

The physical problems Adah encounters also shape her subjectivity. She seems too busy to reflect on her living conditions; however, contemplating on one's circumstances is not the only way to achieve nomadic subjectivity. The daily challenges encourage Adah to build a new life with self-confidence. Her flat hardly meets even the most basic requirements making it difficult to create a peaceful space, but Adah is content with what she has. In a bitter tone, she states she would not mind the rain if it did not wet her flat. In her words, "Whenever it rained outside, it rained inside" (*Ditch* 53). As a consequence, mildew is all over the place, and it is impossible to remove it as the continuing rain always prepares ground for new layers to come out.

The mansion becomes unhealthier because of the stairs which turn out to be slimy since some teenagers use them as toilets. Adah and Mrs. O'Brien, one of Adah's neighbours, fear that their children will be sick because of the urine in the stairs as little children tend to touch anything on the floor. Also, lights do not work properly at night, so the ditch-dwellers have to run errands during the day. Adah has problems of different sorts: her children's milk bottles are stolen, and she is seriously concerned about how to balance diets as she can hardly make ends meet.

Despite all the negative circumstances, the title of this chapter is “Happier on the Dole.” Adah is blissful since she has her own place and time that gives her a peaceful mind. In this state of mood, Adah disregards the disadvantages of the physical and financial conditions. Considering Adah’s circumstances Agnes Györke asserts:

This shifting, fluid, hybrid condition, associated with the migrant experience by Homi Bhabha as well as Emecheta’s critics (eg Sizemore or Pichler), is not a positive trope in Emecheta’s fiction; instead of subverting boundaries and culturally coded norms, it depicts Adah’s experience of being deprived of any meaningful sense of place. The Pussy Cat Mansions, aka “the Mansions society”, is the only location that provides a tangible point of reference for Adah, yet this affiliation does not reflect any clearly delineated place or class in society. Her sense of identity is constructed on the basis of the day-to-day interactions that take place at the Mansions, suggesting that, if there is a positive aspect of this rootless condition in the novel, it is associated with the language of the everyday. (16)

I find Györke’s claims disagreeable as what Adah experiences in the mansions empowers her. The solidarity of women in the mansions and the help Carol provides for her ease Adah’s way to freedom. Mansions provide a safe setting to live in and to meet people from different backgrounds most of whom are stripped of their social classes. This space can be called a rhizome. After leaving her job and becoming classless, Adah loses her point of reference, but now she is more open to transformation and has the chance to re-establish her life in the way she likes.

The story presents many cases where Adah appropriates different territories and circumstances, which transform who she is. Ashley Dawson states that *In the Ditch* “records her struggle to retain a sense of dignity and autonomy as a single parent subjected to the ministrations of the welfare state” (107). In her relationships, she foregrounds the importance of self-respect and yearns for a life where she can earn her own living and does not ask for dole or any kind of help. She never wants

to lose her respectability while living with the assistance of welfare state. Before an officer visits her place to inspect whether she needs what she has asked for from the state, she always dresses up smartly, cleans up the flat and has a bath. Whoopey warns her not to look that smart since the men will think that she does not need the shoe allowance; she even thinks the men will try to take advantage of Adah: "They'll think you're well off. Why don't be your age, girl? What do you think you're doing? You're poor, let the buggers know you're poor, and that's that. What are the sods coming for anyway?" (*Ditch* 65). Adah, in contrast to Whoopey, cares about creating a homely space in her flat. Very basic needs like heating the flat, feeding herself and children and having a bath are all challenges that Adah needs to overcome. Being offended by the way the less fortunate are treated, Adah still appreciates the solidarity in the ditch. Carol invites her for coffee, and she feels consoled in the company of other women.

In the mansions, Adah enjoys the freedom to try new things on the one hand, and suffers from the poor living conditions on the other. Despite her problems, Adah starts a new life which transforms her. As Braidotti professes: "Migrants, exiles, refugees have first-hand experience of the extent to which the process of disidentification from familiar identities is linked to the pain of loss and uprooting. Diasporic subjects of all kinds express the same sense of wound" (*Transpositions* 84). However, she does not end her argument in a hopeless tone; she believes that "[m]ultilocality is the affirmative translation of this negative sense of loss" (*Transpositions* 84). In parallel with Braidotti's suggestion, Adah experiences the process of moving from uprootedness to appropriation:

Adah stopped being homesick. She was beginning to feel like a human being again and with a definite role to perform – even though the role was in no other place but in the ditch. It was always nice and warm in the ditch. (*Ditch* 74-75)

The community in the Mansions make her feel comfortable and grateful and it transforms into a point of reference for Adah. Feeling at home in the ditch does not disconnect Adah from Nigeria at all; she has the richness of translocal experience:

She[Adah] had tried to paint rosy pictures of Nigeria to her kids, the graceful palm trees, coconut-lemonade and all that, yet they were only curious, not really moved. They made Adah feel so old, as if she was talking of another world rather than a place which she left only a few years before. 'Don't tell them at school,' she said. 'Don't tell them you are not proud of your country.' (*Ditch* 80)

As I stated elsewhere, "Adah's attachment to her native land and desire to keep the good memories of home in her memory do not prevent her from becoming a new woman in a new land" ("Personal History" 510). Adah's son Titi's quick reply exemplifies the constructedness of the concept of home: "When I grow up, I'll choose my country, but not now," (*Ditch* 81) so home is not where you or your parents were born but where you feel you belong. Adah's efforts to explain the beauty of Nigeria do not move her children at all. She wants to impress her children by talking about her childhood habits in Nigeria to convince her children not to ask for sweets. Indeed, she is troubled by lack of money but tells her children that she owes the health of her teeth to not having eaten sweets as a child. Despite Adah's attempt to create a heavenly image of Nigeria, her children are sarcastic about their mother's homeland. Titi bursts into laughter as she wonders whether there were any sweet shops when her mother was a child (*Ditch* 82). Let alone her children, Adah herself questions whether it is wise to be back in her homeland:

Oh God, let me die in my country when my turn comes. At least there'll be people to hold my hand. But then her thoughts went to her people who had recently died in the bush during the Biafran War. Most of them had died from snake bites, running away to save their lives. There is no safety anywhere really. (*Ditch* 138)

Despite her longing for home, she surely knows that she cannot attain the feeling of at-homeness in Nigeria any more. In fact, not having been

able to feel at home in Nigeria is the reason why she has moved to England.

Despite the unhealthy living conditions in the mansions, Adah is distressed by the news that mansions will be abolished, and they will be relocated in other places. She has always yearned for a life which enables her to perform her subjectivity, but the chance to acquire it somehow frightens Adah. As Susan Yearwood asserts:

She begins, in the novel, as a working mother struggling to maintain a certain independent status quo for the sake of her young children and her sanity, but finding the task too difficult to follow through with, Adah accepts the financial offerings of the Welfare State, despite her earlier, ideological quest for dignified self-expression and economic autonomy. (140)

As a person who has worked since her early childhood and earned her own living, her self-respect is ruined by living on the dole. Longing for the days when she used to earn money to support her and her children's life, Adah starts looking forward to leaving the place: "She started to yearn for a little privacy. The idea of life being doled out to her became more oppressive as winter gradually gave away to spring. When she moved into her new place she would stay in isolation" (*Ditch* 119). She wants to build her self-esteem by creating a new life for her children where they do not "have to apply for free dinners" (119). She wants her children to have the same facilities as the ordinary children. Imagining a life of dignity and freedom with a little privacy, she gets used to the idea of making a new life.

The novel does not end implying fear and anxiety but suggests hope for the future: "A week later, she moved out of the Mansions, away from the ditch, to face the world alone, without the cushioning comfort of Mrs Cox, without the master-minding of Carol. It was the time she became an individual" (149). Adah's story finishes after she moves out of the Mansions; however, the short chapter entitled "Into the Matchboxes" is

full of happiness and hope for the future and displays a vivid picture of transformation. Her middle-class dream has almost come true; she has started dressing up smartly as she has improved her sewing skills. Despite not being used to the solitude in the apartments which she calls matchboxes, she appreciates privacy and solitude. Like her neighbours she decides to “play it big” (*Ditch* 151) and “enjoy her new surroundings” (150). Adah cannot get rid of binary thinking totally but showcases many instances of criticizing and despising binary thinking. Her yearning for transformation still carries middle-class aspirations, which somehow confine her in dualistic thinking. However, her insistence on being an individual who can keep her self-esteem and her emphasis on her desire for solitude signal that the nomadic subjectivity functions in her process of creating at homeness in England.

4.1.2 Theatre as a homely space in *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*

The story of the unnamed protagonist of *Caravanserai* continues in the sequel novel, *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*. She now lives in a guest workers’ hostel for women in Germany with many other Turkish women without speaking a word of German. Her aspiration to study theatre has driven her to Germany, but she could arrive in Berlin only as a guest worker. However, she reaches her aim eventually, and her interest in theatre paves the way for freedom, which she has already been looking for in her home country. Before she leaves Turkey, her mother criticizes the protagonist for not completing her high school education and taking her diploma. Her mother cries: “Can Shakespeare or Molière help you now? Theatre has burned up your life” (*Golden Horn*³¹ 4). The protagonist is sure about what she wants: “Theatre is my life, how can my life burn itself?” (*Golden Horn* 4). Proving her claim, she constructs her life in Germany with an inquisitive eye as if it were part of a theatre play. In this

³¹ Hereafter *The Bridge of the Golden Horn* will be abbreviated as *Golden Horn*.

process, she brings her former experiences of traditional Turkish theatre to Germany, and in due course she is exposed to different styles of theatres in Turkey and Germany. Her perception of life changes as she gets trained in different theatres, and her theatrical performance and education becomes integral to her subjectivity. In the protagonist's life, theatre serves as a rhizome in Braidotti's sense bringing various discourses, embodying philosophical discussions, gender issues, anti-militarism and anti-fascism together without hierarchizing one over another.

Theatre is a recurrent image in the novel. She is attracted to theatre buildings; she defines where she is by referring to theatre buildings and constantly makes allusions to the traditional Turkish theatre. References to theatre present rhizomes where hierarchies dissolve in a dialogic relationship providing the protagonist with different ways of *becoming*. Not being able to speak German and not being familiar with life in Germany, she visualizes what is happening in her life as an outsider. She has a very limited experience of the host country between "hossel³² door, Hertie door, bus door, radio valve factory, hossel room table and factory green iron table" (*Golden Horn* 16).

In this adaptation process, all the women characters in the novel translocate their former habits to this new land, and the protagonist familiarises herself with her new life connecting her experiences with theatre. She likens the sounds of the kitchen to Turkish shadow plays:

It looked like shadow plays in traditional Turkish theatre. In it figures came on the stage, each speaking their own dialect – Turkish Greeks, Turkish Armenians, Turkish Jews, different Turks from different towns and classes and with different dialects – they all misunderstood each other, but kept on talking and playing, like the women in the hossel, they misunderstood each other in the kitchen, but

³² In the original version the protagonist uses "Wonaym" instead of "Wohnheim" and it is translated to English as "hossel" instead of "hostel."

handed each other the knives or pots, or one rolled up another's pullover sleeve, so that it didn't hang into the pot. (*Golden Horn* 16-17)

The kitchen has a lot of sounds carrying the various accents and experiences of Turkish women to a homogenous space, which does not hierarchise one over the other. Among these women, there are students, prostitutes, mothers, housewives, workers and artists. This polyphony of the Turkish traditional theatre like the above scene shows how they reproduce their habits in Germany before getting used to ways of living in the host country. Days later, they turn on the TV, starting their interaction with life in Germany. The first thing they watch on the TV is figure skating as they do not need language to enjoy the show. Linguistic barriers are evaded by translinguistic devices such as music and dance.

In her early days in Berlin, in the midst of her life restricted between the hostel and the factory, the protagonist is fascinated by the lights of Hebbel Theatre: "The theatre was lit up and a neon sign was constantly going on and off. This light also fell into [their] room" (*Golden Horn* 12-13). The protagonist's desire to be an actress turns the Hebbel Theatre, which is located opposite the women's hostel, into a point of reference to give directions. She locates other places she visits like The Turkish Workers' Association by referring to the location of the Hebbel Theatre, but she does not go to the Hebbel Theatre to watch plays. Hebbel Theatre, although it has gone through a lot of transformation since it was opened, used to be a theatre where classical plays were put on stage. Thus, as a building of classical theatre it stands there as a master signifier and despite being fascinated by its glamour, the protagonist does not attempt to familiarize herself with this institution.

The protagonist watches her first play in Germany thanks to Vasif, whom she calls the communist hostel warden³³, and his wife. The hostel warden's wife invites the protagonist to a theatre performance in East Berlin, and this is her first encounter with life in Berlin outside the hostel. She defines what she has seen and how she feels: "We went to the other Berlin, to the Berliner Ensemble, and saw a play, *Arturo Ui*. The men in gangster suits put up their hands, there was a head gangster, who stood on a high table. I didn't understand a word and loved it and loved the many, many lights in the theatre" (*Golden Horn* 22). Although the protagonist does not depict her feelings and thoughts in depth, her fascination with the performance draws attention to how art transcends linguistic barriers. Not comprehending the language is not an obstacle to appreciate the value of the performance. In fact, this sympathy for the play signals that the protagonist will be drawn to Brechtian Theatre, which indeed problematizes the German way of representing the truth through alienation effects.

On her way from the theatre to the hostel, the protagonist gets familiar with the Berlin streets, which creates a longing for her home country. She smells the air and feels that it is so similar to the smell of İstanbul. Dove tells her that the same diesel oil is used in both İstanbul and East Berlin. The smell of diesel oil creates a translocal experience through which home is remembered through olfactory senses. A rhizome, where the

³³ Life in the hostel has been a women's world until the first hostel warden is fired because she does not hand in the women's packages sent from Turkey. She lies that they have not been accepted to Germany and takes women's packages herself. The communist hostel warden arrives after she is fired. The hostel warden and his wife, whom he calls Dove, worked in theatre in Turkey; they came to Germany upon an invitation from a theatre festival, and then stayed in Germany. The hostel warden extends the limits of their lives by introducing them to new people sharing his books and ideas with them. The hostel warden's contribution to the young women's lives was undeniable, but it should also be kept in mind that his ideas produce binary oppositions from time to time, which will be explained later.

boundaries of home and host are blurred, occurs thanks to her visit to Berliner Ensemble. As Silke Schade claims:

Lived in, it becomes a home filled with memories, sensations, images, smells and sounds associated with social interactions. Through interaction with its inhabitants, the lifeless structure of bricks and mortar becomes the object of emotions too complex, personal and nuanced to ever be fully conveyed except by those who live in it. Here, home is not a static concept, but an interaction, a dialogue, and an ongoing dynamic process. (26)

This dynamism of creating a sense of home involves both remembering and missing the homeland, and denying the oppressive elements of the homeland. Theatre is always connected to the protagonist's formation involving the moments of appropriating the spaces. Her account is almost always related to her experience with or her perception of theatre, which reminds Braidotti's claims built on Glissant to explain this creative process:

[B]ecoming-nomadic marks the process of positive transformation of the pain of loss into the active production of multiple forms of belonging and complex allegiances. What is lost, in the sense of fixed origins, is gained in an increased desire to belong, in a multiple rhizomic manner which transcends the classical bilateralism of binary identity formations. (*Transpositions* 84)

The protagonist's commitment to theatre initiates her sense of identification with the new space. She starts to build this sense of belonging through art, which problematizes fixed identities.

In the protagonist's adaptation process, the oppression of the home culture is translocated to Germany, and each move of the protagonist and her friends involves the fear of their families and the fear of being judged by the society. Discovering the streets involves the pressure of the Turkish norms. The girls yearn for freedom and that is why they are in Germany, but their engagement with the life on the streets of Berlin does not easily lead to it:

They walked along the streets as if at that moment they were being filmed for TV. To me the streets and people were like a film, but I didn't have a part in this film. I saw the people but they didn't see us. We were like the birds, who flew somewhere and from time to time came down to earth, before flying away again. (*Golden Horn* 25)

The constant state of movement like a bird's is an example of nomadic experience. However, the image of the bird, which metaphorically expresses independence, turns out to represent uprootedness in this context. The protagonist and her friends leave the hostel, a striated place in Deleuzoguattarian sense, and stroll around the streets without having any destination to reach. Rather than enjoying freedom immediately and comfortably, the protagonist observes life as an outsider without delving into it, and she tries to get to know it from a marginal status.

The protagonist's perception of time and space is blurred implying not a sense of at-homeness, but a process of getting familiar with the unknown. They try to extend their lives and learn new locations to go to. However, they cannot easily achieve the feeling of belonging:

When the other women came back to the hossel at night, they also brought back new addresses from Berlin with them: KaDeWe, Café Keese, Café Kranzler. So we three girls went to Café Keese. Telephone dance. There were telephones on the tables, one could invite men to dance. We sat down at two tables and phoned each other. 'Hello, Mother, I'm your daughter, how are you?' – 'Oh, my child, how are you? What have you been eating?' (*Golden Horn* 26)

Instead of joining in the telephone dating, they impersonate their mothers through the telephone calls and create a sense of safety and belonging. By mimicking each other's mothers, they try to hear the voices they long for and create a simulacrum of their roots, which indeed would bring the sense of home to Berlin to telephone dancing café at that moment. The protagonist's interest in theatre turns her life into a performance, and what she performs becomes part of her subjectivity. These young women

also believe that their mothers can hear them when they pass by the telephone booth. Silke Schade assumes that:

The protagonist's discussion of a phone booth as an imagined link between herself and her mother is particularly significant: at first, she and her friends make a point to speak loudly in the presence of the phone booth, imagining that their mothers in Turkey can hear them. With increasing connections to the social and physical spaces around them, the girls begin to whisper around the telephone booth, as if hiding their new lives from their mothers. (26-27)

The new land does not readily open gates to freedom, but it takes time to liberate themselves from the constraints of their hometown's traditions. At this point, telephone booth can be taken as an anchoring point referring to Braidotti, who rejects defining subjectivity in the frame of binary opposition of "Self to society" since such a thinking will denounce the complexity of the "web of power effects" in the process, and she underlines how "self and society are mutually shaped by one another" (*Transpositions* 86). Therefore, in Braidotti's understanding, the 'imaginary' encompasses anchoring points which are set on "socially mediated practices" presenting a slippery and context-bound nature. As the characters' relation with Berlin is enhanced, the telephone booth loses its importance as an anchoring point, which builds the connection between their roots and new explorations.

As her experiences in Berlin accumulate, the protagonist starts to be part of life in the streets, and her perception of the streets is not striated / gridded. It is a smooth space coloured by her childhood memories. The focus is on the feeling it evokes. When the protagonist states "[a]s a child [she] ha[s] stayed in the street until midnight, in Berlin [she] ha[s] found [her] street again," she "crafts a metaphor out of a childhood memory to convey a sense of place she feels in the city of Berlin" (Schade 319). Silke Schade believes that the association between the childhood street and Berlin creates a bond between "something large and potentially

impersonal – with the characteristics of intimacy, security, and home” (319). Thus, the physical space becomes a site of memory, which connects home representing rootedness and host representing motion (320). In Braidottian sense, this creates a rhizome where boundaries of space are blurred. Home and host are located and translocated in the narrator’s experience amalgamating the personal memory and nomadic subjectivity by appropriating the street, which creates a feeling of at-homeness. The narrator states:

The Berlin streets had many gaps, here stood a house, then came a hole, in which only the night lived, then again a house, out of which a tree had grown. When we wandered around in the Berlin holes at night, our life disappeared. (*Golden Horn* 40-41).

One should remember that during World War II many houses were bombed and demolished, which left Berlin streets with many holes and ditches. The protagonist is a stranger to this locality and historical background, and this unfamiliarity reveals metaphorical holes in addition to the literal ones. However, these holes can be taken as positively productive sites referring to what Deleuze and Guattari call the lines of flight or ruptures. They are the spaces where nomadic subjectivity defies the limiting effects of state apparatuses. The form of the novel adopts a magical realist tone fostering the ambiguity of the gaps:

Then Angel, Ataman and I walked close together like three sheep. If we had spoken, perhaps the night, which stood in these holes like a big razor blade, would have cut our bodies to pieces. Not until we stood at an intersection and the light was red or green did our life return to us again. We then crossed the street, without turning round to the holes. (*Golden Horn* 40-41)

What the narrator / protagonist means by holes is not obvious. It is a space of ambiguity at the intersections where they regain lives. When there is movement, change, livelihood and crossings, there is becoming

and life. Intersections might symbolize the embeddedness of these characters, and holes might symbolize their *becoming*.

In the midst of this magical realist scene where the intersections and holes prevail, they meet an old man who needs some help to go home since he is affected by the strong storm. They take him to his place. There, Ataman and Angel make love, and this is Angel's first sexual experience. Ataman and the communist hostel warden - the Marxist characters- have been encouraging the young women to make love claiming that they will only be free after having lost their 'diamond,' and getting rid of the diamond is necessary to be a good actress. In their suggestion, there is a paradox: while trying to help them liberate themselves from the constraints of the patriarchy, they use a patriarchal language using the word 'diamond' for virginity ("Female Subjectivities" 200).

Özdamar's witty narration without explicit criticism of these characters reveals how their claims prove to be wrong. In contrast to what they claim, making love does not immediately bring liberation. Angel has an urge to leave the hostel as she thinks she is empowered enough to live in a flat. She also convinces the protagonist to move out of the hostel and live there together. Nevertheless, they cannot feel at home in this new place and understand that their life at the hostel is quite different from life in Berlin, which they are not ready to explore yet. Even Angel, despite having had a sexual intercourse cannot achieve the sense of freedom, in contrast to Ataman's and the communist hostel warden's claims. Thus, sexual experience does not immediately generate autonomy. The narrator speaks in regret:

The clock ticked in the suitcase, which we hadn't opened yet, and water dripped into the sink tip tip tip. In some places the electric wiring was exposed, and many insects had died on the light bulbs. Their dirty light provided hardly any brightness for us, but only weekly illuminated the insect death. Every cigarette we smoked that night showed us that we had made a mistake. We had run away from the herd

and now we wept for the herd. . . .One of the 40 watt light bulbs flickered, went on and off. (*Golden Horn* 44)

There is nothing safe or homely about this description. Rather than enjoying the excitement of a new life, they are hesitant to delve into it. Their suitcase is not unpacked, and the description of the flat presents a hostile environment. The protagonist is aware of their situation:

This was Berlin. This Berlin had not existed for us yet. We had our hossel and hossel was not Berlin. Berlin began only when we left the hossel, just as one goes to the cinema, sees a film and comes back on the bus and tells the others the story of the film, but the image had frozen, had come to a stop. No one knocked, no one stood up and opened the door. We lay on the beds in our clothes and coats, wept in the darkness and before the dew fell we went back with our not yet opened suitcases to our women's hossel. (*Golden Horn* 44)

The protagonist and Angel cannot feel at home in this new place, and they yearn for familiarity which creates a sense of safety. The state of lack of belonging drives them to the hostel once again.

Ironically, the hostel for the guest workers can be taken as a striated space – restricting, authoritative- in Deleuzian perspective, but it turns out to be a smooth space where the female characters feel safe and comfortable by engaging in multiple ways of *becoming*. As Deleuze and Guattari assert, “smooth space is constantly being translated, transversed into a striated space; striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space” (*Thousand* 474). Here, the hostel as a smooth space presents a homely welcome for these young women through familiar images and smell:

When we arrived in the hossel, the women were already awake. The corridor smelt of women's sleep and boiling eggs. We stood outside the bathroom doors and heard the sound of the water splashing on the women's bodies. We opened the door and saw the lather on the stone floor and on the women's faces. The soap slipped out of one woman's hand, I picked the soap up and gave it back to her, she had

shut her eyes, soap was running from her hair over her eyes. I smelled my hand, it smelled of soap, and when we waited at the bus stop again with all the other women and came closer together because of the cold, all the other women smelt of the soap. (*Golden Horn* 44).

The smell of the soap binds the protagonist and Angel with those women. To overcome their fear of still being in the Berlin flat, the protagonist stealthily smells the women's hair to assure that she is together with these women, not in the Berlin flat. Thus, spaces are never dead, and their function is a constant transposition between the striated and the smooth.

The protagonist's life in Berlin introduces her to different ways of *becoming*, but she cannot fulfil her aspirations in a short while. She wants to study theatre and wants to get rid of her virginity to become a better actress as suggested by the Marxist friends. However, she turns back to Turkey without achieving her objectives. She has not appropriated the Berlin streets yet despite her wish to do so. As Ernest Schonfield puts forward:

The two-part structure – Part One mainly in West Berlin, Part Two mainly in Istanbul – might suggest a binary vision of 'two worlds'. On closer reading, however, the many parallels between the various locations do not support such an interpretation. Even the title of the novel refers to the Galata Bridge between two European districts of Istanbul. Running from North to South, rather than an East-West opposition, it implies a sense of crossings within Europe. (7)

Schonfield's comments somehow highlight that the protagonist's concern is not with the dualisms in the Western world. She is a stranger to this dualistic discourse, but she manages to deconstruct what Braidotti and Deleuze try to attack in the course of her formation.

When she is back in Istanbul, the protagonist sees a stable and unwavering life. Rather than feeling comfortable, she is distressed there. Observing Istanbul, she sees that nothing has changed:

In Istanbul everything was in the same place as before, the mosques, the ships, the men who worked on the ships, the men who made tea, the greengrocer opposite our apartment. Even an old car that had broken down stood in exactly the same place as I had seen it a year before. Grass was growing out of the door. The sea was still the same colour, and as before the ships sailed backwards and forwards between Asia and Europe. (*Golden Horn* 78)

She depicts almost a deadly image of İstanbul, which is no longer a smooth space allowing various subjectivities to occur. Even the growing grass is presented in a language suggesting a frozen state. The protagonist feels as if this stagnant life would be waiting for her forever:

I thought, I can leave again, everything will stay in the same place and wait for me. The same light bulb, which a year before had already flickered and constantly gone on and off, still hung in the entrance to our house. When I come back, I thought, it will still be flickering and going on and off, I can leave. I wanted to learn German, and then rid myself of my diamond in order to become a good actress. Here I would have to come home every evening and look in my parents' eyes. Not in Germany. (*Golden Horn* 78-79)

This stability looks deadly to her, and she wants to have a transformative life. Her family is very happy and proud to see their daughter back at home. Realizing that she cannot speak German, they encourage her to go back to Germany and learn the language. In her second visit to Germany, the female protagonist has two aims: she wants to learn German to act in theatre and lose her virginity to be a better actress. She uses a patriarchal and negative language like "getting rid of her diamond," the language of the Marxist characters. She thinks she can only experience sexual intercourse when she is away from her mother and father as sexual relationship out of marriage is disowned by Turkish society. After her second arrival in Germany, she actualizes what she intends to do.

Upon receiving her father's letter stating that her mother is sick, the protagonist turns back to Turkey with two students who drive to İstanbul

through Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria to smell some 'communist air.' The motif of travel with its transformative energy is recurrently underlined. These young people are in a process of intellectual change, and they want to see how the theories affecting them are practiced in communist countries. When she turns back to Turkey, she has learnt German, has had her first sexual experience and has engaged with theatre.³⁴

After arriving in Turkey having fulfilled her objectives, she feels alienated. She is estranged from the familiar settings in her home country. In contrast to her previous observations, nothing is the same now:

We arrived in İstanbul, where many people ate money. The students drove me to my parents. In front of the house a man came driving toward us in a Pontiac. Out of the car window he said: 'Welcome, my daughter, don't you know your father anymore? Have you forgotten us in Germany?' He thanked the two students and said: 'Let us drink a tiredness tea.' We followed him up to the third floor, a woman opened the door and cried out: 'My daughter!', kissed me and looked at me again and again, as if she couldn't believe that I had come back. I hadn't recognised my mother. 'I could only fetch you back to İstanbul with a lie, you were in Germany too long, it's too dangerous for a young girl to live in a foreign country for so long.' I sat on the couch with the two students as if I were in a strange house. The room was full of sun, but I didn't recognise the sun again either. A bird in a cage began to sing. The woman who was supposed to be my mother said: 'Look, Memiş the bird has recognised you, he's singing for you.'*(Golden Horn 133)*

The unnamed protagonist is alienated from her home and does not feel comfortable there. She is even estranged from her mother and father. Believing in the Marxist characters, she makes love with someone she calls the limping socialist, but instead of experiencing the feeling of freedom as they have suggested, she gets pregnant and has to deal with

³⁴ The details of the protagonist's experiences in her second arrival in Germany will be discussed in the next subsection with a focus on how binary thinking is problematized and replaced by nomadic thinking in detail.

this complicated problem. Her new situation alienates her from herself, her family and her homeland. Whatever used to look the same and familiar before are now foreign. She is in a limbo situation, trying to decide what to do with her pregnancy. She looks for ways to get rid of the baby without telling her family. Among the people she thinks of asking for help, her schizophrenic childhood friend proposes to her. He is in love with the protagonist, and he wants to save her from the judgement of the society due to this baby. Instead of yielding to a traditional life by marrying her friend, the protagonist prefers to follow her dreams of becoming an actress. With a friend's help, she terminates her pregnancy in İstanbul. Instead of getting married and having a settled life, she chooses the limitless alternatives to explore ("Female Subjectivities" 203).

While determining how to go on with her life, as Maria Mayr suggests, the protagonist slips into third person, and she focalizes herself as an outsider (328):

The ship was just in the middle between Asian and European İstanbul. The actress came out of my body, she pushed a man and a child in front of her and threw them from the ship into the Sea of Marmara. Then she came back and entered me again. (*Golden Horn* 147)

Since theatre presents limitless ways of becoming, the actress living in the protagonist's body denies a life confined within marriage with a child. As Maria Mayr comments:

Significantly, it is the actress within the protagonist who makes the important decision not to marry and to terminate her pregnancy. In order to pursue her dream of the theatre, her potential future self (that is, the actress) rejects her alternative self as wife and mother. Realizing that she is free to choose the role she wants to adopt and thus carries full responsibility for her actions, she liberates herself from the unwanted pregnancy in the space opening up on the Sea where nothing is fixed and determined and thus everything is changeable. (328)

The protagonist turns to first person narration after making her decision on abortion and not marrying her friend. Mayr's comment on the sea as an unfixed space opening alternatives for transformation demands attention. On the sea, she realizes her right to self-determination by leaving the restricting set-values aside. Being a nomad does not mean that one cannot or is unwilling to create the necessarily stable and reassuring symmetries for identity that allow one to function in a community. Rather, nomadic consciousness consists in not taking any kind of identity as permanent: "The nomad is only passing through; s/he makes those necessarily situated connections that can help her/him to survive, but s/he never takes on fully the limits of one national, fixed identity. The nomad has no passport-or has too many of them"(*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 33). Indeed, theatre helps her to be on the move and in transition while providing a homely space at the same time. Her desire of not losing her image as her parents' naïve daughter contrasts with her desire to be sexually independent and artistically competent. However, these opposing alternatives coexist in her attempts to build up her future.

The protagonist can only rehome herself in İstanbul thanks to the theatre. In her decision to terminate her pregnancy, theatre once again acts as a rhizome enabling multiple points of flight to occur without any confinements. She wants to reformulate her life as a play since she thinks that everything is easier on stage. Imagining her life as part of a play, she gains the agency to shape her life:

I wanted to be an actress; everything that was difficult in life was easier in the theatre. Death, hate, love, being pregnant. One could put a cushion under one's dress and act pregnant, then take the cushion away again and the next evening put it under one's dress again. One could kill oneself for love, but stand up again, wipe away the stage blood, smoke a cigarette. (*Golden Horn* 140)

Her fascination with the theatre might be taken as a sign of her agency to perform her life in the way she wants. Her answer to Memet, the director of the drama school, a famous actor and a director, who asks the reason

why the protagonist wants to be an actress almost in an angry tone of voice demands attention:

I want to live poetically. I want to awaken the passive life of my intelligence ... I love films. Because in one and a half hours one sees a story without holes. It's very beautiful to sit [*sic*] a dark room and to cry and laugh. In the theatre I'd like to waken the emotions of the audience. (*Golden Horn* 152)

In relation to what she says, the protagonist is filled with enthusiasm for life, through the theatre. Fact and fiction are blurred, and she makes use of the power of ambiguity and ambivalence to remake herself.

Theatre education also involves various ways of being through different theatre schools. The protagonist learns about both surrealist and Brechtian theatres. Her experimentation in theatre results in experimentation in life. She has a surrealist teacher, Memet who encourages his students to act passionately and to evoke emotions by referring to the story of Prometheus. He says:

You must go beyond your limits you must draw all the emotions out of your body, until you have got to know them. Then your limits will fall away. Theatre is a laboratory, in which the emotions are studied under a microscope. But first you have to draw them out of your body. (*Golden Horn* 155)

His teaching boosts the protagonist's desire to discover her body and bodily pleasure. Her friends also want to take the ownership of their bodies and talk about the ways to enjoy sexual pleasure. Being aware of the empowering qualities of corporeal expression, they want to transcend the confines of what is readily presented to them.

While Memet, the surrealist teacher, encourages his students to be daring and creative in acting, a Brechtian teacher suggests the opposite: "You mustn't act with the emotions but must act with your head, you must

draw on science and analyse the relations between people sociologically” (*Golden Horn* 156). Theatre education raises questions about various phases of life. In her words, “she raises her consciousness”. The protagonist amalgamates both ways of performing in theatre, and this performance somehow becomes her life.

The awareness the Brechtian theatre creates drives her to Eastern Turkey, but she gets to know people not only with her ‘head’ but also with her ‘body and heart,’ and in this process, the relationship between the body and the mind is not hierarchical. The protagonist and Haydar, the youngest drama student, are moved by the understanding they have developed in their drama education, which foregrounds gaining and presenting knowledge through bodily experience. They resent the news of people suffering on the Turkish-Iranian-Iraqi border because of avalanche and flood. In the newspaper, seeing that Apollo 7 is heading to moon while their people are deprived of food and medicine, with Haydar’s initiative they agree to go to the East to report on these people’s predicament. In fact, the protagonist consents to go to the East imagining that Kerim – her lover who is doing his military service then- will appreciate her seeing the photos taken by her and learning about the books she has read during the journey. This decision exemplifies Braidotti’s comment: “The personal is not only the political, it is also the basis for the theoretical” (*Patterns* 147). Her personal interest engages the protagonist with the political, and when the journey is over she is equipped with a deeper knowledge of her country.

Before she starts her journey, the protagonist’s family is anxious as they believe it is dangerous for a young girl. Despite their fear, the protagonist starts the journey, which somehow turns out to be her journey of transformation, and in the end she has a better understanding of the situation in Turkey. She evaluates the circumstances in different localities, and her experience in the end makes her think about the situation of people in Turkey. Her journey to the East exemplifies the

importance of politics of location as in Braidotti's words, "it provides both the means to explore and the creative force to experiment with alternative representations of the knowing subject" (*Portable* 216). Braidotti by building the nomadic understanding of the term "politics of location" developed by Adrienne Rich and later by Donna Haraway focuses on the importance of "a cartographic method of accounting for multiple differences within any subject position" ("Against Methodological" 410). In fact, the protagonist and Haydar encounter a location, which is alien to their lives in Turkey. They have the chance to see how people live in the Eastern Turkey. While narrating the dust, poverty, underdevelopment of the Eastern cities, the protagonist relates what is happening on the moon by reading the news. Their journey is full of obstacles due to lack of enough money and well- built roads. Moreover, after the protagonist answers the questions of a journalist, who is most probably an undercover police officer as hinted by the text, they are labelled as communists, and people, especially the officers stop helping them. The protagonist depicts their predicament in a comparative way: "We had set out at the same time as Apollo 7; they were already on the moon, and we hadn't even reached the town of Hakkari" (*Golden Horn* 217). This comparison reminds Braidotti's ideas. She confers that "[politics of location] aims at achieving epistemological and political accountability by unveiling the power locations which one inevitably inhabits as the site of one's subject-position" ("Against Methodological" 410). As they get to know different parts of Turkish geography, they understand the situation of the country better.

The local people in Eastern Turkey are friendly, and at first officers and civil servants help them. A senior officer in Diyarbakır appreciates them when the protagonist says: "We are actors from İstanbul and want to study the different people of our country. We want to get to the Iranian-Iraqi border at Hakkari" (*Golden Horn* 215). However, the interview with the journalist creates the image of anarchists and communists about them. They are followed by the soldiers and people stop helping them.

When the journey is over, they are acquainted with different locations of Turkey. Despite having been restricted by the state apparatuses, they discover their potential to fight the injustice they have witnessed. They end their journey hopefully believing that they can improve the conditions in Eastern Turkey, resonating with Braidotti's claims on location:

A cartography is a theoretically-based and politically-informed reading of the present. As such it responds to my two main requirements: namely, to account for one's locations in terms both of space (geo-political or ecological dimension) and time (historical and genealogical dimension); and to provide alternative figurations or schemes of representation for these locations, in terms of power as restrictive (potestas) but also empowering or affirmative (potentia). (*Portable* 216)

After the journey through which they have witnessed the harsh conditions people in the East face, to open up positive alternatives to them, i.e. to be able to change the underprivileged situation of this location, they write a report on what they have seen. The distress they have experienced is obvious in their report, and they are arrested for what they have written. After being released the protagonist sees that the newspapers talk about the pain the people are going through, and the protagonist feels her words are 'wounded'.³⁵ She has to leave to find a new language and to cure herself. Having seen a different part of Turkish cartography, İstanbul is no longer home for her, and she decides to make Germany her home. The atmosphere in Turkey 'wounds' her words, ideas and feelings, and she wants to go back to Germany where she believes her wounds will heal to live there forever. She wants to work in a theatre in Germany, which will provide a rhizome where she can feel at home.

In conclusion, achieving a sense of a homely space involves a complicated and complicating process. Adah wants to keep her ties with Africa alive and wants her children to know about her birthplace, but for her children,

³⁵ The protagonist uses the word 'wounded' to signify her disability to express her ideas and feelings in Turkish because of the traumatic events she experiences in Turkey.

Adah's attachment to her homeland does not make any sense. When dreaming of a life in her homeland again, Adah also remembers the wars going on in Biafra and how hard life would have been there. Adah's anxieties about the possibility of not feeling at home in her homeland are also visible in the experience of the protagonist of the *Golden Horn*. She cannot feel at home after she turns back to Turkey, and her journey to the East of Turkey alienates her from the sense of at-homeness. With the hope of finding a new language in the theatre, which will hopefully provide her with new alternatives to become, she decides to go back to Germany- this time also supported by her mother as she realizes that her daughter must create her home somewhere else.

4.2 Nomadic thinking and Subjectivity

4.2.1 Adah's resistance to subordination in *Second-Class Citizen* and *In the Ditch*

Despite being born into a world of ideologized concepts such as gender, religion, tradition, race and ethnicity, which work through binary thinking, Adah is always critical of essentialised traits and ideas. She creates her own rhizome allowing herself to be on the move. Her desire and effort to make England her home instead of going on with her settled and comfortable middle class life in Nigeria is a proof that she wants to get rid of restrictive ways of living and thinking. However, moving to England does not easily present her with the luxury of living in a non-hierarchical way. England has its own ways of essentialising identity. In Adah's formation process, essentialist identity markers are criticized and evacuated, but they are also reconstructed at certain points.

Deleuze and Guattari's ideas on the relationship between rhizome- non-binary thinking- and dualistic thinking shed light on why and how Adah is trapped in dichotomies, but will also be free of the implied constraints:

Every rhizome contains lines of segmentarity according to which it is stratified, territorialized, organized, signified, attributed, etc., as well as lines of deterritorialization down which it constantly flees. There is a rupture in the rhizome whenever segmentary lines explode into a line of flight, but the line of flight is part of the rhizome. These lines always tie back to one another. That is why one can never posit a dualism or a dichotomy, even in the rudimentary form of the good and the bad. You may make a rupture, draw a line of flight, yet there is still a danger that you will reencounter organizations that restratify everything, formations that restore power to a signifier, attributions that reconstitute a subject— anything you like, from Oedipal resurgences to fascist concretions. (*Thousand* 97)

Encountering the institutions which try to solidify one's being is also part of the rhizomatic experience; nonetheless, as Deleuze and Guattari put it, there are always ruptures and lines of flight which may always act in unexpected ways by dissolving their firm status. Rhizome does not deny the identity markers, but suggests a coexistence of them without imposing any hierarchy or attributing negative connotations to them. Adah's becoming involves an engagement with not only institutions such as Nigerian traditions and the British Commonwealth System, but also their ruptures, which help Adah go beyond the constraints of these institutions to achieve nomadic thinking and subjectivity.

Adah confronts various limitations that tend to classify her experiences and *becoming*. In Adah's case, being disposed of a centre creates a desire to be in the centre, and this sometimes causes her to fall into binary thinking. Identity markers such as gender and place are constantly problematized in the novel but, as Lucinda Newns claims, "the text at points reproduces the very binary logic that the novel as a whole attempts to undercut" (79). However, the ironic tone of the novel always signals the subversion of the binary logic. Adah's escape from dichotomous thinking requires time and experience, and she can feel free only when she realizes the futility of adhering to the norms imposed by dualistic thinking. *In the Ditch* and *Second-Class Citizen* problematize binary thinking through

Adah's characterization and offer alternative ways of *becoming*, which Braidotti calls nomadic subjectivity. As L. Sasi Bala claims:

While Emecheta's main focus is Adah's successful struggle to redeem her individuality and assert her self-hood, she extends her sympathy to all women similarly handicapped whether they are white or black, English, European or African, the world over and bear the double yoke of being women and being poor. (53)

Adah's experiences display how women in general are capable of transgressing the boundaries imposed by the dominant ideology. Thanks to nomadic thinking, she relieves herself from the constraints of dualistic notions in the end. Her migratory experience, blackness, gender and beliefs about a middle-class life are problematized so as to underline the futility of sticking to labels. These identity markers intersect at many points, and the novels demonstrate the dissolution of the intersection of multiple identity markers. Emecheta's ironic narration makes the processes of problematizing binary thinking sharper, and it allows the oppressed to speak and perform.

Second-Class Citizen and *In The Ditch* are mainly about Adah's transformation as a woman and depict how fixed notions of gender are problematized in her *becoming* process. It is hard for Adah to get rid of gender binaries as she is born into a patriarchal society. While discussing gender constructions Deleuze and Guattari focus on how people's bodies are stolen from them to generate opposite organisms: "This body is stolen first from the girl: Stop behaving like that, you're not a little girl anymore, you're not a tomboy, etc. The girl's becoming is stolen first, in order to impose a history, or prehistory, upon her" (*Thousand* 276). Likewise, being born into such a society, Adah's aspiration to go to school is ignored by her family because of Nigerian traditions, which take investing money in a girl's education as waste since she is going to marry someone and will financially be of no use to her own family. In the end her stubborn

attitude pays off, and she starts school. However, her family takes Adah's education only as something to increase her bride price.

Despite her family's negative attitude, which restricts Adah's alternatives of becoming, she manages to relieve herself from these constraints. She has witnessed how her mother has had to marry her paternal uncle after her father's death, and condemns her mother although this is not her own choice. Seeing her mother's situation, Adah makes up her mind:

She would never, never in her life get married to any man, rich or poor, to whom she would have to serve his food on bended knee: she would not consent to live with a husband whom she would have to treat as a master and refer to as 'Sir' even behind his back. She knew that all Ibo women did this, but she wasn't going to! (SSC 19)

Having this in mind as stated above, she marries Francis, a seemingly ambitious young man instead of accepting "rich, old baldies" in her own words. In contrast to what is expected of a traditional Nigerian girl, she is happy that Francis is too poor to pay her bride price. Her marriage with Francis works as an attempt to open up a rupture in patriarchal discourse by using patriarchal tools such as marriage institution against itself. She feels delighted seeing that her mother and other relatives who have not invested anything in her education will receive no bride price, and now Adah has a home, where she can go on with her education at her own pace.

Inscribing the traditional values upon the women's body and preventing her from writing her own story are common traits of the discourse she was born into. Being deprived of her body forces the woman to write her own story to reclaim her *becoming*, as in Adah's case. Adah's multilingual and translocal experience helps her to engage in a flow, and her experiences liberate her story from the limitations of the narratives of the dominant ideology without the necessity to reflect on her condition. Adah achieves nomadic flow thanks to her agency –the power/potential to act-

without meditating on her experience. She has to make daring decisions concerning her education and marriage. She makes the most of her alternatives to lead a better life, but her portrayal is rather different from that of Francis whose characterisation also reveals the problematization of gender as a category in the novel.

As Deleuze and Guattari declare, the men are also stripped of their body and become the second victim whose becoming is seized by a strict definition of manhood against girlhood. Francis is a man who falls into the trap of the social and familial rules and norms, thus, presents a contrasting image to Adah. She chooses Francis for marriage with a false assumption, as he seems to be an ambitious young man with whom Adah can fulfil her dreams of continuing her education and living in England. Adah is disillusioned by Francis in the very first days of their marriage when she sees that Francis leaves the task of managing their lives as a married couple to his parents. She is frustrated when Francis leaves her in Nigeria and goes to England alone on his parents' advice. She resents the way he thoughtlessly reports this news without caring for Adah's pain.

While the novel foregrounds Francis's flaws such as being lazy, selfish and rude, it also lays bare why Adah has to leave Francis to build up her subjectivity. Francis has a tendency to restrict Adah's alternatives and treats her in a degrading manner. In contrast to Adah, who works and struggles hard to lead a decent life, Francis accepts the circumstances, even when they are unpleasant, as they are. He is not bothered by being categorized as a second-class citizen, which "is a metaphor that encapsulates an order of hierarchy, determinism, non-assertiveness, and a passive acceptance of situations as they are, and not as they can be carried forward or restructured" (Adjoe 23) in England and he expects Adah to fit in this category submissively. Upon arriving in England, she is subjected to physical violence as well as psychological abuse by Francis. Already having two children, Adah is concerned about not having another one at that moment, but as the narrator relates, Francis has

passed reasoning and their sexual intercourse hints at sexual violation. Adah's ideas and feelings about sexuality are not heard except for her desire of not falling pregnant again. As Sukanya Ghosh claims, being raised in a society where there is male supremacy, Francis accuses Adah of her frigidity rather than trying to work for a mutually shared sexuality (210). Adah thinks that Francis hates her. Ghosh also suggests that "[t]he narration of Adah-Francis reunion at London does not connote reestablishment of respectful spousal relations" (210).

Adah's fear of getting pregnant comes true. This makes her life in England difficult since nobody would like to hire a pregnant woman. After having found a position in a library, she manages to hide her pregnancy and starts to work, but she has to leave the job when she gives birth to another child. As she gets more sophisticated in England, she wants to go for family planning after having the fourth child. She is sure that Francis will not respect her decision. Already having lost several well-paid jobs because of her pregnancy, Adah this time is determined to prevent pregnancy since she is obliged to work. Due to the fact that Francis is, in Adah's words, "Nigerian through through," she has to do it without letting Francis know. As she has already guessed, when Francis realizes that Adah is trying to avoid a possible pregnancy, he becomes violent. As Daniel Okyere-Darko & Uriah S. Tetteh highlight, "[t]his ... marks the point where the will of the female is asserted and she decides to confront the patriarchal representative in the form of Francis, her husband" (58). He abuses Adah physically and psychologically, and this becomes a turning point for Adah when she understands there is no hope in this marriage.

During her marriage with Francis, Adah cannot own her body and mind. In addition to being deprived of birth control, she is belittled by the letters Francis sends to their families in Nigeria mentioning Adah's attempt to use birth control. Adah understands that Francis will never change for the better, and she opts for a life without him. Although Francis adapts

to some new ways of living in England, his ideas about women will not change at all. As Chris Weedon puts it, “the rigidity of the forms of masculinity that men bring with them from their country of origin” is one of the themes of the novel (23). She opines that gender roles are too fixed for male immigrants to change. While Francis believes that Adah has to earn their family’s living as she did in Nigeria, he grants himself the liberty of sleeping with other women. He rejects Adah’s right to birth control accusing her of using it as an opportunity to sleep with other men.

Adah grasps the dynamics of life in London in a better way than Francis does. This makes her reluctant to lose her job because of another pregnancy. However, Francis is not ready to push the limits of the belief system he is born into. In fact, Adah’s feelings about her pregnancies reveal contradictory moments as she enjoys being a mother on the one hand, and fears losing her job and not being able to fulfil her personal dreams on the other hand. She may owe her ability to adapt to the new situations to her pregnancies during which her body and her subjectivity transform. As Braidotti also suggests “[t]he woman's body can change shape in pregnancy and childbearing; it is therefore capable of defeating the notion of fixed bodily form, of visible, recognizable, clear, and distinct shapes as that which marks the contour of the body. She is morphologically dubious” (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 80). Thus, the natural process the female body goes through can enable the women to assert her uniqueness. However, despite her desire to be a mother and feeling empowered by her experiences as a pregnant woman and a mother, Adah wants to prevent another pregnancy as she falls prey to the ‘logocentric economy.’ She cannot dare to lose her job and her middle-class status once again.

Francis realizes Adah’s readiness to adjust to new locations, and feels threatened by Adah’s transformation, which eventually makes him use physical violence to oppress Adah’s potential to do so. He has already been abusing Adah by living on her income, degrading her emotionally

and psychologically, by not respecting her choices. The constant psychological abuse reaches its peak when Francis burns Adah's first novel, which she calls her brainchild. This encourages her to leave Francis, who insists that in their tradition there is nothing like divorce. He mentions how her mother does not leave her father despite having been beaten for many years. Adah says that Francis is the one to have broken their laws by ignoring his family and beating Adah. Not constrained by the tradition, Adah feels powerful enough to get a divorce to lead a dignified life. Iyer claims that despite earning her life since childhood, living in Ibo and Western masculinist discourses makes Adah feel that a 'complete woman' is one married with children. However, Francis's constant psychological abuse ignites her desire to live without him: "Adah emerges from her trials a prouder and wiser woman, potentially a melange of progressive African and western cultural modes, increasingly free from the reactionary baggage of both cultures and embarking on a journey of transcendence and the self-definition" (Iyer 132). She has yearned for being equal in marriage and sharing the responsibilities of their family. Francis's reluctance leads Adah to take the necessary steps and relieve herself from the confinements of any society. Thus, she determinedly leaves him.

Adah's characterisation shows that the dualistic categories tending to fix one's becoming exist on a slippery ground, and what they represent changes as the human subject transforms and translocates to another place. For example, after Adah migrates from Nigeria to England, the connotations of blackness as an identity marker also change. Being black has never been a source of inferiority in Nigeria despite the colonial rule, but the situation alters when she migrates to England. In addition to the difficulty of finding a proper place to live in as a black woman in London, Adah has difficulty in engaging in communication with others because of many responsibilities such as keeping her job, looking after her kids and pursuing her studies at university.

The Mansions set-up helps Adah in many ways, but looking after her children and keeping them silent so as not to disturb the neighbours become a big challenge (*Ditch* 28). Despite her efforts to escape trouble, one of the early dwellers of the Mansions warns Adah in a threatening tone: “‘Look!’ he thundered, not bothering to introduce himself or excuse himself. ‘Look, I don’t mind your colour!’ Adah jumped. Colour, what colour was he talking about; she had never seen Mr Small before: what colour he was referring to?” (*Ditch* 28). Adah is amazed to hear that Mr Small mentions her colour. Since she was not born into Western dualistic discourse, she only learns about the dichotomy between black and white in England. The narrator’s attitude is satirical condemning segregation:

Well, human nature being what it is, Adah looked at the colour of the back of her hand, well yes. Mr Small did not mind the colour brown, now what next? What is the next thing he did not mind about? Mr Small’s eyes followed her movements and smiled. Happy. He had put Adah in her place. A black person must always have a place, a white person already had one by birthright. (28)

The sarcasm puts a distance between the character and the reader avoiding identification with Adah while relating the bitter events with a sense of humour. Adah makes it obvious that she has not been thinking on her colour, but living in England makes her colour-conscious. Feeling happy since she got divorced from Francis and finding a place of her own to live in, this time she is disturbed by her neighbours who make it clear that they own the place since they have been living in the mansions for thirty years. The Smalls’ attitude shows that they are trying to make sure that they are “one of the original clans of the Mansions” and the Council will count on what they report instead of Adah’s account (29). Realizing the difficulty of fighting against the senior citizens of the mansions, she apologizes and promises to keep her children silent. Appropriating this place is not easy for Adah.

The places occupied by Adah such as the Council flats, the room in the slum and the ruined flat in a wealthy neighbourhood cannot be

considered as proper homes where people can easily have a sense of belonging. Still thanks to her ability to adapt to the new situations, Adah can make her life easier in England: “One of the methods she had found very helpful in securing friendship in England was to pretend to be stupid. You see, if you were black and stupid, you were conforming to what society expected of you” (30). Adah, by experience, knows that playing the part of the stupid never fails to gain the sympathies of the Europeans who think they are superior. When she asks for the Smalls’ help to light the coalite, from their cynical remarks Adah feels that they consider her as illiterate. However, the truth is, she has always lived in Nigeria where the average daily temperature is at the eighties so she did not need to use the coalite. Her neighbours are not aware of her personal history, and Adah sees “no point in explaining to them that in her country she [has] attended a colonial school with a standard equalling the best girls’ school in London” (*Ditch* 32). Ironically, she works as a civil servant in their country placing her in the middle-class. Just to avoid trouble, however, she accepts her role as a stupid woman because “she ha[s] to belong, socialize, participate in the goings-on” (32). Unfortunately, her neighbours resist being friends with Adah, and they go on despising her as an illiterate, black migrant whose children make a lot of noise.

Similar attitudes sometimes have different results. Acting as someone less than she is helps her when she is about to be rehoused at the end of the novel. The evacuation of Pussy Cat Mansions forces all tenants to be replaced elsewhere. As she does not like the first flat offered to her, instead of explaining why she has not liked it, she pretends not to speak and understand English. As B.V. Saraswathy states:

Realising that the only way to get her point across to the officialdom is by behaving in a manner that they expect and understand – by impersonating as someone she is not, yet conforming to the preconceived impression of a black woman – Adah adopts that attitude. (179)

This time the clerk has to accept Adah's rejection and looks for a new place for her. This scene problematizes binary thinking in many ways. First, Adah believes that the white clerk will not respond to her concerns about the flat. Second, without any surprise, the clerk believes that Adah cannot speak English or comprehend what he says in English. Within the traps of this binary thinking, Adah once again turns the dominant ideology against itself to solve her daily problems. Confirming to the white clerk's expectations, she now has the chance of finding a better flat for herself and her children.

Race and colour as identity markers are problematized and emptied of their meaning by signalling the impossibility of categorizing one's subjectivity. To illustrate, the half-caste children of Mr and Mrs Jaja are called coloured by some people, and Mrs Jaja, whose husband is Nigerian, resents the situation. Adah remembers that her son Vicky has told her a kid of Jajas has called them blacks. Thus, the concept of blackness, which aims to solidify one's becoming, moves to a slippery ground losing its intended firm definition. What the concepts of blackness and whiteness connote changes according to each subject's perception as a result of nomadic thinking. What can free people from the negativity of racialization is "[r]ethinking the positivity of race" by "delinking the practice of racialization from its dialectical dependence on dualistic thinking" (*Transpositions* 64). Braidotti considers this "as a powerful form of becoming-minoritarian of racial privilege, according to the affirmative ethics of nomadic subjectivity, and an attempt to set the former minorities into an affirmative process of becoming, or self-affirmation. It is an empowering, albeit risky, strategy" (*Transpositions* 64). Employing such a strategy, Adah fights against the negativity imposed on her colour and race. For example, she shows Mr Persial, the officer who is in charge of replacing the tenants of the Pussy Cat Mansions, how shallow it is to undermine people because of their race. Mr Persial at first explains the reason why he cannot find a proper place for Adah:

Trouble is, large families are not trendy any more. Families are smaller these days. We in England don't have large families. We now reduce the number of our children because it is more economical. In fact in most civilized societies that's the new unwritten law. (*Ditch* 140)

Adah is offended by how Mr Persial categorizes her as 'untrendy' and 'uncivilized'. It seems pertinent here to refer to Braidotti's argument:

The others – women or sexual minorities, natives and non-Europeans and earth or animal others – have been marginalized, excluded, exploited and disposed of accordingly. The epistemic and world historical violence engendered by the claim to universalism and by the oppositional view of consciousness lies at the heart of methodological nationalism or conceptual Eurocentrism. ("Against methodological" 409)

In Persial's perception, Adah is the other who falls into the category of a non-European woman. However, nationalism or Eurocentrism cannot stop Adah's getting empowered by nomadic thinking. She responds to his statements: "Would you, sir, consider the Kennedys uncivilized or untrendy? What do you think of the Royal family?" (*Ditch* 140). Adah does not accept being categorized by the officer and makes her point so obvious that Mr Persial apologizes to her stating that he has not intended to personally look down on her. Instead, he implies, he has been trying to explain why it is so hard to find a place with four bedrooms. Despising the obvious insincerity of Mr. Persial, the tone of the narrator aligns with Adah's stance. As Braidotti further explains: "Nomadic becomings are rather the affirmation of the unalterably positive structure of difference, meant as a multiple and complex process of transformation, a flux of multiple becomings, the play of complexity, or the principle of not-One" (*Transpositions* 145). Likewise, having five children has positive connotations for Adah as her children's existence eases her sense of loneliness and makes her life meaningful. Thus, she refuses to be categorized as 'uncivilized.' Importantly, Adah protests against Mr Persial at a point when she is about to fully grasp the power of nomadic subjectivity, on the verge of setting up her life outside the ditch.

In her early days in the mansions, Adah does not know how to confront racial discrimination as this is something new to her. In time, she gets more experienced in the Mansions and becomes braver to deal with the racial discrimination she has encountered. She learns how to get her clothes washed and ironed in the wash house among women who do not treat each other well and despise Adah for her race and colour. On one occasion, she wants to do ironing using the rolling machine. While the machine is for the use of three people, a woman at the wash house does not leave any space for Adah, and Adah calmly acts by putting her baby's smallest and shabbiest pants into the machine. The woman reacts saying, "I don't understand you people, really I don't" (*Ditch* 129), which makes Adah question whether she has ever tried to understand her people. Adah strongly feels "fed up with being treated as semihuman" (130). The woman voices her racist feelings: "Why don't you go back to your own bleeding country?" (130). At this point Adah reproduces this binary thinking instead of offering an alternative way of becoming. However, Adah's response to this injustice is significant as she does not submit to the others' attempt to fix her identity by placing her in a subordinate category.

Adah emphasizes that the woman she argues with does not look English at all, and Mrs William confirms that she is Greek. However, not being very proud of her behaviour, Adah even feels remorse for not having let her finish ironing first, and more importantly, she feels sorry for "us[ing] the woman's own weapons by accusing her of being an immigrant" (130). Although she falls into the trap of reproducing binary oppositions, she never fully embraces this tendency. McLeod highlights the conflictual situation of dealing with the concept of race, and defines the compound as "a fragile, precarious and temporary space that struggles to make room for novel and sustained forms of identification and action" (100). He does not find the novel's tone hopeful and thinks that the compound cannot provide the feeling of at-homeness serving only as a 'temporary space'. Disagreeing with McLeod, I claim that the novel itself demystifies the notions of stable identities. The gradual development of Adah breeds a

hopeful tone. Despite everything, Adah and the other 'ditch dwellers' find ways to cope with life and experience moments of joy, which helps them feel dignified as human beings.

Adah is a judgement-destroyer and does not confine her subjectivity to the other's controlling judgements. When Carol, the Family Adviser, pays a visit to Adah's place upon the neighbours' complaints of her children's noise for the first time, she is suspicious of Carol and rejects her efforts to have a genuine conversation. She is concerned about the wellbeing of Adah's children and wants to see how they live and what they eat. Carol wants to start a conversation saying: "I see you are Ghanaian" (*Ditch* 35). Adah replies in a self-defensive mood, thinking that her nationality has nothing to do with the situation, and she does not like being categorized by Carol's partial perception of people of colour. While Adah acts in a hostile manner, Carol likes Adah and tries to keep the talk going to learn about Adah and her children to help them. Still, one can sense that Carol acts as a hand of authority, and Adah does not welcome this overbearing manner at her home. For instance, Carol asks Adah about the children's food and says that ground rice is cheap, and Adah protests by stating that she thinks it is filling. Carol further interrogates whether the children do not find it too hot, Adah replies: "Do English children like potatoes, don't they think they're tasteless?" (41). Carol's attempts to engage in a meaningful dialogue have a commanding tone according to Adah, and her demeanour meets Adah's objections to being categorized as the weaker leg of a hierarchical binary.

As Adah and Carol get to know each other, their friendship involves contradictory moments, since Carol also symbolizes Adah's relation with the Commonwealth Social Care System. The British National Assistance Act of 1948 has recognized the single mothers' "reproductive and caring work" (Klett-Davies 32) by providing them with financial support so that they can look after their children without working full-time. The system allows the mothers to work part-time, but does not allow them to earn

enough to help them live decently. Adah, working at a museum at that time, enjoys her professional life and middle class status; however, she has a lot of difficulties in taking care of her children since she does not have a partner to share the responsibilities.

Carol interrogates her for leaving her children very early to school in the morning and not taking them until 5 pm. The schoolmistress is not responsible for the children except for the class hours. Adah bursts out upon this criticism on her motherhood and determinedly states that she would resign:

Adah cut her short with determination. ... Her socialization was complete. She, a coloured woman with five kids and no husband, no job and no future, just like most of her neighbours – shiftless, rootless, with no rightful claim to anything. Just cut off . . . none of them knew the beginning of their existence, the reason for their hand-to-mouth existence, or the result or future of that existence. All would stay in the ditch until somebody pulled them out or they sank under. (*Ditch* 42)

This desperate tone indicates that Adah is not happy to live on the dole, but she recognizes that she has no other choice to keep her children safe. Her personal problems interfere with her work at the museum, and Adah thinks they are happy about her resignation. Losing her middle-class status makes Adah upset. Ironically, although she resents being labelled for her colour, she herself has a superior attitude towards the others not because of their race and colour, but because of educational background and social status due to one's job. Joblessness drives her into social contact in the mansions, and she turns out to be "a regular visitor at Carol's office" (42). B.V. Saraswathy also underlines this 'rootless' situation, but she adds: "Another way of looking at it would be that state-dependent motherhood is a liberating experience for these women" (172). I also take the process of being supported by the state as an emancipating phase in Adah's case. While leaving her job, her plan is to write African stories and earn money. Therefore, the financial support through dole gives her the space to have some time of her own and more time to take

care of her children. In this respect, although Adah cannot fulfil her dream of being a published writer and earning her living, the Commonwealth system appears to be helpful in that it backs up her potential to deal with the difficulties she is exposed to.

Adah has a great talent to overcome the challenges she is exposed to and the Commonwealth system helps her to recover in the process. Giving her a place to live in is a good start, and Carol's extra help also works on her way to liberation. However, living on the dole for a long time ruins Adah's self-respect, and she wants to start making money to buy Christmas gifts for her children with her own money. She does not want to give her children what other people give away. Determined to do something about it, she applies for a job as a cleaner in a hotel. However, she cannot work fulltime since she has to look after her children, and if she earns more than two pounds a week, she will lose her dole. In order not to lose her dole, she asks for two pounds for a six-pound job.

Adah's feelings in the process of application should be underlined as she wants to do it to rebuild her self-respect. Remarkably, this experience turns out to be a liberating one for her. First, her attitude towards the type of work and social-classes changes. Earlier, for example, she felt bitter about living together with lower class Nigerians. Also, despite Francis's demands and insistence, she refused to work in a shirt factory as many other Nigerian women were doing: "Working in a factory was the last thing she would do" (SCC 38). Overcoming the feeling of inferiority, she decides to draw a low profile trying to fit the employer's expectations, and she learns not to mind how other girls look down upon her. She once belonged to the lower-middle class; then resigned and became classless, and eventually with her new choice she becomes a member of the working class. Having experienced different social positions, Adah comes to a point where she leaves her prejudice about class consciousness behind and moves to a more emancipating point.

Adah's life is still hard because of her responsibilities: she works until the noon as a cleaner, looks after the children afterwards, attends the sociology classes in the evening beside doing all the domestic chores, which inevitably makes her health collapse in the end. Carol once again steps in to find a two pound-grant for her so that she may not need to work. Here, one of the problems caused by the Welfare System arises: "The British welfare state gives out mixed messages because it positions lone mothers as carers and workers but primarily as dependents" (Klett-Davies 46). Indeed, Adah has qualities to work as a librarian but working at a well-paid job means losing the dole. Carol's help strips Adah of the pleasure of earning money and buying something for her children with her own money. She is left as a dependant, once again. Adah's experience demonstrates not only the beneficial side of the Commonwealth System and also its flaws. Seeing how Adah is troubled, Carol calls for a doctor, and Adah becomes anxious once again. She thinks her house is too messy to call a doctor, and her lack of self-confidence shows itself once more. She states if she were white, the doctor would tolerate the mess. Adah is definitely bored with being given things and the possibility of being judged by the representatives of the authority such as doctors, social workers and advisers.

Adah is not the only one who is fed up with living on what the Welfare System offers. The women in the mansions revolt against Carol, and Adah also gets angry with her because of her constant spoonfeeding and ruining her chances of being independent. However, it is not easy to give up on Carol because Adah is used to living on the facilities she provides. Adah goes through another contradictory situation wanting to be autonomous on the one hand, and fearing being on her own on the other hand. The narrator speaks through Adah's mind:

The position she was in reminded her of young nations seeking independence. When they got their independence, they found that it was a dangerous toy. She would eat her

cake and have it. She would support the move, but she must be friendly with 'them.' (*Ditch* 113)

Adah still lacks self-confidence. She is afraid of leaving the mansions, not being on good terms with Carol and being left out by her neighbours. To avoid trouble she joins the women's meeting to criticize Carol. Women like Carol but the institution she represents sometimes wrongs them. They also realize that "[p]eople like Carol are employed to let them know their rights, but the trouble was that Carol handed them their rights as if she was giving out charity" (*Ditch* 117).

Adah's story may not seem overtly political but considering how the personal is the political, we see how Adah and the other women in the mansions see the faults of the Commonwealth Care System. In this process, Adah's definition of problem family raises conflicts:

A family is a problem one, if, firstly, you're a coloured family sandwiched between two white ones; secondly, if you have more than four children, whatever your income is; thirdly, if you are an unmarried, separated, divorced or widowed mother, with a million pounds in the bank, you are still a problem family; and lastly, if you are on the Ministry you are a problem. (117)

Adah's attempt to define what a problem family is is interrupted by Mrs Williams, who is a black woman living between two white neighbours with whom she gets on well. Another woman refutes these categories stating that she has six children, but they are working class people not being a problem for anybody. The women's quick reaction presents another instance of dissolution of categories. When Carol learns about the meeting, she gets angry with Adah for describing problem families since she is supposedly the one to have provided Adah with this definition. In this state, Adah re-evaluates her relationship with Carol and resents being humiliated by Carol many times. Carol talks about Adah's private moments in others' company to amuse her friends, and Adah bears this degradation only because she needs the grants Carol arranges for her.

Before leaving the ditch, Adah is determined to win her life back and feels strong enough to start a life without depending on help from the others.

The text also draws attention to another misperception in the society presenting how people overgeneralize what the 1968 youth represent and try to depict a devilish picture of them.³⁶ The volunteer students subvert another myth about identities. While the society believes these long-haired guitar-playing young people do not have any approvable qualifications, Adah is pleasantly surprised to see how they cleaned her flat and looked after her children:

These youths almost became members of Adah's family. They would wash nappies, feed the children and would even go out of their way to come and take the children out at weekends. Till her dying day, Adah would still wonder why overstuffed middle-aged individuals painted all young people as irresponsible, rootless and shiftless. No one ever publicized the good works they did. No one ever hinted that many of them joined organizations like Task Force. No one ever thought it worth his while to say anything about their sympathy and understanding. Some of the youths go to extremes, but what about the older generations, hadn't they got their eccentricities too? (*Ditch* 40)

Despite her previous fears that they would use drugs or make free love before her children, Adah gives a lovely picture of the 68s generation with their thoughtful contribution to society. This description demystifies the conservative society's look on them and presents different ways of becoming.

³⁶ Carol visits Adah which freaks her out with the fear of losing her children at the beginning of the novel. Carol is shocked to hear that Adah leaves her children alone in the evening to go to her sociology classes. She informs Adah that she is not allowed to do that in England and arranges some volunteer students to look after her children to enable her to go to the evening classes. Despite feeling disturbed by the feeling of being limited by Carol's services, she decides to make use of them as much as she can.

To sum up, Adah at the end of her story in the ditch is empowered by nomadic thinking, in a state free of the constraints of dualistic thinking which fosters the binaries of gender, religion, race and ethnicity. Adah despite re-creating dichotomous thinking at some points or becoming the victim of this thinking relieves herself from the restrictions and signals her nomadic becoming in the last sentence of the novel: “It was time she became an individual” (149).

4.2.2 The unnamed protagonist’s search for freedom in *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*

In Özdamar’s *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*, strict definitions and categories are challenged in a fashion to undermine binary thinking. Also, as already discussed, the boundaries of home are blurred. Where home is and who feels foreign to which culture is a matter of the unnamed protagonist’s experiences. The protagonist feels alienated from her own homeland; she does not want to live within the confinements of the patriarchal society. Instead of accepting what is presented to her by the society, she creates her own truth by letting her own circumstances and experiences flow in her becoming processes. The novel destabilizes hierarchical thinking by problematizing binaries of gender, homeland and host country, Marxism and language, and it suggests nomadic thinking instead. Nomadic thinking allows the protagonist to freely experiment with multiple ways of formation. At this point, it should be kept in mind that nomadic thinking does not stand as the opposite of binary thinking.

Since the narrative revolves around the unnamed protagonist’s growth, it opens up a space for discussions about the perception of gender markers and how they dissolve thanks to nomadic thinking and subjectivity. The way gender binaries are represented and subverted weaves the story; that is why, how nomadic thinking functions to unsettle dualistic thinking will mainly be consulted. The discussion on gender binaries and how they are deconstructed will also include the intersection of racial, ethnic and political discussions. The identity markers intersect at many points and

they all fail to seize the subject's formation. As the protagonist lives in a woman's hostel in Berlin, her life is surrounded by other women, who can easily be categorized as immigrant women from Turkey. However, each woman has her own unique history, ways of living and traits proving how it is not possible to categorize people's becoming processes according to gender, age and nationality.

In the hostel room in Berlin, there are six young girls who are different from each other: there are two cousins, two sisters and Rezzan, who also wants to be an actress like the protagonist. The six young women coming from Turkey to Germany as guest workers have distinct beliefs about life and they follow various ways, which make their experiences unique. The novel in the beginning presents a lesbian couple signalling its tone about gender binaries. The two cousins make a lesbian couple, and their roommates witness how "they [pull] the blanket out of the quilt cover, [drop] it on the floor and [crawl] into the cover as into a sleeping bag, [button] it up" (*Golden Horn* 12). Buttoned up in the quilt they kiss each other and the rest of the girls in the room listen to them kissing. The protagonist relates the homosexual relationship without any judgements or comments, and as it is her usual fashion, she does not comment on this experience.

The novel presents various ideas, ways of living and preferences, which result in countless possibilities of subjectivity. In addition to the lesbian couple's relationship, the protagonist reports how the two sisters, who always emphasize how they fear their brothers in Turkey, start to hide behind their beds while changing their clothes. They keep the same habit after the lesbian couple have left their room. The lesbian couple are given a two-bed room by the communist hostel warden to provide some privacy for them. The two sisters think that lesbian cousins are masons, and they are pleased since their brothers do not know that they have lived in the same room with a lesbian couple. Besides, they state that Rezzan should also be happy since her father does not know about this, either. Rezzan's

opinion about the issue is not heard but the protagonist displays the irony of the scene stating that Rezzan's father is already dead. Being too much exposed to the sisters' fear, the protagonist has started to fear their brothers and Rezzan's dead father.

Rezzan, in contrast to the sisters, is open to experimenting with life as she wants to be an actress. While sharing her dreams of theatre with the protagonist, she talks about her wish to act in Tennessee Williams's *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (Golden Horn 13). The protagonist has not heard of Tennessee Williams before, and Rezzan tells her that he is homosexual and left school as they have done. She also reads Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, famous for its homoerotic elements. Her conversations with the protagonist about theatre and the way they do not denounce homosexuality indicate their inclination to change; however, this requires time and experience. There are other references to homosexuality, which are again presented without a pejorative description. In one instance, the narrator recalls her life in İstanbul and says: "I had always walked arm in arm with women, but no one thought about lesbians because of it. There men, too, walked around arm in arm" (120). The lack of judgmental comments about homosexuality and the fact that signifiers of homosexuality change from one community to another indicate that the protagonist - both as a character and narrator - does not have a tendency to classify people. Accordingly, the novel often promotes transformation, difference and plurality without reducing one to the other.

The network of women in the hostel involves a lot of marginal characters with their personal and impressive stories. This destabilizes the overgeneralizing identity markers. One of the women was an opera singer in Turkey. The opera director in İstanbul opens a position for his wife who is not a star singer, and being disturbed by the situation this woman decides to go to Germany as a guest worker. Another woman falls in love with an American soldier in Smyrna, and he wants to marry her. She has

to buy her own ticket to the USA so she goes to Berlin to earn money for the fare. There is also a secret policewoman who falls in love with a secret policeman. The policeman also stars in movies and has love affairs with other women. The secret policewoman runs away from the secret love affairs of the secret policeman. Besides, there is Nur who wants to have a breast surgery since she has big breasts and backache. The lesbian cousins want to go to university. These women's personal stories and objectives in life are too diverse to put into a single category. As these women with diverse personal histories engage with life in Berlin, they have different reactions to what they experience.

Among these marginal female characters, the protagonist, Rezzan and Gül want to explore the streets of Berlin most. They bring new addresses to the hostel, but they are scorned by the conservative ones: "You'll end up whores!" (*Golden Horn* 25). The young women are happy to discover their 'evenings,' the time when they have the chance to explore life in Berlin, but the other ones blame them for visiting the hostels where Turkish men live. They have not met any Turkish men till that moment, but before long they learn "a different side of Turkish men" (27). The Turkish men wait for the women who return from the night shift and hit the most beautiful woman on the face calling those women whores. Here, the novel, like Adah's story closely resonates with Deleuze and Guattari's views emphasizing the way women are associated with a nation's honour. The protagonist does not comment on the event; nevertheless, stating that the hostel warden goes to the bus stop to accompany the women coming from the night shift proves the novels' overall tendency to condemn this brutality and oppression. This is the migrant women's first encounter with Turkish men in Germany. The concerns about keeping the honour of one's nation by imposing the notions of virtue defined by men become part of the narration, but the oppression does not last long.

This is a novel of experiment and experience where a young woman and her friends try to follow their liberating becoming processes. In this

process, as Margaret Littler also accentuates, “Deleuze’s challenge to the Cartesian mind/body distinction exhorts us to pay attention to the attitudes of the body rather than the workings of the mind, to engage with the life beyond human subjectivity” (296). The reader hardly learns the protagonist’s thoughts but witnesses the physical experiences of the characters. The protagonist does not even have a name, and this might suggest that she represents a universal woman figure in the process of becoming. She attends the Brechtian and surrealist theatres, which problematize western representation of reality. Thus, she creates her personal sense of reality through art problematizing the dominant understanding of reality. Obviously, the protagonist’s theatre education in Turkey plays an important role in subverting hierarchical thinking. In a drama class in İstanbul, one of her women friends says:

A brain is like the body of a ballet dancer, only if she practices a lot can she dance well. The good ballerinas first practice with heavy costumes, in order to be able to dance lightly later on. They hang lead from their trouser legs and practice and practice. The rule is to practice dancing with heavy costumes. Our brain must take the work of ballerina as an example. All the concepts that are very hard to learn must be learned and learned, in order to awaken the passive life of our intelligence. (*Golden Horn* 150)

This striking quotation is a vivid example for nullifying the powerful status of the mind over the body. The bodily practice of the ballet dancer sets the example to improve the mind’s capacity putting the two on an equal footing.

The mind of the protagonist is hardly revealed so her characterization is reflected through action and experience. She reaches knowledge through her bodily experience and experimentation. For instance, she discovers her mother on stage while she acts the role of a mother. Not thinking about who her mother is but imitating her mother on stage helps her find out how she perceives her own mother. She either narrates the events as an outsider or becomes an agent of the event, but in each case she only

presents the scene without commenting on it. Nevertheless, through these elements the novel undermines grandnarratives such as Marxism, nationality or gender constructions.

One should keep in mind that the protagonist is an outsider to Western culture, but her *becoming*, which she has translocated from her homeland, unsettles Western thinking. The appearance of the first man beside the communist hostel warden in the hostel reveals such a scene, which ridicules the older women's concerns about the protagonist's and her friends' relation with men:

Then a man came into hossel after all. One night outside the hossel door we found a man lying on the ground in the snow. His trouser buttons were undone, and he wasn't wearing any underpants. He had peed himself. Upstairs the whole women's hossel was asleep, and we three girls tried to help the man to his feet. He did stand up, but went to the middle of the road and sat down in the snow again. We thought the cars would run him over. So we brought the man into hossel lounge, laid him on a coach and went to sleep. In the morning the man was still lying on the coach, asleep, smiling in his sleep, and a stiff penis stuck out of his trousers when the women switched on the light. (*Golden Horn* 27)

This scene exemplifies a Deleuzian 'unthought' priority where three young women, without considering the possible judgements of the other women, take the man inside the hostel. What they focus on is to prevent him from dying outside. Also, the man is drunk, unable to control his mind and only acts according to his bodily needs. As Deleuze asserts, "[w]e do not even know what a body can do: in its sleep, in its drunkenness, in its efforts and resistances. To think is to learn what a non-thinking body is capable of, its capacity, its postures" (189). Here, the residents of the hostel encounter a 'non-thinking body,' and they are disturbed by seeing the old man sleeping on the coach with an erect penis and decide to talk to Herr Schering, their boss, about warning these three girls. However, the communist hostel warden, who is mostly tolerant about alternative ways of becoming, prevents the angry women from

upsetting the three young girls. In fact, the characters who are interested in theatre and literature are more open-minded about the unexpected situations. The protagonist's engagement with surrealism in İstanbul has broadened her vision about being more tolerant to unexpected events and circumstances. One of her women friends says:

The surrealist language consists of dialogues. Several ideas stand in opposition to one another. The words, the dream pictures, present themselves to the listener as a springboard for the mind. They don't want to analyse, they want to be intoxicated by pictures as if intoxicated by opium. In the depths of our minds there are strange forces. That's why all spontaneous writing, storytelling, responding, asking is important. (*Golden Horn* 150)

As the protagonist's friend highlights, it is not easy to decipher the workings of the mind. Rather than foregrounding the steadiness of the 'mind,' she emphasizes the unpredictable mechanisms of the mind evoked by images or words. Thus, a surrealist mode of thinking problematizes the stiffness of categories. Her friend continues:

The Surrealists were against the ideals of family, fatherland, religion, producing children. These were threats, because one had to play a subordinate role, and that sets limits to imagination. ... Freedom, love, poetry, art, those were the flames which expanded personality and imagination. (150)

As the protagonist familiarizes herself with this perspective which denies owning a 'subordinate role,' she learns the importance of letting her imagination free, which helps her become more flexible while evaluating events, ideas and life itself. In this way, her becoming is not seized by the judgement of the majority.

In contrast to the protagonist and her friends, there are other Turkish women who are not eager to explore ways of living in Berlin. They despise the ones who think otherwise. Unlike the young women who are willing to transform themselves, these women act as the extension of homeland's oppressive discourse and criticize them. However, even their attempts to

fix their identities fail ("Female Subjectivities" 196). Although only Turkish women live in the hostel, they form camps as Frank Krause summarizes:

'Sugars' (the women who call each other 'sugar' love the hostel warden), 'Donkeys' (the women who do not call each other 'sugar' form the group of 'donkeys'), 'Whores' (the women who go or seem to go out at night), and 'Kids' (the women who get excited about the 'whores' and whom the warden tries to calm down). (83)

These camps show that there is diversity in Turkish women community. Despite living in the same hostel and coming from the same country, the immigrants' experience cannot be stereotyped according to nationhood. As Braidotti claims,

[The] vision of the 'knowing subject' – or the 'Man' of humanism – constructs itself as much by what it includes within the circle of his entitlements, as in what it excludes. Otherness is excluded by definition. This makes the others into structural and constitutive elements of the subject, albeit by negation. ("Against Methodological" 409)

This negative attitude is avoided by nomadic thinking, and *Golden Horn* as a novel displaying nomadic traits offers an embracing alternative. These women do not belong to the category of the 'knowing subject' or the 'man of humanism' constructing their subjectivities through discrimination and negativity, but instead the women's multiplicity offers a dissolution of it. The women's desire to form groups is an attempt to fix their identities in a different way from that of nationhood, but paradoxically they cannot achieve it, either.

Since a serious conflict arises among women after the three young women take the old drunk man to the hostel, the hostel warden gathers the women in the hall and rearranges their rooms. The narrator reports that "now the children live with children, sugars with sugars, donkeys with donkeys, whores with whores" (*Golden Horn* 28). However, this

classification does not last long and the groups unavoidably intermingle with each other:

On the first evenings no woman left her room. In all rooms they talked about the women in the other rooms. The children in their rooms mimicked the sugars and donkeys and whores in their rooms mimicked the children. All the women mimicked the expressions, the gestures and the dialects of the others, they made fun of the way they walked, the way they ate, and so at some point the women began to look like one another again. Their faces and bodies and mouths absorbed the faces and bodies and dialects of the others, became accustomed to them. Sugars now lived inside children. Children lived in whores and donkeys, and they came together again. In the bus they sat mixed up together again, in the hossel kitchen they passed pots and pans from hand to hand, without asking themselves whether these hands belonged to the sugars or donkeys or children or whores. Now everyone got to know the half-chicken at Wienerwald and the pea soup in the Aschinger restaurant. (*Golden Horn* 28)

The diverse discourses and ideologies existing in the novel point at the impotency of them in constricting the possibilities of women's becoming. The different groups of women with their own viewpoints and dialects defining the qualities of their group start to affect each other. Despite their willingness to seize their becoming by belonging to a group, the women keep transforming. In the protagonist's naïve voice, how sugars, donkeys and whores interact with each other is presented ("Female Subjectivities" 197). As Maria Mayr asserts: "Even though the women do not speak the same idiolects, their meaningless imitation effectively allows them to co-exist among and next to each other. They temporarily take the others in, try on their costumes and thus no longer fear their differences from one another" (327). Difference, according to Braidotti, is reduced to "pejoration, disqualification and exclusion" ("Against Methodological" 408) in binary logic. However, as the exchange among the camps in the hostel proves, nomadic subjectivity triumphs over binary thinking. Krause suggests: "The division between the camps is finally overcome not by means of discussion leading to an agreement, but

through the creative power of aesthetically meaningful role-play in everyday-life" (83). The disintegration of groups draws attention to the impossibility of ceasing becoming processes. The novel reveals transforming subjectivities "rather than insisting on freezing one's identity by exclusionary practices" ("Female Subjectivities" 198).

As the relations among women demonstrate how nomadic thinking dissolves identity markers, the relations between women and men also demystify gender binaries. The protagonist and her friends Rezzan, Gül and Angel get to know life in Berlin through their interaction with men. Their men friends are leftists, which creates the expectation that they would believe in and live according to gender equality, but their experiences show that internalizing the breakdown of hierarchical thinking requires time. The grandnarratives such as Marxism, gender, nationality intersect in these women's formation, and the way the narrator uses humour and irony deconstructs the validity of each grandnarrative.

The Turkish men that the three girls befriend walk together, talk together, eat together, and they speak in the first person plural as if they were doing everything together. Acting as a group makes them more confident and happier, but each one has a different story. Rain is a student, Hamza is a worker who says he is in need of having a sexual affair, and Şükrü is another worker who has six wives in six different villages in Turkey and who had to move to Berlin as his wives found out the situation. Their attempt to talk and act as a group is reassuring, but cannot totalize their becoming processes. Their relationship with the protagonist and her friends does not exemplify a dichotomous understanding of gender; instead the novel shows how they are blurred:

In some Turkish workers we three girls found our mothers again. When these men spoke, the voices of their mothers came out of their mouths. I loved these mothers and we could see these mothers or their grandmothers in the bodies

of the men. It was nice to see the body of a man in which many women lived. I learned their different dialects and practiced them as I assembled radio valves or walked down the long corridors of the hossel, just as I practiced the sentences from the German headlines: WHAT A STORM, ITCHY SKIN? DDT CURSES IT, ROMY SCHNEIDER'S SON IS CALLED DAVID-CHRISTOPHER, PIG FLIGHTS TO BERLIN HAVE STARTED, THERE WAS GRUNTING IN MID-AIR. (34)

The tenderness of Turkish men makes their mothers and grandmothers impersonated in the male bodies. As Braidotti puts it:

The 'body' thus turns into the object of a proliferation of discourses; they are forms of knowledge, modes of normativity and normalization that invest the political and scientific fields simultaneously. Therefore the proliferation of discourses about life, the living organism, and the embodied subject is co-extensive with the dislocation of the classical basis of representation of the human subject. (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 45)

At this point of the novel, the men embody female qualities demonstrating a transgression from "the classical basis of representation of the human subject" and proving the narrative's openness to non-hierarchical discursive production. Thus, their becoming is not limited by gender boundaries. This excerpt also challenges the official history by bringing the newspaper headlines, which can be considered as a state apparatus in Deleuzo-Guattarian sense, against the background of the common man's personal story. The headlines are examples of pastiche, which are out of context and which problematize the historical context.

The conservative women blame the three young girls for spending the men's money in Turkish Workers' Association. They believe these men kiss the girls in return for money, which is a false assumption. However, later a man, who is studying engineering, kisses each of them in an absurd scene. He drinks beer with the girls, and asks questions about communist hostel warden, and takes notes. The communist hostel warden says he is from the secret police, and Rain says he is queer; he

loves men (*Golden Horn* 37). Here, the policeman, as a state apparatus, experiences his own becoming at lines of flight with his queer identity. The intersection of the grandnarratives is an important element in this novel. Another example of blurring the lines is seen in one of the male Turkish worker's -Şükrü's- efforts to stop thinking about women. A religious man comes to his flat on Karl Marx Strasse, prays for Şükrü, blows his breath in Şükrü's face and gives him holy texts, which he is to put under his bed (*Golden Horn* 35-36). However, the narrator shows that religion cannot help Şükrü overcome his problem as he goes on thinking about women. Ironically, the religious man is brought to a street named after Karl Marx, who calls religion "the opium of people" (131). Marx believes that religion cannot make people happy and cannot solve their problems. Thus, two different schemes of thinking are skilfully juxtaposed to show the impotence of religion and this juxtaposition adds up to the diversity of the novel.

The fear of the men whom these migrant women have left in Turkey haunts the novel. The protagonist has two single roommates who are sisters and who live as if their brothers were with them: "When one of the two wept or didn't finish food or caught a cold, the others said to her: 'Your brothers mustn't hear about that. If your brothers hear that!'" (*Golden Horn* 9). Similarly, the women who come late to the hostel because of having lost their way say:

'It is a good thing that no man is waiting for me at home.'
Another woman practiced walking back on an escalator: she also thinks that: '[i]t's a good thing that [she] do[esn't] have a husband, if he could see [her] like this, he would pull out [her] hair.' Every story ended with a husband. (*Golden Horn* 46).

In these circumstances, the way women talk about men reveals how threatening men are in their lives:

One woman said: 'I've burned the meat again, it's turned to charcoal. But it doesn't matter, I don't have a husband who shouts at me because of it.' Overcooked macaroni, too much salt in the food, too many pounds on the body, uncombed hair, a torn bra under her clothes – everything always ended with: 'I have, may Allah be thanked, no man who can see it.' When a glass or plate fell and broke, a woman said: 'It's a good thing that the men can't see it.' (46-7)

Although the narrator does not judge the Turkish men, the way she portrays women's fear of "their husbands, fathers or brothers demonstrates that women's lives are tyrannically controlled by men" (Female Subjectivities" 196). These men are not even in Germany, but women's lives are haunted by their absent presence: "But each sentence, whether it began with 'good' or 'unfortunately', as always gave birth to a man, a husband. The word 'husband' was like a piece of a chewing gum, which they chewed together" (*Golden Horn* 47). The protagonist in an ironic way declares how "[she] began to be afraid of their brothers and of [her] father" (20) since her roommates always emphasized the fear of their fathers and brothers. Some of the women want to be relieved from this oppression, and they are ready to explore new ways of being. Fortunately, some of them are able to get rid of the constraints inscribed in their lives by the dominant patriarchal society.

The communist hostel warden and Ataman try to encourage these young women to have new experiences. However, what they believe to be liberating is also restricting their alternatives. The communist hostel warden takes the girls to Student Association election in support of a communist candidate, but the capitalist candidate wins and the girls having no idea about politics spend time with right-wing students. The narrator's engagement with communism, Marxism and capitalism becomes notable through corporeal experiences or observations on what happens in different social communities:

As often as the word beer was said, the word communist was said just often. If someone poured some beer from his full beer glass into the empty glass of his friend, then he was

a communist. And if someone did not pour some of his beer into the empty glass of another, then he was an anti-communist or a capitalist. (50)

The Marxists in the novel are bossy and sometimes phony. Ataman talks about Hitler, and his deliberate choice of “a moustache and a couple of strands of hair on his forehead.” This outlook, which Ataman calls a mask can easily be duplicated: “If everyone can look like him so quickly that means that everyone has a little bit of Hitler” (52). The communist hostel warden interrupts Ataman while he is acting like Hitler, and states that the mask theory is not his idea but Godard’s. Ironically, the communist hostel warden reads the newspaper and talks about what he has learnt as if he already knew it (*Golden Horn* 53). The way they call virginity diamond and make fun of the girls for not having had any sexual experience is patronizing as well.

Abstract concepts such as Marxism and capitalism are also embodied in the novel, and the protagonist meets these discourses in real life situations. At a bar, four young men, in order to communicate with the girls, shout ‘İstanbul’ addressing the protagonist’s table where she sits with Angel, Ataman, Rezzan, Gül and the communist hostel warden. The protagonist, while on the way from the restroom to her table, sees an empty chair at the four men’s table and sits with them. She shakes hand with all four, and the construction workers who claim to be communists have hands “like a piece of wood, in which there were nails” (*Golden Horn* 53). The students say they are capitalists, and their hands are soft. They wonder whether she is a communist or a capitalist. The concepts of communism and capitalism are not familiar to the protagonist, and her response to their curiosity about her political stance is ‘Telefunken.’ This is the factory for which she works. Not having a political engagement, she states where she belongs. In this humorous scene, she likes the “boy with the capitalist hand” (54). She does not speak the same language as him as she does not know the language of capitalism and communism. She concretizes her understanding of these concepts through their hands- a

metonym for body. Thus, despite her identification with the leftist thought, she finds the “boy with the capitalist hand” more attractive, once again highlighting the dissolution of mind – body hierarchy. Despite the lack of common language, she wants to see them and gives them her address. The next day, the fat, communist boy meets her at the hostel and takes her to the bar where the other three have already been sitting. They end up at a villa where there is only a bed to sit, and they watch Charlie Chaplin sitting on the bed. The protagonist is appalled by what she is exposed to while watching the film:

[O]ne of the boys quickly pushed my pullover up my back and stubbed out his burning cigarette. I screamed and turned round to see which hand had done it. But the four young men sat there, as if the four bodies had only one head and one face, and this common face hid from me who had stubbed out the cigarette on my back. (*Golden Horn* 56)

Capitalism and communism sit together, act together and hurt her together. This scene is almost impossible to interpret as the narrator tells this part of the narrative in a magical realist tone. Later, even the protagonist suspects dreaming about having been burnt, but she checks it and sees the scar (57). The ambivalent parts of the narrative act in accordance with the novel’s overall attitude, which undermines firmness.

The protagonist’s second encounter with the leftists and the rightists is during the election for the chair of the Turkish Students’ Association. The communist hostel warden takes the three girls and a couple of other sugars with him to the election. The communist hostel warden’s friend is a candidate, but his opponent Mobil Oil, a rightist student, wins the election. He leaves the girls there after the election, and they accompany Mobil Oil and his friends to a bar. In the elections they hear politicized names, but the protagonist says that she does not know who Marx, Mao, Khrushchev, Castro and Trotsky are. The girls are not politically aware at that moment and they go on seeing these students. In the meantime, Rezzan, who has been reading and talking about Chekhov, starts to talk

about Mobil Oil all the time. The protagonist realizes the change in Rezzan's language with her new vocabulary such as realistic, unrealistic, and masochistic. Rezzan sometimes says, "That's something that can be discussed" (62); but as the narrator puts it, she never discusses it. Mobil Oil's sentences stand as unsolved riddles for her. Salim and Mobil Oil spend a lot of money, and the protagonist underlines their wealth stating that their shoes are always dry as they always drive. She explains her understanding of capitalism through dry shoes. Not being able to grasp these grandnarratives such as capitalism and Marxism, she reduces them to things or body parts such as the hands. Thus, the firm and stable grounds of grandnarratives are shattered.

Rezzan and Gül enjoy Mobil Oil's and Salim's company as they introduce them to a new life. They decide to move to a flat to see Mobil Oil and Salim more often, but they never visit the girls. To find Mobil Oil, Rezzan goes to his student residence. While waiting for him, she meets a 'small' Turkish student also waiting for Mobil Oil, and this encounter presents another case of belittling constraints of society. They talk to each other, buy curry wurst with ketchup, take a bus and go to Rezzan's flat. When they start kissing and touching each other, the old bed collapses and they fall on to the wurst with ketchup, which lies on the floor on paper plates. The ketchup is all over their arms, legs and face, and Rezzan fears having lost her virginity. Thinking that she is bleeding, she calls the hostel warden for help. He alerts the fire brigade and when the fire-fighters arrive, they see that it is not blood but only ketchup. The sexual experiences of the young women and their concerns about virginity are presented in such absurd scenes. Later, Rezzan goes to the hostel to check her 'diamond' as there is no mirror in her flat, which enhances the absurdity of the situation. These young women are eager to have different experiences but transforming one's life seems to be a gradual development.

The protagonist feels lonely in the hostel after Rezzan and Gül move to a flat. Angel is usually in the communist hostel warden's room with Ataman and Dove. The two men talk about things the protagonist does not understand, but she keeps sitting with them "like a lonely person, looking for stations on his radio at night" (*Golden Horn* 67). She tells the communist hostel warden that she wants to be a communist, and he lends her his Engels book titled *The Origin of the Family*. Even in this help there is some male hubris as he thinks that Marx would be too difficult for her to understand:

The word family was easy to understand, but not the sentences as a whole. I also understood the words food, foodstuffs, clothing, work, home, but not production and reproduction. I always tried to use my father as an example. He worked, procured food, foodstuffs, clothing, home and had a family. But then I was stuck. (*Golden Horn* 67)

She tries to concretize the abstract concepts to understand them. Words can only mean something when they emerge from one's own life for the protagonist:

When I didn't understand something I often read the price given on the back – so many lira. The word lira reassured me, because it was easy to understand. Then I opened the book again. In the factory I sometimes went up to Angel, who had already read a lot because of Ataman, and asked her what reproduction meant. She turned to me, the lens in her right eye, and said: 'I don't know, it's what we do here.' We made radio valves. (68)

Karin Lornsen claims that, "by literally judging the book by its cover she brings the corporal, carnal, and substantial back into the text" (204). The language of Engels, Marx and the Marxist characters is not comprehensible to the protagonist; this may be due to the nature of the language, which is patriarchal and alien to female experience. Thus, she concretizes the book in her own way to get familiar with it. Her second book borrowed from the communist hostel warden is *The Mother* by Maxim Gorki, to which she can relate better. The word mother makes her

realize how she misses her own mother; she weeps for the fictional mother and thinks of her own.

Believing in Ataman's and the communist hostel warden's claims about the importance of sexual experience to improve the quality of acting, the protagonist becomes obsessed with sexuality. She looks for the chances to make love, but, since she is too young and naïve at that moment, sarcastic situations occur ("Female Subjectivities" 201). As Beverly M. Weber avers: "the man's attitude to her is consistently supportive and patronising, encouraging her intellectual and professional development, but always in the voice of a father" (51). Ataman's and the communist hostel warden's language reproduces patriarchal norms by calling virginity 'diamond.' Unlike Turkish Marxist characters, Yorgi, who is temporarily in charge of the hostel instead of Madam Gutsio³⁷ respects the protagonist's experiments in life, without making her feel embarrassed by her virginity. After kissing and hugging Yorgi, she wants to make love with him. She wishes Madam Gutsio were there to help her because she does not know what to do. Yorgi sees that she is not ready for a sexual experience. Yorgi, unlike Ataman and the communist hostel warden, believes that she should experience it only when she feels ready. He assures the protagonist that there is nothing to be ashamed of not being able to get rid of her virginity (*Golden Horn* 89).

Despite the Marxist characters' claims in achieving liberation and a better perception through sexual experience, the protagonist cannot easily attain this liberation which requires the awareness of one's body and pleasure ("Female Subjectivities" 202). She falls in love with a Spanish boy Jordi in Paris, where "she has gone to study theatre with Madam Gutsio's help." She has her first sexual experience with him. The narration of these intimate moments turns to third person. The

³⁷ Madam Gutsio is the hostel warden where the protagonist stays in her second arrival in Germany. She is a Greek Communist and when she goes to meet her family, she leaves the hostel to Yorgi.

protagonist “focalizes her own experience as an outsider.” Their intimacy generates an ironic situation as the protagonist cannot understand that she has had her first sexual relationship because of being too inexperienced. Thus, Özdamar ironically unsettles the Marxists’ statements regarding the relationship between love making and raising awareness. The Marxist characters suggest a reversal of dialectical scheme by forcing the young women to gain their independence, by transgressing social norms; however, nomadic thinking suggests “a radical disruption of this scheme altogether” (*Transpositions* 133). In Braidotti’s words, “Even women have to become-woman in the sense of disengaging themselves from the Phallic signifier. What the process of becoming stands for is this qualitative shift of perspective” (*Transpositions* 133). The narration undermines the Marxists’ oppressive opinions about freedom and sexuality by highlighting the protagonist’s ignorance of what she has been experiencing.

As I stated elsewhere, the protagonist experiences her first orgasm with a man whom people call Owl. He is a leftist whom she meets in the midst of political talks. Being the only woman among these men, she is not able to understand their political language. While she is ignored by the other men in the group, the Owl becomes the first one to ask about her ideas on the points of discussion. She feels uneasy and does not know what to say; however, his tendency to hear her thoughts “might be the reason why she has her first orgasm with him.” She not only focuses on discovering her bodily pleasure but also reads leftist publications to grasp their language. Nevertheless, it is not easy for her to have access to this political language as it belongs to men (“Female Subjectivities” 203).

Towards the end of the novel, the protagonist is empowered by different discourses and sexual awareness which enable her to choose what to do with her life. Indeed, her early encounter with Marxism is at a superficial level. She only imitates the way the Marxist men whom she befriends behave. After falling in love with Kerim, this pretence is enhanced. Kerim

is a cinema student, and he overpowers the protagonist by telling her what to do or how to act in certain cases. He never focuses on how she feels or what she thinks. In her relationship with Kerim, the protagonist imitates being a socialist. She almost becomes obsessed with impressing Kerim, and the manners she mimics become part of her subjectivity in time by empowering her to make her own choices. She is only disillusioned by Kerim when he immediately stops being a socialist after they are arrested by the police. The protagonist's father's attempt saves them, but she realizes that Kerim is no longer a person who can make her happy (203-4).

Haydar understands from the very beginning that Kerim has bourgeois tendencies. The protagonist can only see his real priorities after their arrest. Kerim says: "It is time to gather up bourgeois culture and to read new books and to listen to different music. ... Don't talk this slogan language. Take off the green army parka. Dress like a woman" (*Golden Horn* 254). Hearing these words, she is estranged from Kerim, and she does not want to sleep with him. No longer being an inexperienced young girl who used to live according to the advice of men, she leaves Kerim behind. Now, she has her own words and thoughts to write about the conditions of people in Eastern Turkey. Thus, what she has accumulated up to that moment allows her to decide what to do with her life ("Female Subjectivities" 204). As Braidotti claims: "The nomadic consciousness combines coherence with mobility. It aims to rethink the unity of the subject, without reference to humanistic beliefs, without dualistic oppositions, linking instead body and mind in a new set of intensive and often intransitive transitions" (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 31). The movement she has been involved in enables her to get rid of the binaries of gender, politics and traditions making her apt to create unity and harmony in her life.

The protagonist takes a volume of poetry by Brecht and sings in German to get rid of the pain she is going through. As Silke Schade claims: "the

German language itself functions as a space that Özdamar's protagonist engages with, modifies, and claims as her own. Like physical and sociocultural space, linguistic space is both personal and abstract, both real and imagined, both mapable and metaphorical" (326). The fact that the narrator tells her story in German proves Silke's ideas. When she sings in German, she is encouraged to go back to Germany. Her Brecht copy somehow hints at the fact that she will be empowered by the teachings of the Brechtian theatre. Her new experiences in German language / Brechtian language will cure the heart-breaking experiences in Turkey ("Female Subjectivities" 204-5).

By way of conclusion, both Adah and the protagonist of the *Golden Horn* challenge binary thinking, and they build up their own subjectivity by playing with the restricting identity markers. Adah challenges the status of woman as the weaker leg of the binary and gets rid of Francis's oppression thanks to her efforts of being educated and becoming well-qualified to find jobs to survive in England. She also upsets racial and ethnic dualisms by showing people the vanity of their judgements. At some points she skilfully uses and abuses the Westerners' judgements against themselves to achieve her goals. Thus, rather than being constrained by dualistic thinking, she lives in a fluid space objectifying what the nomadic subjectivity suggests. Her trust in herself, her desire to keep her dignity and the hopeful future she plans with her children prove that she has made England into her home.

Likewise, gender binaries, grandnarratives like Marxism or capitalism are unsettled in the *Golden Horn*. The experiences of women characters, not only those of the protagonist but also of Gül, Rezzan, Angel and the other unnamed ones, are problematized within the patriarchal system. Despite the fact that only Turkish women live in the hostel, it is not possible to talk about a homogenous identity, which proves that identity is not gender or nation bound, but a product of performance. Also, the protagonist's relationship with men problematizes the grandnarratives

such as Marxism and capitalism, and the novel presents a woman in becoming who is trying to grasp abstract knowledge by concretizing it through the bodies of people. At the end of the novel, the protagonist attains the freedom of nomadic thinking and is ready to rebuild her life by going to Germany and making theatre her homely space there.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This dissertation aimed to decipher the reasons why the protagonists of Buchi Emecheta's *In the Ditch* and *Second-Class Citizen*, and Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Life is a Caravanserai-with two Doors, through one of which I came, and through one of which I left* and *The Bridge of the Golden Horn* migrated from their homelands to another country, and how their subjectivities are shaped during this transnational and translocal experience from the theoretical perspective of Rosi Braidotti, who offers concepts such as nomadic thinking, nomadic subjectivity, counter-memory and rhizome. Taking the aesthetic aspects of the novels into consideration, this study offered a new hermeneutics to understand womanly experience in diasporic spaces. The protagonists posit a diasporic space, but the tools of diaspora criticism fail to explain their subject formation in its totality; that is why, Rosi Braidotti's theories are consulted to elaborate on the subjectivities of female characters who are situated in the social context of diaspora. Besides, feminine language plays an important role in the novels' literary style, and this study offered a reading of feminine language in relation to Helen Cixous's theories.

Bringing novels from different localities to discuss the migratory experience opens up a space for discussion on the universal aspects of diasporic involvements. Reviewing the theories of diaspora criticism, I traced the transformation of the concept of diaspora from strict definitions to more fluid ones like transnationalism and translocalism. Through transnational and translocal aspects, the protagonists' subjectivity offers a porous becoming, which finds its correspondence in Braidotti's nomadic thinking and subjectivity. As the foregoing chapters demonstrate, in these novels, which are written in feminine language, the

concepts that diaspora criticism suggests cannot offer a comprehensive understanding of the protagonists' subjectivity. Therefore, I refer to Helen Cixous's theory as she provides the tools to explain corporeality in language. In this process, I needed another term to explain the transfer of the qualities of native language (language of departure) to the language of the host country. I used the term 'linguistic translocation' and demonstrated that unique qualities of the native languages are carried to the host language by disrupting the hierarchy between the languages. As a result of linguistic translocation, the language of the host country is hybridised in a non-hierarchical way.

Based on this novel look which brings different epistemologies (African, Turkish, German, English) together to discuss female diasporic subjectivity, this study concludes that female characters who are oppressed by the limitations of the patriarchal society are in search of a new place where they can re-home themselves. However, this does not imply a tendency to break all the ties with their homelands. On the contrary, the protagonists create a negotiation between the givens of homeland and the new possibilities offered in the host country. The novels reveal the protagonists' personal / minoritarian / counter-memory against the background of historical / Majoritarian memory.

Considering the fact that the women protagonists want to escape the constraints imposed by patriarchy, it is not surprising that they want to extend the boundaries of language, which is inherently patriarchal. Emecheta's *Second-Class Citizen* and Özdamar's *Caravanserai* make it possible to transfer women's experience in a patriarchal language by transforming it and offering a language stemming from female body and experience in the end. The protagonist of *Second-Class Citizen*, Adah is empowered by female bodily experiences such as childbirth and breastfeeding, which helps her discover her potential to write a novel in her own voice. *Second-Class Citizen* transfers the rhythm of Nigerian languages and ways of storytelling to English language by *igboizing* it.

Likewise, Özdamar's unnamed protagonist formulates her own language by making use of the oral tradition she has inherited from her native language. She collects various female voices from distinct localities of Turkey and composes her own narrative by making this polyphony her own. The use of language in both novels draws attention because of not only choosing the host country's language, but also presenting a unique language growing out of female body and experience. Both writers translocate the linguistic qualities of their native languages and ways of story-telling to their novels. Thus, the style of these novels presents distinctive qualities.

In addition, the importance of women's solidarity in the formation of the protagonists' language and the formation of subjectivity that develops in parallel has been explored. Adah lacks the female solidarity enjoyed by the majority of women through familial or communal bonds in Nigeria. She is only supported by a feeling which she calls the Presence, which, in my opinion, stands for her grandmother's spiritual existence. In contrast, Özdamar's unnamed protagonist is surrounded by many women whose contribution to her subject formation is crucial. Her mother, grandmother and the women in the neighbourhood (sane and insane) present her with different ways of living and she has someone to help her in every phase of her life. Despite the patriarchal tendencies of some of the characters, the unnamed protagonist finds a way to get rid of restrictions since she has the chance to see alternative ways of living. Her fascination with marginal women such as the prostitutes and mad women hints at her future self, open to new alternatives, change, and enemy to limitations, judgements or prejudices. Thus, both protagonists, with or without a supportive female community, suffer from patriarchal traditions and seek for a new space of becoming.

It is seen that, in *Second-Class Citizen* and *Caravanserai*, despite their desire to leave their homelands, the protagonists reconceptualise them by referring to religion, tradition and education exemplifying counter-

memories, which present the individual stories of the characters. Adah's experiences in her homeland are dominated by her efforts to get what is not presented to her in a patriarchal society. Her determinacy allows her to go to school, choose who to marry, and use and abuse religious teachings for her own needs. Her reconceptualization of Nigeria leads to frustration, justifying the reason why she wants to migrate. Likewise, *Caravanserai's* protagonist, in a subtle language, criticises being restricted by patriarchal norms. She is blessed by the love of family and a closely-knit community, but she cannot feel at home in this dominantly patriarchal atmosphere. At the end of the novel, she realizes that the best alternative to achieve her subjectivity by leaving the patriarchal constraints behind is moving to Germany. Hence, moving from one place to another gives women the necessary space to feel free.

The protagonists' experiences in the host countries demonstrate that they have the ability to rehome unfamiliar places, offering moments of nomadic subjectivity which is free of dualisms. Emecheta's *Second-Class Citizen* and *In the Ditch* narrate Adah's story in England, and Özdamar's *Golden Horn* focuses on the subject formation of the unnamed protagonist in both Turkey and Germany. These women, in the process of rehoming the host countries, go through similar processes, and in the end they achieve their agency despite the striated places and the stabilizing tendency of identity markers such as race, gender, ethnicity, religion and etc. After divorcing from her husband, Adah is located in the mansions that Commonwealth Social Care System offers. Mansions are striated places in Deleuzo-Guattarian understanding, which means that they have the potential to limit the individuals. Indeed, what she and her children eat, how she treats her children and how she lives are under the control of this system, which somehow ruins her personal dignity. However, she turns this power relationship upside down, and rather than becoming more submissive, she learns to make use of the services mansions set-up offers, and then she empowers herself to start her life with new possibilities. Likewise, Özdamar's protagonist adapts to her life in Berlin thanks to her early

experiences in the hostel for the guest workers. Living in the hostel prevents the protagonist from having an immediate access to life in Berlin; however, this process prepares her to appropriate Berlin streets in time. Her engagement with the theatre helps her adapt to different locations, mind-sets and inevitably different ways of becoming. Both protagonists develop strategies to turn striated places to rhizomes, which gives them the feeling of at-homeness by freeing their minds from binary thinking.

One of the most remarkable points in the novels is the way these protagonists achieve nomadic flows since, belonging to non-Western cultures, they have never been exposed to binary thinking in the Western sense. Indeed, they bring their own ways of becoming to a western context, which, in the end, leads to nomadic thinking and subjectivity. Still, it should be kept in mind that they were born in patriarchal societies where different hierarchies exist. Their already rebellious characters and desire enable fluid interconnections to the host country. Instead of abiding by the binary thinking they are exposed to, they shatter the westerners' perception of the other. Being exposed to racial discrimination in Adah's case and patriarchal subordination in both characters' case perplex them as they do not accept being subordinated, and both can find ways to transgress the limits imposed on them.

To conclude, living in perpetual fluctuation and flight, and by problematizing the fixed notions of identity, the protagonists destroy the firm grounds the western world holds. Despite having different forms of socio-political consciousness, both protagonists resist being subordinated to any source of power, and their state objectifies the freedom of nomadic thinking and subjectivity. I believe, not being codified in western thinking gives them more free space to engage in becoming processes in Europe. Moreover, the narrative styles of the novels accompany the characters' quest to discover their inner potential. The narratives are beyond the confines of the Western understanding of

realism and carry their own ways of storytelling to a western genre. As the genre is being transformed, we witness the transformation of the women characters. The protagonists of the novels engage in porous spaces and relationships, which in the end results in their achievement of nomadic thought and subjectivity.

Further studies about Buchi Emecheta and Emine Sevgi Özdamar can focus on the dynamics at work in men's subjectivities. This dissertation, due to the limitations of scope and space, overlooks the male experience which also deserves a detailed treatment. Despite their traditional representation as the stronger leg of the gender binary, there are several depictions of men in the novels analysed, which uncover their fragile position in their experience as migrants. As far as, when Adah's husband Francis is concerned, the situation is quite pathetic as he is the victim of not only his position as a migrant in England, but also the limitations he is subject to by his traditional family structure in Nigeria. Likewise, the protagonist's father in *Caravanserai* and *Golden Horn* is not a powerful patriarchal figure even in his homeland. He goes bankrupt several times, and he is portrayed as a vulnerable character. In *Caravanserai* and *Golden Horn*, the experiences of male migrants are also narrated along with the women migrants. Their engagement with diaspora and subject formation processes can also be studied. In addition, the methodology I suggested in this dissertation can also be used to explore the novels with male protagonists whose stories take place in diaspora. Studying men's experience through the framework of linguistic translocation might also lead to significant findings in further research.

REFERENCES

- Adak, Hülya. "From l'Écriture Féminine to Queer Subjectivities: Sevgi Soysal, Emine Sevgi Özdamar, and Perihan Mağden." *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, vol.12, no.1, March 2016, pp.107-111. DOI: 10.1215/15525864-3422589.
- Adjoe, Casimir. "Metaphor and the Carrying Forward of Embodied Experience in the Development of Individuality and Freedom in Emecheta Buchi's Second-Class Citizen: A Question Sociability." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, vol.20, no.9, 2015, pp. 20-28. DOI: 10.9790/083720932028.
- Anzaldua, Gloria. *Borderlands*. Aunt Lute Book Company, 1997.
- .Interview by Patti Blanco. *The University of Arizona Poetry Center*. 12 Nov 2015, www.poetry.arizona.edu/blog/interview-gloria-anzald%C3%Baa.
- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large*. U of Minnesota P, 1996.
- Arndt, Susan. "Buchi Emecheta and the Tradition of Ifo." *Emerging Perspectives on Buchi Emecheta*, edited by Maria Umeh, Africa World P, 1995.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Post-colonial Studies :The Key Concepts*. Routledge, 2000.
- Attoe, S. A. Effah. "Women in the Development of Nigeria Since pre-colonial Times." *Online Nigeria*, 2002.
www.onlinenigeria.com/links/adv.asp?blurb=150.
- Azmeh, Zeina Al. "Nomadic Feminism: Four Lines of Flight." *European Scientific Journal*, special edition, vol. 2, June 2014, pp 98-107.
- Bala, L. Sasi. *Image of Women in the Works of Buchi Emecheta*. 2004. Sri Venkateswara University in Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, India, PhD Dissertation.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Translated by Richard Miller, Blackwell, 1974.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Shiller and Cristina Szanton Blanc. *Nations Unbound*. Routledge, 1994.

Bavington, Grace. *Buchi Emecheta and Ruby Slippe jack: Writing in the Margins to Create Home*. 1998. Memorial University of Newfoundland, Master Thesis.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 2006.

Bird, Stephanie. *Women Writers and National Identity: Bachmann, Duden, Özdamar*. Cambridge U P, 2003.

Bongfiglioli, Chiara. "Nomadic Theory as an Epistemology for Transnational Feminist History." *The Subject of Rosi Braidotti: Politics and Concepts*, edited by Bolette Blaagaard and Iris Van Der Tuin, Blommsbury, 2014, pp.198-203.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Stories of women: Gender and Narrative in the postcolonial nation*. Manchester U P, 2005.

Braidotti, Rosi. "Affirming the Affirmative: On Nomadic Affectivity." *Rhizomes*, vol. 11-12, 2005-2006, no page.
www.rhizomes.net/issue11/braidotti.html.

---. Conversation with Rosi Braidotti by Sarah Posman. *Transit Zone*.
www.ny-web.be/transitzone/conversation-rosi-braidotti.html.

---. "Difference, Diversity and Nomadic Subjectivity." *Translatum.gr*.
www.translatum.gr/forum/index.php?topic=14317.0.

---. "Embodiment, Sexual Difference, and the Nomadic Subject." *Hypathia, Inc. Wiley*. Vol.8, no. 1, 1993, pp. 1-13.
www.jstor.org/stable/3810298.

- . "Feminist Philosophies." *A Concise Companion to Feminist Theory*, edited by Mary Eagleton. Wiley-Blackwell, 2003, pp. 195-235.
- . "How to Endure Intensity? Towards a Sustainable Nomadic Subject." *Micropolitics of Media Culture: Reading the Rhizomes of Deleuze and Guattari*, edited by Patricia Pisters and Catherine M. Lord, Amsterdam U P, 2001, pp. 177-204.
- . *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*. Polity, 2002.
- . *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. 1st ed., Columbia UP, 1994.
- . *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. 2nd ed., Columbia UP, 2011.
- . *Nomadic Theory: The Portable Rosi Braidotti*. Colombia U P, 2012.
- . "Nomadism: against methodological nationalism." *Policy Futures in Education*, vol.8, no: 3 & 4, 2010, pp. 408-418.
doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2010.8.3.408.
- . "Nomadism with a difference: Deleuze's legacy in a feminist perspective." *Man and World*, vol. 29, 1996, pp 305-314.
- . *Patterns of Dissonance*. Translated by Elizabeth Guild, Polity P, 1991.
- . *Posthuman*. Polity P, 2013.
- . *Transpositions*. Polity P, 2006.
- Brazier, Jana Evans. *Diaspora*. Blackwell, 2008.
- Baraitser, Lisa. "Nomadic Subjects and the Feminist Archives." *The Subject of Rosi Braidotti*, edited by Bolette Blaagaard and Iris van der Tuin, Bloomsbury Academic, 2014, pp. 176-181.

- Brickell, Katherine and Ayona Datta. Introduction. *Translocal Geographies*, edited by Katherine Brickkel and Ayona Datta, Ashgate Publishing, 2011, pp. 3-22.
- Busby, Margaret. Foreword. *Emerging Perspectives on Buchi Emecheta*, edited by Maria Umeh, Africa World P, 1995, pp.xiii-xix.
- Butler, Kim D. "Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse." *Diaspora: A journal of Transnational Studies*, vol. 10, no.2, 2001, pp.189-219.
- Carlson, Lisa Marie. *Affective Metamorphoses: Formations of Community in the Black British Female Bildungsroman*. 2012. Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana, Master's thesis.
- Chronister, Necia. *Topographies of Sexuality: Space, Movement, and Gender in German Literature and Film since 1989*. 2011. Washington University in St Louis, PhD dissertation. Proquest publication number: 3450932.
- Chuku, Gloria. *Igbo Women and Economic Transformation in Southeastern Nigeria, 1900-1960*. Routledge, 2005.
- Cixous, Helen. "Coming to Writing" and Other Essays. Harvard UP, 1991.
- Clifford, James. "Diasporas." *Cultural Anthropology*, vol.9, no.3, 1994, pp.302-338. www.jstor.org/stable/656365.
- . *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, Harward U P, 1997.
- Cohen, Robin. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. Taylor & Francis, 2001.
- Dawson, Ashley. *Mongrel Nation: Diasporic Culture and the Making of Postcolonial Britain*, U of Michigan P., 2007.

Deleuze Gilles: *Cinema Movement 2: the time-image*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta, U of Minnesota P, 2001.

Deleuze, Gilles and Feliz Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. U of Minnesota P, 2005.

Dennis, Carolyne. "Women and the State in Nigeria: the Case of the Federal Military Government 1984-85", in *Women State and Ideology: Studies from Africa and Asia*, edited by Haleh Afshar, State U of New York P, 1987, pp.13-27.

Dufoix, Stéphane. *Diasporas*. U of California P, 2003.

Emecheta, Buchi. *In The Ditch*. Flamingo, 1988.

---. "Feminism with a small f." *Criticism and Ideology: Second African Writers' Conference*, edited by Peterson, Kirsten Holst. Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, 1986, pp. 173-81.

---. *Head Above Water*. Heinemann, 1986.

---. Interview with Buchi Emecheta by Feroza Jussawalla and Reed Way Dasenbrock, *Interviews with the Writers of the Postcolonial World*, edited by Feroza Jussawalla and Reed Way Dasenbrock, UP of Mississippi, 1992, pp. 82-99.

---. "A Nigerian Writer living in London." *Kunapipi*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1982, pp.114-123, ro.uow.edu.au/kunapipi/vol4/iss1/11.

---. *Second-Class Citizen*. George Braziller, 1975.

Erunke, Canice Esidene and Umar Abdul Shuaibu. "The Role of Women in Nigerian Politics: Interrogating the Gender Question for an Enhanced Political Representation in the fourth Republic." *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 4. 2, 2013, ISSN: 2229 – 5313.

Falola, Toyin and Matthew M. Heaton. *A History of Nigeria*. Cambridge UP, 2008.

Faist, Thomas. "Introduction: Diaspora and transnationalism as awkward dance partners." *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*, edited by Rainer, Bauböck and Thomas Faist, Amsterdam UP, 2010.

Fishburn, Katherine. *Reading Buchi Emecheta: Cross Cultural Conversations*. London, Greenwood P, 1995.

Flotow, Luise Von. "Life is a Caravanserai: Translating Translated Marginality, a Turkish- German *Zwittertext* in English." *Meta: Translators' Journal*, vol. 45, no. 1, 2000, pp. 65-72.
DOI: 10.7202/004578ar. www.id.erudit.org/iderudit/004578ar.

Foucault, Micheal. *Language, Madness, and Desire on Literature*, edited by Philippe Artières, Jean-François Bert, Mathieu Potte Bonnevillie, and Judith Revel. Translated by Robert Bononno U of Minnesota P., 2013.

---. "Nietzsche, genealogy, history." *Aesthetics, Method, Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, vol. 2*, edited by J. Faubian, Penguin, 1998, pp. 369-391.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Indiana U P, 1994.

Ghaussy, Sohelia. "Das Vaterland verlassen: Nomadic Language and 'Feminine Writing' in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Das Leben ist eine Karawanserei*." *The German Quarterly*, Vol. 72, No. 1 Winter 1999, pp. 1-16. jstor.org/stable/407900.

---. *Les autres voleuses: Writing the feminine in diasporic spaces*. 2001. Purdue University, PhD Dissertation.

Ghosh. Sukanya. *Female Militancy and Cultural Orthodoxy in The Novels of Buchi Emecheta*. 2015. Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur, PhD Dissertation.

- Gupta, Akhil and James Fergusson. "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity and the Politics of Difference." *Cultural Anthropology*, vol.7, no.1, February 1992, pp.6-23.
- Györke, Agnes. "London in Buchi Emecheta's Fiction." *Continental Shifts in Perception: Black Cultures and Identities in Europe*, edited by Sharmilla Beezmohun, Cambridge Scholars P, 2016, pp. 9-24.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by Jonathan Rutherford, Lawrence & Wishart, pp. 222-37, 1990.
- Ho, Janice. *Nation and Citizenship in the Twentieth-Century British Novel*. Cambridge UP, 2015.
- Huddart, David. *Homi K Bhabha*. Routledge, 2006.
- Iyer, Lisa H. "The Second Sex Three Times Oppressed: Cultural Colonisation and Coll(i)usion in Buchi Emecheta's Women." *Writing the Nation: Self and Country in Postcolonial Imagination*, edited by John Hawley, Rodopi, 1996, pp.123-138.
- Johnson, Sheila. "Transnational Asthetik des türkischen Alltags: Emine Sevgi Özdamar's Das Leben ist eine Karawanserei." *The German Quarterly*, vol. 74, no. 1, 2001, pp. 37-57, www.jstor.org/stable/3072814.
- Katrak, Ketu H. "Womanhood / Motherhood: Variations on a Theme in Selected Novels of Buchi Emecheta." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol.22. no.1, 1987, pp. 159-170. doi.org/10.1177/002198948702200113
- Klett-Davies, Martina. *Going it alone? Lone Motherhood in Late Modernity*. Ashgate P, 2007.

Krause, Frank. "Shadow Motifs in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Die Brücke Vom Goldenen Horn*: A Corrective to the Limitations of Current Debates on Inter-Cultural Issues." *Debatte: Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe*, vol.8, no.1, 2000, pp. 71-76. doi. org/10.1080/713659892.

Levi-Strauss, Claud. *Totemism*. Translated by Rodney Needham, Beacon, 1963.

Littler, Margaret. "Machinic Agency and the Powers of the False in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn* (1998)." *Oxford German Studies*, vol. 45, no.3, 2016, pp.290-307. DOI: 10.1080/00787191.2016.1208420.

Lornsen, Karin. "The City as Stage of Transgression: Performance, Picaresque Reminiscences, and Linguistic Incongruity in Emine S. Özdamar's *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*." *Gender and Laughter: Comic Affirmation and Subversion in Traditional and Modern Media*, edited by Gaby Pailer, Andreas Böhn, Stefan Horlacher, and Ulrich Scheck, Rodopi, 2009, pp. 201-217.

Mani, Benkat.V. *On the question, "what is Turkish-German?" Minority literatures and the dialectics of exclusion*. 2001. Stanford University in California, PhD dissertation.

Marx, Karl. *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right.'* Translated by Annette Jolin and Joseph O'Malley, Cambridge UP., 2009.

Massumi, Brian. Translator's Foreword. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, U of Minnesota P, 2005, pp. ix-xv.

Mayr, Maria. "Among and Between: Alterity in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn*." *Migration and Literature in Contemporary Europe*, edited by Mirjam Gebauer and Pia Schwarz Lausten, Martin Meidenbauer, 2010, pp.319-32.

McLeod, John. *Postcolonial London: Rewriting the metropolis*. Routledge, 2004.

Mishra, Sudesh *Diaspora Criticism*. Edinburgh U P, 2006.

Newns, Lucinda. *At Home in Metropole: Gender and Domesticity in Contemporary Migration Fiction*. 2014. London Metropolitan University in London, PhD Dissertation.

Nadaswaran, Shalini. "The Legacy of Buchi Emecheta in Nigerian Women's Fiction." *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, vol.2, no.2, 2012, pp.146-150.

Nnaemeka, Obioma. "From Orality to Writing: African Women Writers and the (Re)Inscription of Womanhood." *Research in African Literatures*, vol. 25, no. 4, 1994, pp. 137- 157.
www.jstor.org/stable/3819872.

Okyere-Darko, Daniel and Uriah S. Tetteh. "The Significance of the Theme of Marriage to Character Development in the Novels Buchi Emecheta." *International Journal on Studies in Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, vol. 3, no. 11, 2015, pp. 53-69. ISSN 2347-3126 (Print) & ISSN 2347-3134 (Online).

Özdamar, Emine Sevgi. *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*. Translated by Martin Chalmers, Serpent's Tail, 2007.

---. Interview by Murat Şevki Çoban, 30 May 2016.
test.t24.com.tr/k24/soylesi/kendimi-sahneye-koymak-istedim-731

---. Interview: Living and Writing in Germany by Horrocks, David and Eva Kolinsky. *Turkish Culture in German Society Today*, edited by David Horrocks and Eva Kolinsky. Berghahn Books, 1996.

---. *Life is a caravanserai: has two doors, I came in one, I went out the other*. Translated by Luise von Flotow, Middlesex UP, 2000.

---. Public Talk with Perihan Mağden. *Boğaziçi Chronicles*.
vimeo.com/170439256.

Peleikis, Anja. *Lebanese in Motion: Gender and Making of a Translocal Village*. Transaction P, 2013.

Peter, Christine St. "Changing Worlds: The Nigerian Novels of Buchi Emecheta." *Atlantis*, vol. 11, no.1, 1985, pp.139-146.
DOI: 10.1080/00787191.2016.1208420.

Quayson, Ato and Girish Daswani. Introduction. *A Companion to Diaspora and Transnationalism*, edited by Ato Quayson and Girish Daswani, Blackwell, 2013, pp. 1-26.

Raghav, Priya. *Writing Her/Self: A Critical Study of Buchi Emecheta's Novels*. 2008. North Eastern Hill University, PhD Dissertation.

Safran, William. "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of homeland and Return." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, vol 1, no.1, 1991, pp.83-99. *U of Toronto P*.

Saraswathy, B.V. *Political and Social Positioning of Refugees in Britain: A Study of Select Works of Black British Writers Abdulrazak Gurnah, Caryl Phillips and Buchi Emecheta*. 2014. University of Madras in Chennai, Tamil Nadu, PhD Dissertation.

Schade, Silke. "Emine Sevgi Özdamar's Berlin: Linking Migration and Home in *Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn*." *Focus on German Studies*, pp. 21-33.

Schonfield, Ernest. "1968 and transnational history in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn*." *German Life and Letters*, vol.68, no.1, 2015, pp. 66-87. eprints.gla.ac.uk/101349/.

Seyhan, Azade. "From Istanbul to Berlin: Stations on the Road to a Transcultural/Translational Literature." *German Politics & Society*, vol. 23, no. 1 (74), Berghahn Books, 2005, pp. 152-70, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23740917>.

---. *Writing Outside the Nation: translation, transnation*. Princeton UP, 2001.

Sezer, Şermin. "Narrating the Personal History against the background of a Colonial History: Buchi Emecheta's *In the Ditch* and *The Second Class Citizen*" *Bakea 2013 History in Western Literature*, edited by Zekiye Antakyalıoğlu, UEM, 2014.

- Sezer-Toraman, Şermin. "The Effect of Language and Sexual Liberation on Female Subjectivities in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*." *Monograf Journal*, vol.12, 2019, pp. 189-206. www.monografjournal.com/sayilar/12/11-sermin-sezer-toraman.pdf
- Sieg, Katrin. "Class of 1989: Who made Good and Who Dropped out of German History Postmigrant Documentary Theater in Berlin." *The German Wall Fallout in Europe*, edited by Marc Silberman, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, pp. 165-183.
- Sizemore, Christine W. "The London Novels of Buchi Emecheta." *Emerging Perspectives on Buchi Emecheta*, edited by Maria Umeh, Africa World P, 1995, pp.367-385.
- Smith, Micheal Peter. "Translocality: A Critical Reflection." *Translocal Geographies: Spaces, Places and Connections*, edited by Katherine Brickkel and Ayona Datta, Ashgate Publishing, 2011, pp. 11-198.
- Stimpson, Catherine R. "The Nomadic Humanities." *Los Angeles Review of Books*, July 12, 2016. www.lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-nomadic-humanities/.
- Tedeschi, Miriam, Ekaterina Vorobeva and Jussi S. Jauhiainen. "Transnationalism: current debates and new perspectives." *GeoJournal*, doi.org/10.1007/s10708-020-10271-.
- Tello, Veronica. "Counter-memory and and-and: Aesthetics and temporalities for living together." *Memory Studies*, 2015, pp.1-12. DOI:10.1177/1750698019876002
- Topçu, Canan. "The Multiple Worlds of Turkish Women." *Qantara.de*, 17 May 2005. www.en.qantara.de/node/1110
- Tölölyan, Kachig. Interview by Robin Cohen. vimeo.com/25020401.

Umeh, Marie. Introduction: (En)gendering African Womanhood: Locating Sexual Politics in Igbo Society and Across Boundaries. *Emerging Perspectives on Buchi Emecheta*, edited by Maria Umeh, Africa World P, 1995, pp. xxiii-xLi.

Van Allen, Judith. "Sitting on a Man': Colonialism and the Lost Political Institutions of Igbo Women." *Canadian Journal of African*, vol.6 no. 2, Special Issue: *The Roles of African Women: Past, Present and Future* 1972, pp. 165-181. www.jstor.org/stable/484197.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge, 2008.

Vertovec, Steven. *Transnationalism*. Routledge, 2009.

Walker, Alice. *In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens: Womanist prose*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.

Weber, Beverly M. "Work, Sex, and Socialism: Reading Beyond Cultural Hybridity in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn*." *German Life and Letters*, vol.63, no.1, 2010, pp. 37-53.

Weedon, Chris. "Migration, Identity, and Belonging in British Black and South Asian Women's Writing." *Contemporary Women's Writing*, vol. 2, no.1, 2008, pp-17-35. Doi: 10.1093/cww/vpn003.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room One's Own*. Grafton, 1977.

Yearwood, Susan. "The Sociopolitics of Black Britain in the Work of Buchi Emecheta." *Black British Writing*, edited by R. Victoria Arana and Lauri Ramey. Palgrave, 2004.

APPENDICES

A. CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Sezer-Toraman, Şermin

Nationality: Turkish (TC)

Date and Place of Birth: *** **

Email: ***

Orcid Id: ***

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MA	METU English Literature	2010
BA	METU Foreign Language Education	2006

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place Enrollment
2013-Present	Sinop University – Instructor of English
2008- 2013	METU Department of Foreign Language Education - Research Assistant

PUBLICATIONS

1. Sezer-Toraman, Şermin. “The Effect of Language and Sexual Liberation on Female Subjectivities in Emine Sevgi Özdamar’s *The Bridge of the Golden Horn*.” *Monograf Journal*, vol.12, 2019, pp. 189-206.www.monografjournal.com/sayilar/12/11-sermin-sezer-toraman.pdf
2. Sezer, Şermin. “A Portrait of a More Habitable England in Hanif Kureishi’s *Borderline*.” *Interdisciplinarity, Multidisciplinarity and Transdisciplinarity in Humanities*, edited by Eugene Steele, Banu Akçeşme and Hasan Baktır, Cambridge Scholars P, 2016, pp. 68-75.
3. Sezer, Şermin. “Narrating the Personal History against the background of a Colonial History: Buchi Emecheta’s *In the Ditch* and *The Second Class Citizen*” *Bakea 2013 History in Western Literature*, edited by Zekiye Antakyalıoğlu, UEM, 2014.

4. Sezer, Şermin. "Performative Identities: First Generation Immigrants Haroon and Anwar in Hanif Kureishi's *The Buddha of Suburbia*." *UC Merced: World Cultures Graduate Student Conference*, 2013, escholarship.org/uc/item/22p806hz.
5. Sezer, Şermin. "Hanif Kuresihi's *The Black Album* as a Challenge to Thatcherite Politics." *BAKEA: Ideology in Western Literature*, edited by Ertuğrul İşler et al., Ata Matbaası, 2012, pp. 341-7.
6. Sezer, Şermin. "The Struggle with Language as a Resistance to Colonial Power in Derek Walcott's Poems." *12th International Language Literature and Stylistics Conference*, 2012.
7. Sezer, Şermin. "Redefining Britishness in *The Buddha of Suburbia* by Hanif Kureishi." *17th METU British Novelists Conference Proceedings: Hanif Kureishi*, edited by Nurten Birlik, Buket Doğan and Seda Coşar Çelik, Sözkese, 2010. (ISBN 978-605-125-592-7)

EDITING

1. Editors: Yıldız Bağçe, Hülya, Özlem Türe Abacı, Şule Akdoğan and **Şermin Sezer**. *Proceedings of the 19th METU British Novelists Conference: Kazuo Ishiguro and His Work*, Kardelen Ofset, 2012. (ISBN: 978-605-125-592-7)

CURRENT RESEARCH INTERESTS

Contemporary Novel, Literary Theory and Criticism, Postcolonial Studies, Diaspora Studies, Comparative Literature.

B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET

Zorunlu ya da gönll gn yz yıllardır var olduėu bir dnyada, zne konumları durmaksızın deėişmekte ve bu durum da g, diaspora, postkolonyalizm, ulustesilik (transnationalism) ve gebelik zerine yapılan alıřmaların artmasına neden olmaktadır. Dřnrler ve sosyologlar bu toplumsal olayların insan znelliėinin oluřumunda nasıl iřlev grdėn arařtırırken, gmen / diasporik /ulustesi / gebe insanların deneyimleri edebi eserlere girerek edebiyat tartıřmalarının sınırlarını geniřletmektedir. Smrge tarihi, postkolonyal deneyimler, savařlar, lkelerdeki i karıřıklıklar, dnya kaynaklarının daėılımındaki eřitsizlik ve siyasi nedenlerle dnyadaki sınırlar bir taraftan esnekleřip bir taraftan sıkılařırken aynı zamanda milyonlarca insan ge zorlanmıřtır. Bu hareketlilik, farklı baėlamlarda, ev sahibi lkelerde kltrel ve ekonomik aıdan ya eřitlilik vaat eden bir zenginlik ya da lkenin znde var olana zarar verecek bir tehdit olarak algılanmaktadır. Bu alıřma, kadının zne oluřumundaki eřitli diasporik deneyimlerin olumlu ve umut vaat eden sonularına odaklanmaktadır.

Bu alıřma dnyanın uzun sredir devam eden hareketliliėini gz nnde bulundurarak, Buchi Emecheta'nın *ukurda* (1972) (*In the Ditch*) ve *İkinci Sınıf Vatandaş* (1974) (*Second-Class Citizen*) ve Emine Sevgi zdamar'ın *Hayat Bir Kervansaray* (1992) (*Life is a Caravanserai*) ve *Halılı Kpr* (1998) (*The Bridge of the Golden Horn*) romanlarında kadın karakterlerin memleketlerinden ev sahibi lkeye g etme nedenlerinin ataerkil anavatanlarının baskısından kamak ve yeni bir alanda ev / memleket kavramını kurgularken sonsuz *oluř* sreleri iine girmek olduėunu iddia etmektedir. Bu iddiayı da Rosi Braidotti'nin gebe dřnce ve gebe znellik kavramlarının arka planında savunmaktadır. Farklı lkelerden ve kořullardan gelmelerine raėmen, Emecheta ve zdamar'ın kadın karakterleri benzer řekilde zne inřa srelerinin nemli bir parası olan diasporik alanda ev kavramını yeniden řekillendirirler ve bu srete kendilerini doėdukları ve g ettikleri lkelerin kısıtlamalarından

kurtarırlar. Bu tartışma öncelikle kadınların diasporik konumunun çerçevesini çizmektedir. Ayrıca, diasporada özne oluşumlarının akışkanlığını diaspora çalışmalarının ürettiği kavramlar yeterince açıklayamadığı için Braidotti'nin teorik çerçevesinde göçebe düşünce ve göçebe öznellik kavramlarına başvurulmaktadır. Braidotti'nin Micheal Foucault'dan aldığı karşı-bellek kavramına ve Deleuze & Guattari'den aldığı rizom (köksap) kavramına da analiz kısmında atıfta bulunmaktadır. Aynı zamanda kadın karakterlerin seslerini duyurma biçimleri Helen Cixous'nun kadın yazını üstüne düşüncelerine gönderme yapmayı da gerekli kılmaktadır.

İncelenen romanlardaki ana karakterler farklı ulusal ve tarihi geçmişlerden olsalar da, ataerkil bir toplumda kadın olma konusunda benzer kaygılar taşırlar ve kendilerine özgürleştirici bir alan yaratma isteği sonucunda göç yolu ile başka bir ülkeyi kendi evlerine dönüştürme niyetindedirler. Bu yeniden konumlandırma, içinde yer aldıkları söylemlerin sınırlamalarına rağmen öznelliklerini yeniden inşa etme potansiyellerini keşfettikleri bir alanda gerçekleşir. Bu alan hiyerarşilerin yönetiminde olmaktan ziyade rizomatiktir; yani farklı oluş biçimlerinin birbirine üstün gelmeksizin aynı anda işlevini sürdürebildiği bir uzamdır. Bu çalışma diasporik bir alanda kadın özneliği tartışması haline gelir ve özne oluşumunu kadınların diasporadaki deneyimlerini ev kavramına bağlanmaları veya ev kavramından kopmaları bağlamında inceler. Anavatan ataerkilliğinin baskısının, Batı ataerkil ortamında yeniden ikinci sınıf vatandaş olmanın baskısıyla birleşmesi nedeniyle güçlülerin hegemonyasını yeniden yaratma şansına sahip olduğu bir toplumda kadın iki kez marjinalleştirilir. Bu klişe görüşe kadın ana karakterler meydan okur ve ikili karşıtlıklardan bir çıkış yolu sunarlar. Aslında, kadın karakterler batılı olmayan söylemin ürünüdür; bu nedenle insan özneliğini açıklamaya yönelik Batılı araçlar, onların özneliğini tanımlamada yetersiz kalmaktadır. Diasporik bağlamı göçebe öznellik ile birleştirmek, bunu yapmanın bir yolunu sunar. Bu çalışma, yazarların romanlarda betimlediği diasporik deneyimin diaspora çalışmalarının

kavramsal araçları ile açıklanmadığını tespit eder ve bu yüzden diasporik alanda kadın deneyimini açıklamak üzere Braidotti'ye başvurmanın yanı sıra Cixous'nun kadın yazını üstüne fikirlerine de değinir. Kadın karakterlerin kullandığı dilin eski jenerasyon kadınlardan miras kalmış olması ve bu dilsel özelliklerin ev sahibi ülkenin diline taşınmış olması *dilsel translokasyon* olarak adlandırdığım kavramsal bir araçla anlatılmaktadır. Böylece bu çalışma tüm bu teorik yaklaşımları birleştirerek yeni bir hermenötik sunmaktadır. Bu çalışmaya göre kadın karakterlerin özne inşasıyla dönüşüme uğrama olasılığı daha yüksektir.

Tezin birinci bölümü olan giriş kısmında çalışmanın önemi, yazarların bağlamsal arka planı ve tezin planı anlatılmaktadır. Buchi Emecheta'nın yazar olma serüveninde Nijerya'nın pre-kolonyal, kolonyal ve post-kolonyal dönemlerinin etkileri ve yapılan literatür taraması ile Emecheta eserleri hakkındaki araştırmalar gözden geçirilmiş ve bu çalışmanın sunduğu yeni okuma biçimi ele alınmıştır. Bununla birlikte, Emine Sevgi Özdamar'ın Türkiye ile Almanya arasında imzalanan misafir işçilik anlaşması kapsamında Almanya'ya göçünün onun yazın hayatını nasıl şekillendirdiği anlatılmıştır. Ayrıca yazarın tiyatro deneyiminin onun yazarlık becerilerine katkısının altı çizilmiştir. Özdamar'ın eserleri hakkında yazılmış eserler gözden geçirilerek bu çalışmanın özgün yanı ortaya koyulmuştur. Yapılan incelemeler iki yazarın da belli bir millete aidiyetle sıfatlandırılmak yerine ulusötesi yazarlar olarak nitelenmelerinin daha uygun olduğunu göstermektedir.

Bu çalışmanın ikinci bölümü, tartışmanın teorik çerçevesini çizmektedir. Diaspora kavramının tarihsel gelişimi, dönüşümü ve ürettiği diğer terimler anlatıldıktan sonra bu terimlerle ilişkili biçimde Braidotti'nin teorisi anlatılır ve tezinin romanlarla ilişkisi kurulur. Diaspora çalışmalarının popülerleşmesi, tanımının gelişmesine, genişlemesine ve diasporik deneyimden türeyen yeni kavramlar oluşmasına neden olmaktadır. 'Ulusötesilik' bunlardan biridir. Aslında küreselleşme, diaspora, göç ve ulusötesilik gibi terimler organik olarak birbiriyle

ilişkilidir ve tanımlarını keskin bir şekilde ayırmak olası değildir. Diaspora ve ulusötesi terimlerinin günümüzdeki algılanışı hemen hemen benzer olsa da, diaspora önemli ölçüde dönüşüme uğramış kadim bir kavramdır. İlk kez İncil’de Yahudilerin yerinden edilmesine / dağıtılmasına atıfta bulunmak için kullanılan sözcük çağdaş dünyada Çin ‘ticaret diasporaları’ ve Türk ve Meksikalı ‘işçi göçü diasporaları’ gibi her türlü dağılmayı tanımlamak için kullanılmaktadır (Cohen aktaran Faist 12). Eski diaspora deneyimleri anavatana dönme arzusunu güçlendirirken, daha yeni şekli anavatan ile misafir eden ülke arasındaki kesintisiz etkileşimi ve bağlantıyı desteklemektedir. Arjun Appadurai (1996), tüm hareketli kişilerin diasporik deneyimlerinin tanımını ‘ulusötesi’ olarak genişletir (Aktaran Faist 12). Böylece yeni biçimiyle diaspora kavramı neredeyse ulusötesi ile eşittir. Ulusötesiliğin ön plana çıkardıkları şunlardır: akışkanlık, sınırları aşma kapasitesi, çok yönlü bağlantılar ve deneyimler. Ulusötesilik sınırların yarattığı baskının güçsüzleştiği ve geçirgenliğin arttığı bir zemin oluşturur. Bu nedenle, incelenen romanlarda kadınların ulusötesi deneyimi, kadın karakterler sabit kimlikler taşıyıp merkezde konumlanmadıkları için, geçirgen ve marjinaldir. Bu çalışma, romanlardaki ulusötesi alanları gerçek sınırlardan ziyade soyutlamalar olarak ele alır ve kültürel aktarıma odaklanır. Bu, ikili zıtlıklara meydan okuyan, zıtlıklar arasındaki çizgileri bulanıklaştıran ve oluşun akışkan yollarını sunan dönüştürücü bir süreçtir.

Diaspora kavramının ürettiği ulusötesi terimiyle birlikte gelişen bir diğer kavram translokalizmdir (yerelötesilik). Bu ifade, her ne kadar, sınırları farklı yerler arasındaki etkileşime atıfta bulunsa da, aslında bağlamsal bir deneyimdir. Yerellik de yerelötesilik de öznenin içinde bulunduğu şartlara göre şekillenir. Bir lokalitenin belli davranışlar ve ritüeller üretmesi ve bunlarla sınırlı kalması mümkün değildir. Doğanın koyduğu ya da devletlerin çizdiği sınırlar arasında sayısız iletişim ve etkileşim olanakları vardır ve bu çoklu deneyim yerelin sınırları aşmasına, yerelötesi deneyimlerle özne oluşumunun akışkanlaşmasına neden olur.

Çağdaş dünyada, teknolojideki gelişmelerin bir sonucu olarak, translokal deneyimlerin bir parçası olmak daha kolaydır. Konum olarak uzakta olduğumuz alanlarla ilişkimiz kolayca devam etmektedir. Ancak romanlardaki olaylar, 1960'lar ve 70'lerde iki yeri birbirine bağlayan teknolojilerin daha zayıf olduğu zamanlarda geçmektedir, ama bu çalışma, yerelötesini ülkenin belirli niteliklerinin göçü olarak ele aldığından, romanlardaki translokalitenin niteliklerini zayıflatmaz. Bilhassa ana karakterlerin ana dillerinin özelliklerini misafir eden ülkenin diline taşınması bir translokasyon örneği oluşturur. Bu tezde, ana dilin ritminin yeni bir dile taşınması bu deneyimi anlatmak için oluşturduğum *dilsel translokasyon* terimiyle açıklanmaktadır.

Yalnız, daha önce belirtildiği üzere, diaspora ile ilintili olan ulusötesilik ve yerelötesilik kavramları, kadın öznelerin diasporik deneyimini anlatmada yetersiz kalıyor. Bu noktada, Braidotti'nin *göçebe öznelliği*, göç deneyimi yaşayan kadın öznelerin oluş süreçlerini anlamak için önemlidir. Bu tez, yazarların ve ana karakterlerin göç nedeniyle yaşadıkları talihsiz olayları ön plana çıkarmaz, ancak bireyselleşmelerini olumlayıcılık (affirmativity) ile nasıl elde ettiklerine odaklanır. Karakterler, eksiklik duygusuna ve anavatan ve misafir eden ülke, göçmen ve yerleşimci, erkek ve kadın arasındaki gerilime odaklanmak yerine, ikili düşüncenin yarattığı stresi hafifleten göçebe düşünceyi benimserler. Savaşların, terörün ve doğal afetlerin çok sayıda insanı öldürdüğü ya da birçok insanın hayatını mahvettiği bir yüzyılda yaşamak, olumluya odaklanmak için bilinçli ve emek isteyen bir çaba gerektirir. Felsefesini Deleuze ve Guattari'nin fikirlerine dayandıran Braidotti, eksiklik duygusu yerine faillik değerine odaklanan olumlu bir öznellik alternatifi sunar. Onun felsefesinde, tıpkı Derrida'nınki gibi, yani postyapısalcıların düşünme biçiminde olduğu gibi, çatlaklara (ruptures) vurgu vardır ve çatlaklar olumlayıcılığa hizmet eder. Bu tez için incelenecek romanlar, kendilerine sunulan alternatifleri en iyi şekilde değerlendiren ve ıstıraptan çok umutlu bir üslup benimseyen kadın karakterler çizer. Bu bağlamda, Braidotti'nin göçebe düşünce, göçebe

öznellik, karşı-bellek (Foucault'dan ödünç alınmıştır) ve rizom (Deleuze ve Guattari'den ödünç alınmıştır) kavramlarına atıfta bulunularak, ulusötesi deneyime sahip kadın karakterlerin evlerini nasıl hatırladıklarını ve sonsuz yaşam üretimine nasıl giriştiklerini gösterecektir.

Göçebe Özneler adlı kitabında Braidotti, “göçebe özne projesinin metodolojik milliyetçiliğe karşı bir direniş eylemi ve Avrupa-merkezciliğin içeriden bir eleştirisi olduğunu” belirtir (7). Göçebe öznellik, “çağdaş küreselleşmiş dünyayı yapılandıran birçok ‘merkezden’ birinin içinden gelen özne, kimlik ve bilgiye ilişkin hakim anlayışlara yönelik bir eleştiriye alevlendirir ve korur” (7-8). Postkolonyalizm ve ırkçılık karşıtı feminizm üstüne düşünceler üreten Gayatri Spivak, Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Avtar Brah, Helma Lutz, Philomena Essed, Gloria Wekker ve Nira Yuval-Davis “güç, farklılık ve konumlar politikası (politics of locations)” üzerine yaptıkları çalışmalarla Braidotti'nin çalışmalarında önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Ayrıca, özellikle feminist düşünürler olmasalar da, Deleuze ve Guattari'nin çoğunlukla *Bin Yayla*'da ortaya koyduğu fikirleri, Braidotti'nin göçebe anlayışını şekillendirir. Aydınlanma felsefesinin bütünsel öz iddialarına bir alternatif olarak Deleuze ve Guattari, göçebe özneliliğin önemini vurgular. Tamamlanmış, tutarlı ve üniter olan Kartezyen benliği kınarlar ve zihni bedene üstün tutan Kartezyen varsayımı eleştirirler.

Göçebe düşünce, değişik oluş ve düşünce biçimlerini dışlamak niyetinde değildir. Deleuze ve Guattari, psikanalizde simgesel olanın, Derrida'nın fallosentrizminin ya da Butler'daki heteroseksist matrisin işlevinin diğerlerini sınırladığını ve marjinalleştirdiğini düşünür. Braidotti, sosyal teoride son zamanlarda ortaya çıkan ve merkez (centre) ile kenar (margin) arasındaki ikili karşıtlıklara “melez, çekişmeli, çok katmanlı figürasyonlar” yoluyla meydan okuduğu düşünülen özne konumlarının bunu başaramadığına, çünkü yaptıklarının ikili düşünceyi yok etmek yerine yalnızca daha olumlu ‘ötekiler’ yaratmak olduğuna inanmaktadır.

Buna karşılık Deleuze ve Guattari, tamlık, çokluk, akışkanlık ve deneyim gibi olumlu bir durumu çağrıştıran bir arzu anlayışı sunar. Braidotti'nin belirttiği gibi “Göçebe düşünce, psikanalitik bastırma fikrini ve Hegelci diyalektikten miras kalan eksiklik olarak arzusunun olumsuz tanımını reddeder. Bunun yerine Spinoza'dan, oluşun ontolojik bir gücü olarak pozitif bir arzu nosyonunu ödünç alır (*Portable* 2). Bu bağlamda, göçebe düşünürler, marjinalleştirilmiş ötekileri olumlu ya da olumsuz bir konumlandırma üstünden değerlendirmek yerine her bir öznenin bulunduğu yerden konuşmasını sağlayan hiyerarşik olmayan özne konumları sunmaktadırlar.

Deleuze ve Guattari için göçebe düşünce, devlet şebekelerinin sunduğu sınırların ötesinde işlev gördüğü için devlet aygıtına (state apparatuses) karşı savaşı bir savaş makinesidir (war machine). Devlet aygıtı sınırları belirler, bireyleri bölgelere ayırır ve hükmetmek için olanaklar yaratan sınırlar inşa eder. Bu kontrol aracı, içsellik (interiority) uzamları üretir. Ancak, *Bin Yayla*'nın çevirmeni Brian Massumi'nin kitabın önsözünde belirttiği gibi: “‘Göçebe düşünce’ kendini düzenli bir içsellik sınıra hapsedmez; bir dışsallık (exteriority) ögesinde özgürce hareket eder” (xii). Göçebe insanlar bu kategorilere uymazlar ve bu içsel bölgelerin dışında yaşarlar. Böylece göçebe düşünce, devlet aygıtının koyduğu kısıtlamalardan arınmış bir dışsallık tutumu haline gelir ve devlet aygıtının sürekli bir oluş halinde olan göçebe düşüncenin özgür doğasını bastırma eğilimlerini aşan bir dışsallık kaynağı işlevi görür.

Braidotti'nin göçebe felsefesi, ansızın ortaya çıkan, aidiyetsiz bir öznellik fikrinden bahsetmez. Gömülü (embedded) ve bedenleşmiş (embodied) yapısı ile “hem fiziksel, maddi hem de spekülatif ve eterik” olduğu için “zekanın hareketliliğine” benzeyen “söylemsel bir pratiktir” (*Portable* 3). Böylece göçebe özneler, öznelliklerini benzersiz konumlanmışlıkları ve iç içe geçmişlikleri içinde inşa ederler. Göçebe düşünce, “kişinin benliğini sabitleme ve ondan yararlanmaya yönelik sınırlı, egoya bağlı bir alışkanlık” olan kimlikten bir kaçıştır (4). Dolayısıyla, Braidotti merkez ve

otantik kimlik kavramlarının tamamen çözülmesi gerekliliğini vurgularken öznenin fallosentrik tasvirinden bir kaçış yolu sunar.

Braidotti'nin öznellik kavramı, Aydınlanma ideolojisiyle şekillenen Kartezyen benlik anlayışına karşı durur. Braidotti'ye göre zihni bedenden önde tutan, birleşik, tutarlı, bütünlüklü bir kimlik anlayışını savunan Kartezyen düşünce, öznenin olanaklarını ortadan kaldırır. Braidotti ile paralel düşünceleri olan Elizabeth Grosz da insan öznelliğini açıklamada Kartezyen ikiciliğin (dualism) ne kadar işlevsiz olduğunu savunuyor”(Volatile 3). Grosz'un da belirttiği gibi, ikili karşıtlıklar üzerinden düşünmek, kutuplaşmış kategorilerin hiyerarşikleştirilmesiyle sonuçlanır. Düalist düşüncenin bir ayağı güçlü olurken diğeri kaçınılmaz olarak güçlü ayağın “bastırılmış, tabi kılınmış, olumsuz karşılığı” olur (3). Zayıf ayak her zaman güçlü ayağın ne olmadığıyla tanımlandığından, bu aynı zamanda olumsuzluk üzerinden bir düşünme biçimi sunar. Böylece ikili düşünme, bedeni “zihin olmayan, ayrıcalıklı terimden farklı ve başka” olarak tanımlar(3). Beden, asi doğasını evcilleştirmek için yönlendirilmeye, yargılanmaya ve bastırılmaya ihtiyaç duyduğundan, zihin tarafından tabi kılınmak için oradadır. Akıl ve beden ikiliği, “akıl ve tutku, duyu ve duyarlılık, dış ve iç, ben ve öteki, derinlik ve yüzey, gerçeklik ve görünüm, mekanizma ve dirimsellik, aşkınlık ve içkinlik, zamansallık ve uzamsallık, psikoloji ve fizyoloji, form ve madde vb.” gibi başka karşıtlıkları da beslemiştir. Bu karşıtlık, birbirini dışlayan, beden ile zihin arasındaki etkileşimi kesen ve insan öznelliğine indirgemeci bir yaklaşımın uygulanmasıdır. Grosz, Descartes'tan çok daha önce Platon ile başlayan ikili düşüncenin birçok felsefi tartışmanın başlangıç noktası olduğunu vurgular. Birçok filozof Kartezyen düşünceyi takip ederken, Deleuze ve Guattari'nin, Grosz ve Braidotti'nin ve diğerlerinin çalışmalarını etkileyen Nietzsche ve Spinoza gibi bazıları da insan öznesi üzerine düşünce üretmenin alternatif yollarını bulur.

Bu çalışmanın üçüncü bölümü, teorik açıdan göçebe düşünce ve göçebe öznellik kavramlarını açıklanan şekilde ele alarak Emecheta'nın *İkinci*

Sınıf Vatandaş ve Özdamar'ın *Hayat Bir Kervansaray* romanlarındaki kadın ana karakterlerin misafir eden ülkeye göçlerinden sonra, zihinlerinde anavatanlarını yeniden kurgulama biçimlerinin, göç etme isteklerinin arkasındaki nedenleri gösterdiğini savunmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, her ana karakter, onları anavatanlarını terk etmeye zorlayan farklı koşullardan geçiyor. Bu kadınlar anavatanlarında ataerkil baskıya maruz kalıyor ve bu da başka bir ülkeye taşınma isteği yaratıyor. Emecheta'nın ana karakteri Adah, içine doğduğu toplum kız çocuklardan çok erkek çocukları tercih ettiği için kız olmanın acısını çekiyor; eğitim hakkı gibi temel insan haklarından yoksun bırakılan Adah, kendi iradesine göre yaşayabilmek ümidiyle İngiltere'ye giderek yeni bir hayat kurmak istiyor. Adah'ın kaçıışı, temelde onun çeşitli deneyimler yaşama alternatiflerini kısıtlayan ataerkil baskıya tepki olarak görünüyor. Benzer şekilde, Özdamar'ın isimsiz ana karakteri, Türk toplumunu açıkça eleştirmese de, yaşadıkları, onun alternatiflerinin ataerkil yaşam biçimleriyle nasıl sınırlandığını anlatıyor. Tiyatroya olan tutkusunu da göz önünde tutarak daha iyi bir oyuncu olma arzusuyla Almanya'ya taşınmanın kendisi için en iyi çözüm olduğunu düşünüyor.

Ana karakterlerin anavatanlarında geçen deneyimlerinin Braidotti'nin Foucault'dan alarak kullandığı karşı-bellek teriminin açıklayabileceği görülüyor. Karşı-bellek, resmi tarihe karşı duran kişisel belleği ve azınlık hafızasını tanımlamak için kullanılmaktadır. Ayrıca anavatanı hatırlama sürecinde her iki romanda da dilin ele alınışı tartışılmıştır çünkü Anzaldua'nın dediği gibi "Dil bir anavatandır" (55). İşin ilginç tarafı bu romanların misafir eden ülkenin dilinde yazılmış olması ama bu dile ana dilden öğelerin taşınmış olmasıdır. Bu eğilim daha önce belirtildiği üzere *dilsel translokasyon* terimi ile açıklanmaktadır.

Bu bölümde incelenen ilk roman, *İkinci Sınıf Vatandaş*, üçüncü tekil şahısla yazılmıştır, ancak açıkçası roman, ana karakter Adah'ın zihninden konuşur. *Hayat bir Kervansaray*, isimsiz ana karakter tarafından anlatılan birinci tekil şahıs anlatımıdır. Her karakter, kendi

yerel kültürü hakkında yargıda bulunmadan kişisel anılarını hatırlar ve bu süreçte aynı zamanda eski nesil kadınların deneyimlerini de yansıtır; bu da bu romanları feminist soykütüğün bir parçası haline getirir. Aslında ne eserlerin yazarları ne de romanlardaki karakterler feminist olduklarını iddia etmiyorlar ama Braidotti'nin yaklaşımı bu romanların da feminist tartışmaların parçası olabileceğini gösteriyor. Braidotti, “feminist soykütükleri kavramının ... diğer kadınların çalışmaları üzerinden geriye doğru düşünme süreci olduğuna” inanıyor (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 207). Dolayısıyla, kadın deneyimine odaklanan bu romanlar da kuşaklar arası bir bağ yaratarak feminist soykütüğe katkıda bulunuyor. Braidotti şunu ekliyor: “[s]oykütükler, direnişi bizim için bir destek ve ilham kaynağı olan bazı kadınların deneyimlerine ve konuşan seslerine bağlı kalmamızı sağlayan politik olarak bilgilendirilmiş karşı-bellektir.” Bu nedenle, Braidotti'nin Foucaultcu karşı-bellek kavramını nasıl yorumladığı karakterlerin gerçekliğini açıklamakla bağlantılı hale gelir. Sonuç olarak, bu bölüm, kadın karakterlerin hatırlama biçimlerinin ataerkil toplum tarafından kendilerine tahsis edilen ikincil statüyü nasıl aşabildiğini ve kendi oluş şanslarını nasıl yarattıklarını Braidotti'nin bellek anlayışına atıfta bulunarak ortaya koymaktadır. Tartışma, çoğunluğun yani resminin belleğine karşı azınlığın yani resmi olmayanın belleğinin nasıl yazıldığının altını çiziyor. Azınlığın belleği oluşu, değişimi ve akışı işaret ederken, çoğunluğun belleği azınlığın seslerini bastırma eğilimindedir. Karşı-belleğin mekânların özgüllüğüne ve somutlaşmış deneyimlere yaptığı vurgu, merkezi ve baskın hafızaya bir tehdit işlevi görerek kadınların bireysel pratiklerini ön plana çıkarır.

Romanların ana karakterleri doğdukları ülkenin tarihine ve kültürüne gömülüdür, ancak bireyselliklerini ekleyerek hikâyelerini baskın söyleme karşı kurarlar; dolayısıyla her roman, kaçınılmaz olarak bir karşı-bellek örneği haline gelen benzersiz bir kadın öznelliğinin ürünüdür. Öznelliğin oluşumunda kadın dayanışmasına duyulan ihtiyaç her iki romanda da belirgindir ve kadın dayanışmasının varlığı ya da yokluğu karakterlerin

gelişiminde önemli rol oynar. Bu bölüm, ev kavramsallaştırmasının karakterlerin anavatanlarını terk etme nedenlerini nasıl sunduğunu deşifre etmeye çalışırken, dilin kendisini ev veya ruhsal (psychic) bir aidiyet alanı olarak alır. Hem Özdamar'ın hem de Emecheta'nın karakterleri, toplumun farklı kesimlerinden insanlara ses vererek farklı söylemlerin bir arada var olmasını sağlar. Romanlar, özgün üslup ve temalarıyla farklı kadınların çoklu pratiklerini öne çıkarır ve onları özgürlüğe götüren bellek işleyişinin önemli bir rol oynadığı özne oluşumunun çeşitliliğini örneklendirir.

Dil, bellek üzerine düşünmenin aracıdır ve her özne dili kendine özgü halleri ile kullandığı için dilin kullanım şekli karşı-belleğin nasıl etkinleştiği ile yakından ilişkilidir. Kadınların öznelliklerini hayata geçirmek ve kendilerini ifade etmek için baskın dili dönüştürmeleri gerekir çünkü egemen olan dil ataerkildir. Hatta Braidotti şöyle der: “Lacancı psikanaliz bize, tüm dillerin babanın adını taşıdığını ve onun sicili tarafından damgalandığını, anadil diye bir şey olmadığını gösterir” (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 11). Kadınların, Braidotti'nin deyimıyla ‘yüksek teorinin’ kadınlara verdiği ikincil konumun üstesinden gelmek için olumlayıcı (affirmative) bir dil yaratmaları gerekiyor. Sabit kimliklerin çözülmesi, ancak düşünceyi ve eylemi ikili sınırlamalardan kurtaracak alternatif bir olumlayıcı dil yaratarak mümkündür. Dolayısıyla kadın dili, egemenin sabit statüsünü sarsan azınlık belleğinin / karşı-belleğin bir ürünüdür.

Kadın karakterlerin belleği, çok dilli olma konumlarının etkileri sayesinde aktive olur. Karakterler, dilsel alanlar arasında hareket ederler ve maruz kaldıkları dillerin belirli yönlerini benimseyerek kendi ev hislerini yaratırlar. Bir dilin sınırlarıyla kısıtlanmak yerine, işgal ettikleri dilsel alanların kendilerine hitap eden yönlerini ödünç alarak dil kullanımlarını zenginleştirirler. Diller arasında hareket etme özgürlüğü, dil aracılığıyla sonsuz oluşumlara girmelerine ve bir ev hissi yaratmalarına olanak tanır. Braidotti, çok dilli bir kişinin becerilerini detaylıca açıklıyor. Braidotti ana

dil yerine kişinin başlangıç noktası olan dilsel alanlardan bahseder. Çok dilli (multilingual) bir kişinin ana dil yerine birçok geiş izgisi olduėunu iddia eder. Çok dillilerin hangi dilde tekerleme sylediėini, rya grdėn, hayal kurduėunu hatırlayabilmek gibi bazı yaygın davranıřları kaybolur. Diller arasında kayma, bir dilden diėer dile geerken akustik izler alma, fonetik ve ritmik baėlantılar retme ok dillilerin deneyimleri arasındadır. Braidotti'ye gre ok dilli birine verilebilecek en gzel hediye henz bilmediėi yeni bir szcktr (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 13). Braidotti'nin bu bakıř aısı, bu alıřmanın her iki romanda da dili nasıl ele aldıėının teorik arka planını sunmaktadır. Birok ynden, Emecheta ve zdamar'ın romanları bu teorilerin kurguya aktarılmıř bir versiyonu gibi grnyor nk ok dilli iki ana karakter deėiřik diller arasında gidip geliyor ve her iki karakter de dilsel bařlangı noktaları olmayan bir dil kullanıyor. Ancak řarkılarda, tekerlemelerde ve řiirlerde 'ana dillerinin' izleri grlyor. Farklı diller, karakterlerin onları hatırladıėı řekilde anlatıdaki yerini alıyor ve farklı akustik nitelikleri nasıl dn alıp onları bir araya getirdiklerini gsteriyor. Dili kullanma biimleri de gebe bilincin bir rneėini gstermektedir. Kendi anadillerinin dilsel aralarını misafir eden lkelerin dillerine aktararak, diėer bir deyiřle, szcklerin, řarkıların veya herhangi bir dilsel niteliėin yeni bir dile tařınmasıyla hem ana dili hem de ikinci dili dnřtrerek evlerinde olma hissini elde etmeye alıřırlar. alıřmanın bu blmnde, ana karakterlerin romanlarda dil kullanımlarının evi yani anavatanı hatırlama sreciyle yakından iliřkili olduėunu ve alıřmanın geri kalanının bu tartıřmayı geliřtirmek iin bu blmdeki tartıřmaları izleyeceėini ileri sryorum.

Cixous'un kadınlara bedenlerini yazma aėırısı, kadın yazısının soyktėne odaklandıėımızda daha anlamlı hale geliyor. Braidotti'nin de vurguladıėı gibi, kadınların eski kuřaklardan edindikleri deneyimler ve onların yazıya giriřleri, aėdař kadın yazarların yolunu aıyor. Kadın bedenini yazmaya ynelik bildik vurgusuna raėmen Braidotti, konumlar politikasını deėerlendirmede, Virginia Woolf'un "Bir kadın olarak benim

lkem yok” szn yaklaşımlarının merkezine alan Cixous ve Luce Irigaray'dan farklı bir duruş sergiliyor. Braidotti, bir lkenin olmaması gibi bu ikircikli durumun, ayrıcalıklı olmayan kadınların dezavantajlı koşullarını göz ardı ettiğine inanıyor. Bu nedenle, konumlar politikasının önemini vurgulayarak feminist soyktğ tanımlarken karşı-belleg işlevi gören “gml ve bedenleşmiş” bir söyleme odaklanır. Feminist soyktğ gözlemlerken Braidotti, kadın yazılarının tarihini bulmak için geniş bir yelpazeye seslenir. Yaratıcı ve kurgu metinler ile akademik veya teorik metinler arasındaki ayrımı kaldırır. Feminist bir metnin gücn farklı türleri bir araya getirme, karışırma ve birleştirmeden aldığını vurgular. Başka yerlere ve zamanlara ait kadınların yazdığı feminist eserleri hala bize açık olan, bize seslenen açık uçlu yollar olarak okumayı önerir (*Nomadic Subjects* 1994 207). Braidotti'nin iddia ettiğı gibi, türlerinden bağımsız olarak tm feminist eserler feminist soyktğn bir parçası haline gelir ve zne inşasının zenginliğini arttırır. Metinlerdeki feminist soyktğn izini srmek, karşı-bellegin nasıl çalıştığını ve nasıl alternatif bir söylem oluşturduğunu gösteriyor. Her kadının yazısını kendi özel koşulları içinde değerlendirmenin önemini altını çizilerek, Emecheta ve Özdamar'ın romanlarında kadının evi yeniden kavramsallaştırmasının şekillenmesinde kadın yklerinin soyktğnn önemli bir rol oynadığı görlmektedir. Romanlarda görldğ gibi kadın dilinin ve yazınının şekillenmesi, kadın karakterler arasındaki dayanışma ve karakterlerin din, eğitim ve gelenekle ilişkisi memleket kavramının nasıl imgelendiğini göstermektedir.

Tezin drdnc blm, *İkinci Sınıf Vatandaş* ve *Çukurda* romanlarının ana karakteri Adah'ın ve *Haliçli Köprü* romanın isimsiz ana karakterinin göçebe znelliğın sağladığı güçle onlara tahsis edilen mekânları ve uzamları kendilerine mal ederek doğdukları ve göç ettikleri lkelerin sınırlamalarından kurtulduğunu ileri sürer. Blmn ilk kısmında, karakterlerin misafir eden lkede ev hissi yaratma süreçleri anlatılır. Bu çalışma, kadın karakterlerin yeniden ev kurma deneyimlerini yapıcı pratikler olarak gözlemler; yaşadıkları yerleri nasıl sahiplendiklerine ve

sonunda maruz kaldıkları sosyal çevrelerin sınırlamalarından nasıl kurtulduklarına odaklanır. Bu çalışma mekânın kısıtlayıcı niteliklerine odaklanmaz; Braidotti'nin göçebe öznelliği çerçevesine atıfta bulunarak karakterlerin mekânları nasıl sahiplendikleri ve öznelliklerini gerçekleştirmek için ruhsal (psychic) sınırlara nasıl meydan okudukları ile ilgilenir. Mekân anlayışı merkezi, hiyerarşik veya istikrarlı değildir. Göçebe düşüncenin özü, zayıfları güçlendirmek değil, hiyerarşiler yaratmadan farklı kesişimsel modların eşit bir temelde var olmasını sağlamaktır. Kesişen ırk, cinsiyet ve sınıf biçimleri, üniter öznellikleri dayatmadıkları sürece Braidotti için kabul edilebilir: “Öznenin bir dizi dış kuvvet ve diğerleri ile çoklu, doğrusal olmayan ve dışa bağlı ara bağlantılar kurma kapasitesini” vurgular (“Affirming the Affirmative”). Braidotti, cinsiyet, ırk ve sınıf gibi ikili düşüncenin kimlik belirteçleri aracılığıyla kişinin öznelliği hakkındaki aşırı genellemeleri reddeder ve konumlar politikası dediği kavram ile kişinin kendi koşullarına vurgu yapar - kadın karakterlerin ait olduğu konum onların farklı zaman ve mekânlardaki oluş süreçlerini de etkileyen bir referans noktasıdır.

Braidotti'nin belirttiği gibi, göçebe düşünce merkezileştirilmiş kavramlara değil, karşılaşmalara, birbirine bağlılığa ve diyalojik ilişkilere odaklanır. Bununla birlikte, öznenin bir söyleme gömülü olma durumunu da vurgular ve “insanın üzerinde hiçbir zaman tam olarak kontrol sahibi olmadığı bir öznelliği yapısöküme uğratamayacağını” ekler (*Metamorphosis* 82). Tıpkı, romanlardaki göçmen kadınların belli söylemler içine doğmuş olması ve bu söylemlerin ürettiği devlet aygıtlarının (state apparatus) kısıtlamalarına maruz kalmaları gibi. Adah'ın devlet desteğinde bir daireye yerleştirilmesi, *Haliçli Köprü*'nün isimsiz ana karakterinin Almanya ve Türkiye arasında yapılan anlaşmalar bağlamında Almanya'da misafir işçiler için ayrılmış bir pansiyonda yaşaması bu kısıtlamanın parçası gibi görünür; ancak, bu mekânların yarattığı sınırlar kadın karakterlerin kimliğini sabitleyemez. Bedenleri ve zihinleri, kendilerine sunulanın sınırlarını aşar ve arayışları, özne oluşumunun bir parçası olan sonsuz müzakere ve değişimi kapsar.

Ana karakterler bu çizilmiş yerleri (striated places) benimseyerek onları pürüzsüz alanlara (smooth spaces) dönüştürme yeteneğini kazanırlar ve bu süreç öznenin güçlenmesi ve hiyerarşiden yoksun bir rizom elde edilmesi ile sona erer. Bu nedenle, ne karakterlerin konumları ne de benzersiz oluş biçimleri gözden kaçırılmamalıdır. Resmi tarih, hukuk ve din gibi devlet aygıtları kişinin oluşumunda etkilidir ve tüm göçmen deneyimlerini etiketler altında açıklama eğilimindedir. Deleuze ve Guattari'nin belirttiği gibi: “Tarih, konu göçebeler olsa bile her zaman yerleşik bir bakış açısıyla ve en azından olası bir üniter Devlet aygıtı adına yazılır” (23). Ancak bu resmi tarihte “[n]omadoloji, yani tarihin karşıtı” eksiktir (23). Söz konusu romanların karakterleri, resmi tarihin önemsiz bir parçası olmaya direnen tavırlarıyla göçebeliliğin oluşumunu örneklemektedir; devlet aygıtlarına karşı bireysel hikâyelerini yazarlar. İkili düşünceyi yok eden ve bir kaçış noktasında öznelliğin gücünü kavrayan bir rizom yaratırlar. Bu alternatif oluş alanı “hareketli / hareketsiz, yerleşik / yabancı arasında değil” bu kategoriler içinde gerçekleşecektir (*Transpositions* 60). Özne konumları arasında sınırlanmadan hareket etme alternatifine sahip olmak, karakterlerin yeni yerleri eve dönüştürmelerini sağlar.

Nihayetinde, öznenin kendini evde hissettiği bir alan oluşturması karmaşık bir süreçtir. Adah, Afrika ile bağlarını canlı tutmak isterken kendi çocuklarının da doğduğu yerle duygusal bir bağlantı kurmalarını sağlamaya çalışıyor ama çocukları için Adah'ın anavatanına bağlılığı hiçbir anlam ifade etmiyor. Aslında, Adah da çocuklarını haklı çıkaran yorumlarda bulunuyor. Örneğin, memleketinde bir hayat hayal ederken Biafra'da devam eden savaşları hatırlıyor ve orada hayatın ne kadar zor olacağını da vurguluyor. Adah bir daha anavatanına dönmüyor. Onun anavatanında kendini evinde hissetmeme ihtimaline ilişkin kaygılarının, *Haliçli Köprü*'nün isimsiz ana karakterinin deneyiminde de gerçekleştiği görülüyor. Romanın isimsiz ana karakteri, Türkiye'ye döndükten sonra kendini evinde hissedemez ve Türkiye'nin Doğusuna yaptığı yolculuk onu

evde olma duygusundan daha da uzaklaştırır. Tiyatro aracılığıyla kendisine yeni alternatifler sunacak yeni bir dil bulma umuduyla Almanya'ya dönmeye karar verir - bu kez kızının evini başka bir yerde yaratması gerektiğini fark eden annesinin de desteğini alarak döner.

Dördüncü bölümün ikinci kısmında karakterlerin özne inşasında göçebe düşünce ve öznellik kavramlarının nasıl rol oynadığı ve düalist düşüncenin nasıl alaşağı edildiği görülmektedir. İkili düşünme yoluyla işleyen cinsiyet, din, gelenek, ırk ve etnik köken gibi merkezi kavramlar dünyasında doğmuş olmasına rağmen, Adah her zaman özelleştirilmiş özellikleri ve fikirleri eleştirir. Sabitlenmek yerine hareket ve dönüşüm halinde olmayı seçerek kendi rizomunu yaratır. Nijerya'daki yerleşik ve rahat orta sınıf yaşamına devam etmek yerine İngiltere'yi yuvası haline getirme arzusu ve çabası, kısıtlayıcı yaşam ve düşünce biçimlerinden kurtulmak istediğinin bir kanıtıdır. Bununla birlikte, İngiltere'ye taşınmak, İngiltere'nin kendine özgü kimliği totalize etme yöntemleri olduğundan, ona hiyerarşik olmayan bir şekilde yaşama lüksünü kolayca sunmaz. Adah'ın oluşum sürecinde özcü kimlik belirteçleri eleştirilip yapısöküme uğratılır. Belirli noktalarda Adah'ın düalist düşünceleri yeniden inşa etme tuzağına düştüğü görülse de romanın sonunda göçebe düşüncenin sağladığı özgürleşmeyi yaşar.

Deleuze ve Guattari'nin rizom ile ikici düşünme arasındaki ilişki hakkındaki fikirleri, Adah'ın neden ve nasıl ikiliklere hapsedildiğini, ancak aynı zamanda onun kısıtlamalarından da özgür olacağını açıklar. Onlara göre:

Her rizom, kendisine göre katmanlaştırıldığı, bölgeselleştirildiği (territorialized), düzenlendiği, anlamına geldiği (signify), atfedildiği vb. parçalılık çizgilerinin yanı sıra, sürekli olarak aşağı doğru kaçtığı yersizyurtsuzlaşma çizgilerini içerir. Parçalı çizgiler kaçış noktalarına dönüştüğünde rizomda bir kopma olur, ancak kaçış noktaları rizomun bir parçasıdır. Bu çizgiler her zaman birbirine bağlanır. Bu nedenle, hiç kimse iyinin ve kötünün ilkel biçiminde bile, hiçbir zaman bir ikicilik (dualism) ya da bir ayrılık (dichotomy) varsayamaz. Bir çatlak yaratabilir,

bir kaçış noktası oluşturabilirsiniz, ancak yine de her şeyi yeniden sınıflandıran örgütlerle, bir gösterene iktidarı yeniden kazandıran oluşumlarla, bir özneyi yeniden oluşturan atıflarla ... yeniden karşılaşma tehlikesi vardır. (*Thousand* 97)

Varlığını sağlamlaştırmaya çalışan kurumlarla karşılaşmak da rizomatik deneyimin bir parçasıdır; yine de, Deleuze ve Guattari'nin belirttiği gibi, her zaman, bu kurumların güçlü statülerini çürüterek beklenmedik şekillerde hareket edebilen çatlaklar ve kaçış noktaları vardır. Rizom, kimlik belirteçlerini reddetmez, ancak onlara herhangi bir hiyerarşi dayatmadan veya onlara olumsuz çağrışımlar atfetmeden bir arada var olma potansiyeli sunar. Adah'ın oluş süreci, yalnızca Nijerya gelenekleri ve İngiliz Milletler Topluluğu Sistemi gibi kurumlarla değil, aynı zamanda Adah'ın göçebe düşünce ve öznellik elde etmek için bu kurumların kısıtlamalarının ötesine geçmesine yardımcı olan kopuşlarla da bir etkileşimi içerir.

Adah gibi, Özdamar'ın isimsiz ana karakteri de *Haliçli Köprü*'de katı tanımlara ve kategorilere, ikili düşünceyi zayıflatacak şekilde meydan okuyor. Daha önce tartışıldığı gibi, evin sınırlarının bulanık olduğu romanda, evin nerede olduğu ve kimin hangi kültüre ait ya da yabancı hissettiği, isimsiz ana karakterin deneyimleriyle ilgili bir meseledir. Ana karakter, kendi anavatanına yabancılaştırmış hissederken ataerkil toplumun sınırları içinde yaşamak istemediğini fark eder. Toplum tarafından kendisine sunulanı kabul etmek yerine, Almanya'da yaşamayı seçerek ve kendi koşullarının ve deneyimlerinin oluş süreçlerinde akmasına izin vererek kendi gerçeğini yaratır. Roman, cinsiyet, anavatan ve misafir eden ülke, Marksizm ve dil ikililerini sorunsallaştırarak hiyerarşik düşünceyi istikrarsızlaştırır ve bunun yerine göçebe düşüncenin özne inşasındaki işlevselliğini vurgular. Göçebe düşünce, ana karakterin birden çok oluş yolunu özgürce denemesine izin verir.

İsimsiz ana karakterin gelişimi etrafında şekillenen anlatı, cinsiyet belirteçlerinin algılanması ve göçebe düşünce ve öznellik sayesinde

mutlakiyetlerin nasıl çözüldüğü hakkında tartışmalara alan açıyor. Cinsiyet ikiliklerinin temsil edilme ve altüst edilme şekli anlatıyı şekillendiriyor; bu nedenle, göçebe düşüncenin düalist düşüncüyü geçersiz kılmak için nasıl işlev gördüğü önem kazanıyor. Cinsiyet ikilikleri ve bunların nasıl yapıbozuma uğratıldığına ilişkin tartışma aynı zamanda ırksal, etnik ve politik tartışmaların kesişimini de kapsıyor. Kimlik belirteçleri birçok noktada kesişirken hiçbirisi özne oluşumunu sonlandıramıyor / donduramıyor. Ana karakterin, Berlin'de bir kadın yurdunda birlikte yaşadığı bütün kadınların kimliği “Türk göçmen kadınlar” olarak kolayca kategorize edilebilecek gibi görünür. Ancak her kadının kendine özgü bir geçmişi, yaşam biçimi ve insanların oluş sürecini cinsiyete, yaşa ve uyruğa göre sınıflandırmanın imkânsızlığını kanıtlayan benzersiz özellikleri vardır.

Nihayetinde, hem Adah hem de *Haliçli Köprü*'nün ana karakteri ikili düşünceye meydan okuyor ve kısıtlayıcı kimlik belirteçleriyle oynayarak kendi öznelliklerini oluşturuyorlar. Adah, kadının ikili sistemin zayıf ayağı oluşuna meydan okuyor. Eğitiminin ona sağladığı avantajla, kocası Francis olmadan İngiltere'de çocukları ile yeni bir hayat kurabileceğini fark ederek Francis'i terk ediyor ve onun baskısından kurtuluyor. Ayrıca insanlara önyargıların beyhudeliğini göstererek ırksal ve etnik ikiliklere de zarar veriyor. Bazı noktalarda, hedefine ulaşmak için Batılıların siyahi bir göçmene küçümseyici bir tavırla yaklaşmasını onlara karşı ustaca kullanıyor. Yeteneklerinden daha azına sahipmiş gibi davranırken, düalist düşünce tarafından kısıtlanmak yerine, batılı üstten bakışı kendisine karşı kullanıyor ve böylece göçebe öznelliğin önerdiğini örnekleyen akışkan bir uzamda yaşıyor. Kendine olan güveni, itibarını koruma arzusu ve çocuklarıyla birlikte planladığı umutlu gelecek, İngiltere'yi kendine ait bir eve çevirdiğini kanıtlar.

Aynı şekilde, *Haliçli Köprü*'nün isimsiz ana karakteri toplumsal cinsiyet ikililerini, Marksizm veya kapitalizm gibi büyük anlatıları sorunsallaştırıyor. Romandaki ana karakter, Gül, Rezzan, Melek ve adı

açıklanmayan diğer kadınların ataerki ile sorunlu bir ilişkisi olduğu görülüyor. Sadece Türk kadınlarının yaşadığı kadın yurdunda homojen kimlik belirteçlerinden bahsetmenin imkânsızlığı, kimliğin asla ulus ya da cinsiyete bağlı olmadığını, performansın ve kişisel tercihlerin bir sonucu olduğunu gösteriyor. Ayrıca ana karakterin erkeklerle ilişkisi, Marksizm ve kapitalizm gibi büyük anlatıları sorunsallaştırıyor ve roman, soyut bilgiyi insan bedeni üzerinden somutlaştırarak kavramaya çalışan oluş halindeki bir kadını resmediyor. Romanın sonunda, göçebe düşünce özgürlüğüne kavuşan ana karakter, Almanya'ya tekrar dönme kararıyla orada tiyatro sayesinde yeni mekânları kendini evinde hissettiği alanlara dönüştürmeye ve öznelliğini sonsuz bir akışa bırakmaya hazır halde yola koyuluyor.

Sonuç olarak, farklı epistemolojileri (Afrika, Türk, Alman, İngiliz) kadın diasporik öznelliğini tartışmak üzere bir araya getiren bu çalışma, ataerki toplumun sınırlamaları tarafından ezilen kadın karakterlerin kendilerini yeniden evde hissedebilecekleri yeni bir mekân arayışı içinde olduklarını savunur. Karakterler, anavatanın kendilerine kazandırdıkları ile misafir eden ülkede kendilerine sunulan yeni olanaklar arasında bir uzlaşma yaratırlar. Romanlar, tarihsel / çoğunlukçu bellek arka planına karşı karakterlerin kişisel / azınlıkçı / karşı-belleğini ortaya çıkarır. Sürekli dalgalanma ve kaçış içinde yaşayan ve sabit kimlik kavramlarını sorunsallaştıran ana karakterler, batı dünyasının üstüne kurulduğu düalist düşüncenin sağlam zemini yok ederler. Farklı sosyo-politik bilinç biçimlerine sahip olmalarına rağmen, her iki ana karakter de herhangi bir güç kaynağına tabi olmaya direnir. Batı düşüncesinde kodlanmış olmamalarının onlara Avrupa'da alternatif oluş deneyimleri ile angaje olmak için daha fazla serbest alan sağladığına inanıyorum. Ayrıca romanların anlatım biçimleri, karakterlerin iç potansiyellerini keşfetme arayışlarına eşlik ediyor. Anlatılar, Batılı gerçekçilik anlayışının sınırlarının ötesindedir ve bu kadınlar sözlü gelenek gibi kendi hikâye anlatım yollarını batılı bir tür olan romana taşır. Edebi tür dönüşürken kadın karakterlerin de dönüşümüne tanıklık edilir. Romanların

karakterleri, geirgen uzamlarda yařadıkları akışkan ilişkiler sonucunda göebe düşünce ve öznelliğın özgürlüğünü örnekler.

C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐
- Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : SEZER TORAMAN
Adı / Name : ŞERMİN
Bölümü / Department : İngiliz Edebiyatı / English Literature

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): WOMANLY EXPERIENCE IN DIASPORIC SPACES: BUCHI EMECHETA AND EMİNE SEVGİ ÖZDAMAR

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master ☐ Doktora / PhD ☒

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. /** Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years.** * ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. /** Secure the entire work for period of **six months.** * ☐

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. /

A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature Tarih / Date

doldurulacaktır.)

(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle

(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.