I. Historical Context: Charlotte Bront's *Jane Eyre*

Charlotte Bronte's works are alive with the essential elements of feminism. Her world is a world of men and women facing the complex moral, social, personal, and fragmented aspects of life as they live with. However her unique ability manifests in her portrayal of emotions and conditions of women in artistic manner. Particularly the interesting issue is her writing results from her thinking about women. People who read her novel find the direct and indirect means of inferiorizing women in a male governed society.

Charlotte Bronte, daughter of an Irish clergyman, was born in 1816. She was the eldest of three daughters, the others being Emily and Anne; her brother, Patrick Barnwell, was the youngest of the family. Her mother died at a tender age, they were brought up by a aunt and their father. They lived in a parsonage at Haworth, which was situated amid the Yorkshire moors. Bronte's father was a virtuous and conscientious man, but unfit to rear his children, as he could not understand their sensitive and imaginative natures nor their delicate health.

Charlotte's life was one of sorrow and struggle. At the age of eight she was sent to Cowan's Bridge School, the "Lowood" of which she has given a dark picture in *Jane Eyre*. The family was poor and the daughters were forced to earn a living as governesses. She escaped from Yorkshire for a while to study language in Brussels, for this was the only chance she got to see something of the world. Having a stronger will and personality than her sisters or her brother, she became the leader and it was through her efforts that their works were published and got recognition in the world of literature. She first attempted writing poems and these

were published under the names of Currer, Ellis, and Acton Bell. They were a failure, however, she turned to fiction. Charlotte Bronte's first novel was *The Professor*, but it failed to find a publisher until after her death. She wrote another novel, *Jane Eyre* which was published in 1847 and it won her immediate and universal fame. Later she wrote *Shirley* (1849) and *Villette* (1853).

The literary importance attached to the authoress's works is due to the fact that they are all autobiographical. They all reflect the dreariness and narrow outlook of her life. The character of Jane Eyre in the novel *Jane Eyre* is modeled on her own experiences. An essential part of the story is the belief that dreams are more or less mystical prophecies of things to come. This belief was held by many people, particularly those of celtic descent and those living in country districts, and may therefore have been inherited from Charlotte Bronte's parents. In the closing chapters she raises the veil on her subconscious passionate nature. G.K. Chesterton sums her up in these words: "Charlotte Bronte embodies a contrast which is at least a curiosity of literature . . . she might be compared to a Baptist chapel built on a volcano."

The two sides of Charlotte Bronte's nature are seen in her life: on the one hand she was a realist, supervising her father's household, directing her sisters, and preparing to teach in school. On the other hand, she was a romanticist, seeking to escape from the dull routine of reality in a make-believe dream-world. She became writer to relieve the tedium of women's hum-durum existence, but it occurred to Charlotte's practical mind that this occupation might be a means of livelihood. It was both as a realist and a romanticist that Bronte wrote her first published novel, *Jane Eyre*. She presents female character exposing plain of having loving nature along with unusual honesty. She explores her own nature

through her writings where her tenderness and strength, turbulent desires queer mixture of recklessness get presented. The fiery soul, the pride, the courage integrity and resolute purpose were all part of Charlotte herself. In spite of Charlotte's insistence that her heroine was like herself only in physical appearance, she projects feminist values in the character Jane Eyre. Such projection distinguishes her texts from previous Victorian heroines.

Charlotte Bronte loved life and continued writing her novels as if nothing was happening outside. In her time, she had to struggle hard against the social and political atmosphere which was adverse for women. So her works became the subject for discussion and criticism. But the works she produced occupies the significant spirit in feminist theory as a tool in literary field. Feminist theory turns a new movement for women to develop their personality and their ways of living. It is a means for women to be aware about exploration of the exploitation of women in patriarchal society. But feminism as a movement did not exist in Bronte's time. Rather the atmosphere was essentially patriarchal. However, it does not mean that there was no feminist feeling. Today, feminism has become a way for women to be suitable in every field from politics to literature. In other sense, it encourages women to be readers and writers.

Jane Eyre was first published in 1847, a moment of historical transition in which Britain was turning its attention away from its West Indian colonies towards the colony that would become the 'jewel' in Victoria's crown, India. The primary reason for declining British involvement in the Antilles was the unprofitability of sugar and tobacco plantation in the wake of the abolition of slavery in 1833. There are several compelling reasons to suggest that the move

into India would merit considerable attention in a novel published in 1847 and so palpably concerned with colonialism as in *Jane Eyre*. The conquest of India was protracted and violent. Moreover, It was well publicized, as Lawrence James details in *The Rise and Fall of the British Empires*, "the army in India fought campaigns in Burma . . . [and in] Afghanistan (1838-42), conquered the Sind (1843) and the Punjab (1845-6) . . . The British press gave extensive coverage to the campaigns, usually reproducing stories from local papers, official dispatches, and letters from men serving at the front" (190). The securing of India's north-west frontier, a bloody and drawn-out process which occupied much of this press attention in the years leading up to the publication of *Jane Eyre*, was characterized by catastrophes. One of the most notable examples was the killing of almost the entire Kabul garrison of the British Army during a harrowing winter retreat through the Khyber pass in 1838. The response to this 'massacre' was a number of barbarous raids of reprisal in which entire villages, along with their livestock and crops, were destroyed, in addition to often costly (both in terms of life and property) British military victories.

Like many novels of the Victorian period, Charlotte's novel was published under a male pseudonym as was common of women writers of her day. It records her knowledge of the abuses of the poor in the guise of charity, and her anger at the hypocritical religious practices of the men directing the institutions responsible for their care and education. School, upon which the fictional Lowood school was based abounded in England during Bronte's lifetime, as did the cruelly dependent situations of the young women and girls who taught and resided in them. While their ostensible goal was to assure the modicum of literacy

that might be required for the limited if inevitable participation of the poor in the coming democracy, the larger value involved protecting the membership of the particular religious denomination sponsoring the school and maintaining the unquestioning conformity of pupils. Women might never vote, but they might teach, bear and raise a subset of the working class male voter; they needed to be kept in their places and to educate the next generation of their peers to do the same. When government subsidies became available in the thirties, the incentive became even greater to feed, clothe and house pupils at the absolute minimum cost.

Since the very beginning Victorian society had been shaped and governed according to patriarchal norms and values. In patriarchy, all aspects of society and human behaviour are controlled and guided by men only. All social, cultural, literary, economic, religions, and legal and many other aspects are dominated by men to suit their purpose. In such society authority is passed through the male line from father to son. So, women are alienated and their plight is pitiable. In Bronte's time, the existence of female was miserable. The atmosphere of society for women was unfavourable. The female writers had to struggle more than male writers to establish themselves. There was no organization that favoured women. So, as a result, women could not develop the sense of unity and could not participate in the activities of the world. The male governed society laughed at women and ridiculed their arts so the female works did not flourish in Bronte's time.

Critical Response to *Jane Eyre*

Jane Eyre is a popular Victorian novel by Chrarlotte Bronte's that shows the status of female and the social structure of the then time, which has remained

at the centre of critical interest and has received much critical appraisals after its publication in1847. David Daiches remarks:

> *Jane Eyre* first published novel and the work which brought her contemporary fame - shows her writing with an almost melodramatic abandon, out of her own passion, dreams, and frustration, parts of the book are practically straight autobiography and the other part represents the kind of wish fulfillment which view Victorian women had the courage or the power to translate into fiction. (1065)

Charlotte Bronte's generation of women fought for women's suffrage and emancipation. Her work explores the kind of anxieties these change raised about the role that women should play in the society and their sexual romance and legal relationship with man. In his essay "Victorian Age" William Jones makes a point that her works are "interesting in many of its early passages, as the reflection of [her] own life and experiences" (515).

Some of the critics focus about the ideological aspect of this text. Vanden Bossche in his article "Ideology, Agency, Class and the Novel" writes that "*Jane Eyre* is a pivotal text for histories of the novel because it raises particularly vexed questions about the ways novels support ideology. In his understanding, some reading emphasize how the text produce ideology, others how it serves as critique, and still others discovering some combination of the two." Another critic talks about the romantic aspect of the text. Alison Searle writes:

> The seductive power of the romantic narrative that *Jane Eyre* relates namely the relationship of the heroine to Rochester and her gradual empowerment as a writing subject, has enticed critics to

> read it as either a secular celebration of erotic attachment, or the achievement of one female's search for independence. (37)

In this way, the novel is observed from several angles by different critics and reviewers in terms of women suffering, autobiography, dream, frustration and ideological aspects of the text. However, criticisms are unavailable to address adequately of contrapuntal issues of the novel. Therefore, the argument is that this research will show solidly feminist encounter with high Victorianism exposing the nexus between masculinity and colonialism. Further this feminist critique of high Victorian British Society is threaded with colonial rule also. And the attempt will be directed toward the exposition of masculine excesses on British women paralleling the excesses on the natives by the colonizing whites.

Thus, the researcher's endeavor in this work will be to unveil the exploitation of women in Britain showing a parallel to the exploitation of the natives in the colonies. The methodology of this research hence, will be feminism and postcolonialism especially the notion of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Gilbert and Gubar as well as Edward Said's Orientalism, Culture and imperialism and Contrapuntal Reading.

II. Feminist Perception of Victorientalism

Feminism and Post-colonialism

Feminism has close affinity with the post-colonial discourse exposing the domination of powerful over the powerless. The experience of women in patriarchy and those of colonized subjects can be paralleled in a number of respects such as in representation, identity, gender and economy. Where the feminist and the postcolonial discourse oppose domination. Feminism like post-colonialism, has often been concerned with the ways and extent to which representation and language are crucial to identity formation and to the construction of subjectivity. For both groups, language has been a vehicle for subverting patriarchal and imperial power and both discourses have involved essential argument in posting more authentic forms of language against those imposed on them. Both discourses share a sense of disarticulation from an inherited language and have thus attempted to recover a linguistic authenticity via a pre-colonial language of a primal feminine tongue. However, both feminists and colonized peoples, like other subordinate groups, have also used appropriation to subvert and adopt dominant language and signifying practices.

Similarly, the text of feminist theory and those of post-colonialism concur on many aspects of the theory of identity of difference and of the interpellation of the subject by a dominant discourse, as well as offering to each other various strategies of resistance to such controls. Similarities between 'writing the body' in feminism and 'writing place' in post-colonialism, the strategies of bisexuality and cultural syncreticity; and nationalism can be detected. There have been vigorous debates in a number colonized societies over whether gender or colonial oppression is the more important political factor in women's lives. Sometimes it

has led to the division between western feminists and political activities from impoverished and oppressed countries; or, alternatively the two are inextricably entwined, in which case the condition of colonial dominance affects, in material ways, the position of women within their societies. This has led to call for a gender consideration of the construction and employment of gender in the practices of imperialism and colonialism.

More recently feminism has been concerned with the categories like gender. Sometimes attempts are made to the ignorance of genre within the larger formation of the colonial, and that post-colonial theory, so as to elide gender differences in constructing a single category of the colonized. Many critics argue that colonialism operated very differently for women and for men, and the double colonization that resulted when women were subject both to general discrimination as colonial subjects and specific discrimination as women needs to be taken into account in any analysis of colonial oppression. Even post independence practices of anticolonial nationalism are not free from this kind of gender biasness, and construction of the traditional or pre-colonial bias that falsely represents 'native' women as quientist and subordinate.

The domestic quarrel between post-colonialism and feminism does not end here. If western feminism stands convicted for its theoretical articulation of the 'third - world women', it is also blamed for the way in which it simultaneously occludes the historical claims of this figure. To a large extent, both 'faults' privileges the issue of representation. So both the criticisms, feminism and post-colonialism are two sides of the same coin. Thus, liberal academic feminism is said to reveal the 'native woman' in its pious attempt to represent or speak for her. Spivak questions:

> in the face of those silent women, is about her own identity rather than theirs . . . this too might be characteristic of the group of thinkers of when I have most generally, attached her. In spite of their occasional interest in touching the other of the West, of metaphysics, of capitalism, their repeated question is obsessively self centred: if we are not what official history and philosophy say we are, who then are we [not], how are we [not]. (Spivak 255)

Spivak's earlier essay, "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism" offers another talk on the 'disappearance' of the 'gendered subaltern' within liberal feminist discourse. Her argument here opens up a crucial area of disagreement between post-colonialism and feminism. Rather than chronicle, the liberal feminist appropriation of the 'gendered subaltern', this essay queries the conspicuous absence of the 'third - world women' within the literature which celebrates the emerging female subject in Europe and Anglo-America. A rereading of women's history shows that the historical moment of feminism in the west was itself defined in terms of female access to individualism. Yet nowhere does feminist scholarship stop to consider where the battle for female individualism was played out. Nor does it concern itself with the numerous exclusions and sacrifices which might attend the triumphant achievements of a few female individuals. Spivak's essay is posed as an attempt to uncover the repressed or forgotten history in European American feminism. Once again the margins reveal the mute figure of gendered subalternity: "As the female individualist not male, articulate herself in shifting relationship to what is at stake, the 'native female' as such is excluded from a share in this emerging norm" (Spivale 244).

Spivak in her essay "Three Women's Texts and Critique of Imperialism," situates this cult text of western feminism in the great age of European imperialism. The culture and literary production of nineteenth century Europe, She argues, is inextricable from the history and success of the imperialist project. Thus, feminism seeks its inspirational origins in this period, it must also reconsider its historical complicity with imperial discourse. Spivak writes:

> We must remind ourselves that it should not be possible in principle, to read nineteenth-century British literature without remembering that imperialism, understood as England's social mission, was a crucial part of the cultural representation of England to the English. The role of literature in the production of cultural representation should not be ignored. (243)

When we look the feminist criticism historically, its mainstream spirit concerns exclusively with the western tradition. Thereby it disregards the issues of the non-European females. On that sense the mainstream feminism others the issues of the non-western women. So, the Other corresponds to the focus of desire or power Empire in relation to which the subject is produced, the Other is the excluded subject created by the discourse of power. In Spivak explanations, othering is a dialectical process because the colonizing Other is established at the same time as its colonized others are produced as subjects. The articulation of feminist identity all too often repeats what she characterizes as the quintessential gesture of colonialism blindness to the epistemic violence that effects the colonial subject and requires her to occupy the space of the imperialist's self consolidating Other.

As some version of feminist and at least a post-postcolonial critic like O' Connor doesn't believe that politics should be left entirely out of the picture talking about feminism, or even that literary criticism can or should be completely divorsed from history and social criticism. Her notion that the key operation of the post-colonial critic has been to treat every Victorian novel as an "allegory" of empire is just as problematic as Fredric Jameson's much criticized claim that all "Third world" novels are about" National allegories". Most accounts of the history of post-colonial criticism don't start with Spivak's 1985 essay, but with Said's 1978 *Orientalism*. That key work has been both highly influential and much criticized, even by those whom it has influenced, for seeing "Orientalism" as too monolithic and for concentrating almost exclusively on European discourse. Perhaps the response to these criticism, is *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), where Said surveys the anti-colonial writings of such non-western intellectual as Frant Fanon, Amilear Cabrat, and CLR. For Victorianist, there are serious issues at stake regarding slavery, war, colonies, geographical exploration, economic exploitation, race, empire, immigration, starvation and so on. These issues are directly or indirectly addressed in countless Victorian novels. While some recent forms of interpretation and criticism, including versions of the post-colonial variety, have been ham-handed, post-colonial criticism in general has opened up many new resources for understanding cultures, where as victorian literature can't escape its imperial "mission".

The binary of colonizer and colonized appears mainly in two ways. First, we are told that the Victorian novels are loser, having been taken over by post-

colonial criticism. Then we learn that Victorianist and feminist critics are also looser, their "finest hour" achieved when they become one of Spivak's "research assistants". The defeat of the Victorian novel by post-colonial readings and the today deference of Victorians to Spivak's *Jane Eyre* has been caused by the lack of toughness in the ranks.

Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *Mad Woman in the Attic* (1979) is another brilliant book of a historical study of feminism which stresses especially the psychodynamics of women writers in the nineteenth century. Gilbert and Gubar in this book, according to M.H. Abrams:

> propose that the 'anxiety of authorship' that resulted from the sterotype that literary creativity is an exclusively male prerogative, effective in women writers a psychological duplicity that projected a monstrous counter figure to the heroine . . . such a figure is usually in some sense the author's double, an image of her own anxiety and rage. (236)

Gilbert and Guber's main argument is that artistic creativity of the nineteenth century tradition, which is perceived basically as a male quality, is in fact patriarchal superimposition upon the women writers who are imprisoned within it. They suggest that the female writers should first struggle against men's oppressive reading of women. But they further argue that the women writers can begin strongly only by actively seeking a female precursor who, far from representing a threatening force to be denied or killed, proves by example that a revolt against patriarchal authority is possible.

Gilbert and Gubar have made the full leap to a feminist aesthetic. In *The Mad Women in the Attic*: The women writer and the nineteenth century literary

Imagination, they offer a more theoretical comparative method which defines a mode of imaginative expression uniquely female: formed in response to literary traditions and social contexts which are undeniably male. They describe the formal strategies - conscious and unconscious - which women writers have devised in order to make their fictions reflect either their own lived experience or the fantasized words they have created to make their realities hearable. The book is extraordinary exciting: deeply insightful, broadly imaginative, breathtaking risky. Its failures as well as its successes spark further formulations. It is the work to which most feminist criticism and theory of these next years will have to refer, in support and disagreement.

Gilbert and Gubar show that the dominant patriarchal ideology at this time presents artistic creativity as a fundamentally male quality: since creativity is defined as male, it follows that the dominant literary images of feminity are male fantasies too. Women are denied the right to create their own images of femaleness and, instead, must seek to conform to the patriarchal standards imposed upon them; hence the figure of the madwoman which features in all the nineteenth-century novels in Gilbert and Gubar's study and which they claim is an equally crucial figure in twentieth-century fiction by women. As Moi says: "The monster woman is the woman who refuses to be selfless, acts on her own initiative, who has a story to tell-in short, a woman who rejects the submissive role patriarchy has reserved for her" (145). The creation of the mad woman in fiction conceals a deep, not easily accessible level of meaning has to do with the situation of the woman artist under patriarchy. Gilbert and Gubar claim that their authors managed the difficult task of achieving true female literary authority by simultaneously conforming to and subverting patriarchal literary studies. The

madwomen, then, is in some sense the author's double, an image of her own anxiety and rage. In projecting their anger and disease into dreadful figures, creating dark doubles for themselves and their heroins, women writers both identify with and revise the self-definitions that the patriarchal culture has imposed on them.

A construct which might help us understand particular colonialism of Gilbert and Gubar, and of many white feminists, is taken from Shakespeare's play *The Tempest*. The trope of Prospero and Caliban and its evocation of self and other, the West and the rest of Us, the colonizer and the indigeneous people, has received much critical attention, the relationship between Mirinda and Caliban has been virtually ignored. In the symbolic economy of the "prospero complex," prospero enacts the role of omnipotent western patriarchy, and Caliban, that of the "native" other suffering from the cultural deracination that serve as the intellectual and emotional counterpart to economic enslavement (Bulhan 189). Mirinda - the Anglo European daughter offers us a feminine trope of colonialism, for her textual and psychological selflessness in *The Tempest* exposes the particular oppression of women under the rule of their biological and cultural fathers. Like Caliban, Mirinda has been colonized and tricked and exists only "as man's other side, his denied, abused, and hidden side. She has constantly been the embodiment of a nonculture. A crucial question raised by the coupling of Mirinda and Caliban is why these two victims of colonialist prosperity cannot "see" each other; for us, the crucial question is why Gilbert and Gubar, who in Madwoman occupy the position of Mirinda, cannot see the "native" female in their reading of women's texts.

Another influential critic, Elaine Showalter says that female psyche is influenced by generate subculture, but within it there is their own sub culture which forms a collective experience of women of everywhere. Generally, feminist have rejected all patriarchal notions. To go against the idea, the radical women's writings are needed. She wrote a readable and excellently documented book, *A Literature of Their Own* which is an effort to describe the female literary tradition in the English novel from the generation of the Brontes, to the present day, and to show how the development of this tradition is similar to the development of any literary sub culture. Furthermore, as Showalter also points out, feminist critics have a sympathy for Bertha Mason, a central Character of *Jane Eyre* that, ironically, charlotte Bronte does not seem to share.

Virginia Woolf says to emerge as a writer one needs the freedom of expression in her essay "*A Room of One's Own*." Likewise , with the generous concern for women, Woolf also speaks for women that a woman cannot fulfill her literary ambition in the shortage of social and economic support. She discloses the reality in the essay "A woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction" (546). Social freedom is, therefore, the most essential thing. Otherwise, whatever be the noble thought and talency all will probably be useless. From Bronte's *Jane Eyre*, the message of freedom is needed to be flourished in society. Because the freedom means getting individual liberty, which is root of opportunities despite the hard and social norms.

Culture and Imperialism

Imperialism refers to the formation of an empire, and as such, has been an aspect of all periods of history in which one nation has extended its domination over one or several neighbouring nations. Edward Said uses imperialism in this

general sense to mean "the practice, theory, and the attitude of a dominating metropolitant centre ruling a distant territory" (8). Said in introduction to his book *Culture and Imperialism* defines culture as "a concept that includes a refining and elevating elements, each society's reservoir of the best that has been known and thought" (xiii). Edward said further says, "Imperialism means thinking about, setting on, controlling and that you do not posses that is distant. That is lined on and owned by others" (5). Said thus argues that imperialism includes multiple activities that exceed the mere fact of the political control of land mass. Now English literature is not the sole property of the England or English people. It has become the common property of the world. Former colonized country got influence from colonizer but even colonizer also got some influence from colonized people, from native people or culture.

Previously non-Africans wrote about Africa but this is an attempt by Africans themselves to narrate their own approach. There are no mediators so the message comes directly from Africa to the world. There is no manipulation, no derivation, no change. We see Africa as it is, "Independence was for whites and Europeans; the lesser or subject people were to be ruled; science, learning, history emanated from the west" (Said 26). Post-colonial writing is a written reply against written document of white people. It is a book about injustice done by imperialism:

> Western may have physically left their old colonies in Africa and Asia, but they retained them not only as makers but locals on the ideological map over which they continued to rule morally and intellectually . . . More over, it focuses not on what was shared in the colonial experience, but on what must never be shared, namely the authority and rectitude that come with greater power and development. (Culture 27)

Similarly, 'Culture' is used to designate not merely something to which one belongs but something one possesses, and along with that proprietary process, culture also designates a boundary by which the concepts of what is extrinsic or intrinsic to the culture come into forcefully play. Culture writing about the evils of West to the non-West is just like the filling the case in international intellectual court. Standing the witness in the witness box with the fact which was previously did not get chance to state frankly and freely. Not to speak the truth about the colony is a job just to stake the fact without fear, westerns think the time was such and it was compulsion for them. They say the argument is already over and want to deny the blame to them as colonizer. They want to justify their point. It is just reopening the case file, which is already buried by West in dusty storehouse. Said in his book *Culture and Imperialism* says "It is a kind of historical necessity by which collection pressure created anti colonial resistance" (Culture 45). In fact, it is the colonial suppression, which gave birth to the strong anti imperialist feeling.

Postcolonial discourse gave rise to the marginalized people about their culture, history, and real representation, which was written by colonized people. And those colonized people for the colonizers were never taken as serious task having any political caliber. Natives were not only neglected but also never discussed about before. But after the rise of post colonial discourse it is taken only as accepted norms but still the European measuring rod measures its value. The practical meaning and the operating ideology of culture and literature were Euro-centric. Now many part of the world is geographically free and through geographical control they controlled culture and history but now slowly geographical decolonization is leading to cultural and historical decolonization, which is now ongoing. To dismantly is easy but to construct is very difficult and

invites hard labor. Same kind of difficulty is now facing by ex-colonized countries.

Postcolonial studies sketch the interacting experience that links imperialists with the imperialized. The study of the relationship between culture and imperialism does not demand the chronological study it can be attempted through description. After world war second scholars, historians, activists have been in both for and against the subject. Similarly, this is the age of colonialism as well as resistance to it. This age belongs to a period of theoretical elaboration, of the universalizing techniques of deconstruction and structuralism. Said says; "from the eighteenth century to the middle nineteenth century, when the cultural riches of India, China, Japan, Persia and Islam were firmly deposited at the heart of European culture" (Culture 234).

Here we can realize that the influence is two-way. Not only Europe influenced the Dark continent but also even Europe got influenced from the Africa or Orient. The culture, which Africa got from Europe and supposed, to be imposed to Africa was already influenced by Africa. In this sense, Africa is getting its culture back from Europe. The difficulty Africa is facing is because of the inequality between Africa and Europe in economic and cultural fronts. At present thinking about cultural exchange involves thinking about domination and forcible appropriation. One side gains and another loses; one side is triumphant and another defeated.

Anti-colonial or anti-imperial activity, thought and revision has challenged the western empire "Ho chi Minh in Vietnam held the view the Western culture could be helpful in ending colonialism" (culture 236). Europe gave the colonies their modernity and argues about the well-being and the progress of Europe which

is built up with the sweat and the dead bodies of Negroes, Arabs, Indians, and Yellow races. In this aspect, Europe in the creation of third world:

> The West needed those territories to furnish Europe with manpower and resources for a war of little direct concern for Africans and Asians . . . For the successful nationalist parties that led the struggle against the European powers, legitiamacy and cultural primacy depend on their asserting an unbroken continuity leading to the first warriors who stood against the intrusive white man. (Culture 238)

Culture and imperialism is not only a book seeking to describe "the general relationship of culture to empire," but it also exists to dispute the very authority of the western canon of literature, where the canon excludes more than it includes. *Culture and imperialism* offers to its readers an arrangement of reading, the contrapuntal, which asks that every text be read not only for what is included inside of it but also for what has been left out. In the imperial mode, contrapuntal reading means considering the facts of imperialism in a work with the realities of resistance, which are often elided. Said also means to include inside the contrapuntal the idea that "each cultural work is a vision of a moment and we must juxtapose that vision with the various revisions it later produced" (Culture 239). What this means is that canonical literature must be read critically, and that we should not be satisfied with the canon alone. As Said wrote in "Secular criticism," "We are now . . . in a period of world history when for the first time compensatory affiliative relationships interpreted during the academic course of study actually excluded more than they included" (Culture 240).

Colonialist's Discourse: Orientalism

Edward Said extended the theory of discourse and linked the theory of discourse with real social and political struggle. Forgrounding his deep faith in the notion of discourse is yielded with power, he propagated that the discourse are the result of real power struggle in the society. Said's main interest is to study and analyse the relations between the West and the East, and the role of 'Orientalism' as a governing force in this relationship. Orientalism as the discourse of the West about the East, Said argues, designates the long term images, sterotypes and general ideology about the Orient as 'the Other'. His book on Orientalism, for Selden, shows "how the western image of the Orient [is] constructed by generatin of scholars, produces myth about the lazyness, deceit and irrationality of the Orientals" (102). According to Said, Orientalism is a huge body of text that construct certain sterotype images of the Orient. These sterotypes, however ironically, accepted as self-evident truths and facts. Orientalism is also the western projection of will govern over the Orient. The Orient is governed by and dominated by the discourses produced by the Orientalists rather than material, military, or political power, because the discourses make possible Orient as "subject class". Orientalists discourses fashion their modes of thought and working style by developing confidence in them, which in turn, increase their power and authority over the Orient.

The Orientalists' discourses always try to prove the superiority of western language and culture in comparison to all nonwestern culture. The Orient is studied on the basis of 'knowledge' produced by the western elites, which is based on the sterotype "images" of the colonized or the non-western. Defining the

colonialists practices of the discourse, Elleke Bochmer in his book *Postcolonial Literatures* writes:

> Colonialist discourse can be taken to refer to that collection of symbolic practices including textual codes and conventions and implied meaning, which Europe deployed in the process of its colonial expansion and, in particular, in understanding the bizarre and apparently Unintellible Strangeness with which it came into contact …. Colonialist discourse, therefore, embraced a set of ideological approaches to expansion and foreign rule. (50)

The Western colonialist discourses create the myth of inferiority of the colonized, and it deployed the superiority of colonial culture. The colonized natives were tamed by the pedagogy of "civilizing mission" that advocate the need of colonial rule over the indegenous land. Because in European imagination, the colonized are irrational, uncivilized, and therefore unable to establish peace in their own land. The representation of the colonized as unfit to rule, or to manage their own resources was one such ideological mechanism that worked with particular persuasiveness. According to this approach, the naming of the indigenous as irrational, barbarism, Indian, animal like was simultaneously an act of evaluation, usually of downgrading. In these colonialist discourses, the presence of the native people was entirely erased from the land they occupied.

The colonialists ruled over the non-western world by symbolism, because the colonial authority expressed its dominance in the part through the medium of representation. A colonialist's work of imagination functioned as instrument of power. The colonialist in their representation depict 'the Other' in need of western civilization. E.M. Forster's *A passage to India* vividly describes the British, or the

colonialist attitude towards India, or the colonized land. Ronny, the representative of British rule in India, tells Adela that the British are necessary in India. There would certainly have been bloodshed without them. He says, "I am out here to work . . . to hold this wretched country by force" (Orientalism 50). He thinks that the Indians are savage, and cannot administrate their country in peace. That is why, he believes, he is sent by his government to hold this 'wretched country,' and establish peace. Ronny always feels superior to Indians: he feels that it is not necessary for him to behave pleasantly towards the natives, but he has only a strong feeling to rule over them. He says, "I am just a several of the Government . . . we're not pleasant in India, and we don't intend to be pleasant" (50). Ronny's attitude towards the Indians is the picture of all colonialists' attitude towards the nations of the colonized land. Homi Babha is his essay "The Other Question" says:

> The objectives of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction . . . colonial discourse produces the colonized as a fixed reality which is at once on 'Other' and yet entirely.
> (Orientalism 41)

The exercise of colonial power through discourse demands an articulation of forms difference racial and sexual. The colonial discourse employs a certain types of narrative in which the colonized are represented as fixed reality, 'a regime of truth, 'that is structurally similar to racialism. Said, in this book *Orientalism* argues that the "Orient" was the European fantasy, "without examining Orientalism as a discourse, one cannot possibly understand the

enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage and even produce the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically and imaginatively" (Orientalism 3). The Europeans produced a heavy body of texts advocating the superiority of their culture, and their race. They developed the stereotyped version, images, vocabularies that served as the "lenses through which the Orient is experienced" (Said 58), and the "idea of European people and cultures " (Orientalism 7). The subjectivity of European narrative was to separate "us" from "them" and the West from the East. Said further opines that the Orientalism should seriously be studied. He speaks for the sake of non-westerns, and comments that the "Orientalism depends for its strategy of this flexible positional superiority, which puts the westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever loosing him the relative upper hand" (Orientalism 7). This means that the discourses that were produced on the basis of European knowledge on the Orient were effective tool to dominate and rule over the Orient.

The presentation of the Africans as the cannibal, eating fellow's flesh and blood, is a form of European image. Such allegories, given to the colonized are supposed valid. Such allegories were mainly developed just to prove them inferior. With reference to Said, Micheal parker in his book *Postcolonial Literature* says.

> Central to Said's thesis is the textual nature of place and placement, of 'us' and 'them,' 'west' and 'East,' the rigidly binomial oppositions of 'ours' and 'theirs' with the former always encroaching on the later. Such are the defining relations in European vocabularies. (12)

The Orient was created by the Euroepans: they have given various identical characters in which the Orient live with in short, Orientalism is a body of knowledge in which the Orient is a kind of western projection onto and will to govern in his another book *Culture and Imperialism* advocates:

> Europeans writing on Africa, India . . . [is] the European effort to rule distant lands and people . . . what are striking in these discourse are the theoretical figures one keeps encountering in their descriptions of "the mysterious East," as well as the sterotypes about "the African [or Indian, or Irish, or Jamaican] mind." The notions about bringing civilization to primitive or barbaric peoples, the disturbingly familiar ideas about flugging or extended punishment being required when "they" misbehaved or become rebelling because "they" mainly understood force or violence best; "they" wore not like "us," and for that reason deserved to be ruled. (Introduction XI)

European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self. Said writes: "So to speak of Orientalism is to speak mainly, of a British and French cultural enterprise, a project whose dimensions take in such disparate realms as the imagination itself, the whole of India." When we take about the relationship between East and West, it is not very good; it is often antagonistic and aggressive. Said says, "The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degree of a complex hegemony" (Orientalism 5). The Orient was Orientalized not only because it was discovered to be "Oriental" in all these ways considered commonplace by an average nineteenth

century European, but also because it could be that is submitted to bring made Oriental. Orient lost its prestige by its frequent misinterpretation by the West created a myth about the Orient.

The above argument makes clear how the Europeans created the Orient, and marginalized so as to prove their rule over the natives. Thus, the Orientalism the discourse produced by the West about the East helped the Europeans to rule over the East.

Contrapuntal Reading

A form of "reading back" from the point of view of the colonized that brings to light the hidden colonial history that permeates nineteenth century European literay texts. Said introduces the concept of contrapuntal reading in *Culture and Imperialism*, a notion which critics Bill A. Chcroft and Pal Ahluwalia trace to the Saidian enthusiasm for accomplished painist, found in music the way to formulate a contrapuntal relationship, between imperial and postcolonial narratives (Mortimer53). We should bear in mind, however, that before applying contrapuntality to literature, he evok it in terms of the exile's heightened awareness of multiple dimension, stating:

> Most people are principally aware of one culture, one setting, one home; exiles are aware of at least two, and this plurality of vision gives rise to an awareness of simultaneous dimensions, and awareness that - to borrow a phrase from music - is contrapuntal. (Mortimer 55)

Said seems to be making music a special and unique instance in human behaviour, but in fact he is not. He clearly wants to see music as an activity that performs social work. But his Proustain approach gives him the purchase he has

on art's action. As he says, "The transgressive element in music is its nomadic ability to attach itself to, and become a part of social formation" (Mildren 67). His focus is absolutely on the object and the recipient's interaction with the object. But the object offers all those who interact with it no resting spot, no image of completeness, no hope for the coincidence of art and morality or art and the world.

Artworks such as music offer us the illusion of unity and completeness, but in fact they await completion in the response of the auditor who might respond in enthusiasm, forgetfulness, other recollections, distraction or boredom. Artworks offer us "illusions of aesthetic unity" (Lindsday 75). A pecularity of music that differentiates it from some other arts, though certainly not from sport events, such as football games, is that experience of music is subject to time. We listeners are compelled to rigorous and linear attention by the sheer unfolding equality of the work of music in time. Music has an "ineluctable temporal modality"(Lindsday 96). We must, if we would experience it, submit to "the tyranny of its forward logic or impulse" (Lindsday 96). However, although musical events are one time occasions, they can return to us in memory.

When the Saidian theory of contrapuntal reading is approached, for example, to Jane Austen's novels, her dominant feminine voice is also found to be threaded at places with her criticism of British imperial and colonial attitudes. In feminist writings of her time, the British patriarchy's domination of British women parallels the former's domination of the colonized. *Jane Eyre,* from this perspective turns out to be a text, the feminist vision of which remains also threaded with references to colonization.

III. Nexus between Masculinity and Colonialism: Feminist Encounter with High Victorianism

The question of identity is central issue in the novel *Jane Eyre*. The problem of identity in the novel triggers towards the identity crisis of the colonized because of the presence of the British colonizers. The articulation of feminist identify all too often repeats what the novelist characterizes as the quintessential gesture of colonialism-blindness to the epistemic violence that effaces the colonial subject and requires to occupy the space of the imperialist's self-consolidating Others. The novel as a text of feminism privileges the individualist female subject who, articulates herself in such a way that the '"native female' . . . is excluded from any share in this emerging norms" (Spivak 245). This position of the self-consolidating other clearly describes the space Bertha occupies in the novel. As Rochester's first wife, Bertha is the obstacle preventing Jane and Edward's ultimate happiness and like some strange wild animals, she blurs the frontier between human and animal and justifies the project of 'soul making' which is identified with the imperialist project. Bertha sacrifices her own identity so that Jane might find hers. So, *Jane Eyre* as a text of feminism implies that Bertha functions as a slave figure that reminds us the system of slavery. A note of diaspora also runs in these lines as Spivak writes:

> We must remind ourselves that it should not be possible, in principle, to read nineteenth-century British literature without remembering that imperialism, understood as England's social mission, was a crucial part of the cultural representation of England to the English. The role of literature in the production of cultural representation should not be ignored. (113)

Instead of the Invisible Man, however, there looms the Invisible Woman the character of Bertha Mason in Charlotte Bronte's novel Jane Eyre. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar have made the full leap to a feminist aesthetic about the invisibility. In *The Madwoman in the Attic*, they offer a more theoretical comparitivist method which defines a mode of imaginative expression uniquely female formed in response to literary traditions and social contexts which are undeniably male. As in *Jane Eyre* we can see Bertha Masson the mad hidden and confined in the attic of Thornfield and uses her as the pivotal figure in re-visioning as alternative literary tradition manifesting the common, female impulse to struggle so as to free herself from social and literary confinement through strategic redefinitions of self, art and society. Bertha, who not only imprisoned by Rochester within the privatestic cell, but also deprives her of any independent textual significance. The placement of Bertha within that genre of women's fantasies "in which maddened double functioned as social surrogates for docile selves" (Gilbert 9) irrevocably alienates her from culture - a denial of autonomy and subjectivity which they deplore when it oppresses Anglo-European women. Like the Invisible man, women of color learn that "I may not-see myself as others see me not" (Ellison 466).

The incident of the "Madwoman in the Attic" explores innumerable interpretations and symbolic readings. Bertha Mason represents the horror of Victorian marriage as well. Rochester claims to have imprisoned her because she is mad, but it is easy to imagine an opposite relation of cause and effect, in which years of enforced imprisonment and isolation have made her violently insane or, at least, increased her insanity. Thus, the mad woman in the attic could represent the confining and repressive aspects of Victorian wifehood, suggesting that the

lack of autonomy and freedom in marriage that suffocates women, threatening their mental and emotional health. Bertha's tearing of Jane's wedding veil could be seen as symbolizing her revolt against the institution of marriage Rochester marriage to Bertha represents the British Empire's cultural and economic exploitation of its colonial subjects. Briggs's letter states that Bertha's mother is a "creole" which could mean either that she is a person of European descent born in the colonies or that she is of black or mixed descent. In either case, Bertha might evoke British anxieties about having to deal with the other cultures under Britain's dominion, and Bertha's imprisonment might signify Britain's attempt to control and contain the influence of these subject cultures by metaphorically "locking them in the attic" (Gilbert 12). Bertha is that she is a double for Jane herself, the embodiment of Jane's repressed fear and anger, both in regard to her specific situation and in regard to oppression. For although Jane declares her love for Rochester, her dreams and apprehensions suggest that she also secretly fears being married to him perhaps even that she secretly wants to range against the imprisonment that marriage could become for her. Although Jane does not manifest this fear or rage, Bertha does. Thus, it is Bertha's existence that stops the wedding from going forth.

To understand the colonialism and its evocation of self and other, the west and the rest, the colonizer and the indigenous people, we must see the role of Rochester, Bertha and Jane in *Jane Eyre*. Rochester enacts the role of omnipotent western patriarchy, and Bertha, that of the native other suffering from the cultural deracination, and Jane, the Anglo European women is a social outsider in the novel who has been marginalized. Throughout the novel, Jane appears as a threat to the other characters. Either because she is an intruder, or because her ideas are

threatening, even as a child she is isolated from the social group: Eliza, John and Georgiana are now clustered round their mama in the drawing-room she dispenses from joining the group saying:

> she regretted to be under the necessity of keeping me at a distance, but that until she heard from Bessie, and could discover by her own observation that I was endeavouring in good earnest to acquire a more sociable and child-like disposition, a more attractive and sprightly manner, something lighter, franker, more natural as it were--she really must exclude me from privileges intended only for contented, happy little children." (1)

This scene is indicative of Jane's situation at Gateshead, and her otherness in relation to the Reeds remains unchanged throughout the novel. Even latter at her aunt's deathbed, Jane says of Mrs. Reed, "poor suffering women ! It was too late for her to make now the effort to change her habitual frame of mind: living, she had ever hated me -- dying, she must hate me still" (Bronte 242). Gateshead becomes representative of Jane's position outside the social order as a whole.

Except for those at Lowood and Marsh End, the other characters in *Jane Eyre* generally exclude Jane from their social spheres, and they do so in various ways. For example, John Reed says to Jane, "You have no business to take our books: You are a dependant, mama says; .... You ought to beg, and not live here with gentlemen's children like us, and eat the same meals we do, and wear clothes our mama's expense "(Bronte 11). He wants to separate Jane from himself by removing from her some of the outward signs of their similarity. Similarly Mrs. Reed also marginalizes Jane; Jane recalls, "Since my illness she [Mrs. Reed] had drawn a more marked line of separation then ever between me and her own

children; appointing me to a small closet to sleep in by myself, condemning me to take my meals alone, and pass all my time in the nursery while my cousins were constantly in the drawing-room" (Bronte 26). By separating Jane from her own children Mrs. Reed removes her from the Reed's social group, placing Jane instead among the servants. And when Jane falls ill during the red-room incident, Mrs. Reed sends for Mr. Lloyd, an apothecary, who was "sometimes called in by Mrs. Reed when the servants were ailing: for herself and the children she employed a physician" (Bronte 19). In this way, Mrs. Reed marks a clear distinction between her own children and Jane by lumping Jane with the servants. But the servants will not have Jane either; Miss Abbot says, "No, you are less than a servant, for you do nothing for your keep" (Bronte 12). So Jane is not allowed inside either community. Even outside Gateshead, Jane continues to exist as the other. Soon after she arrives at Lowood, Brocklehurst attempts to marginalize Jane from the society of the school; he places her on a stool and tells the inhabitants that Jane "is a little castaway: not a member of the true flock, but evidently an interloper and an alien "(Bronte 67). He then advises: "You must be on your guard against her; you must shun her example: if necessary, avoid her company, exclude her from your sports, and shut her out from your converse" (Bronte 67). By his choice of "interloper" and "alien" words Jane also used to describe Mrs. Reed's view of her, Brocklehurst tries to transform her into the other and then urges those of the school to reject Jane if they wish to remain members of the large social group.

Jane is shunned in a like manner when she arrives in Morton. Not only the inhabitants treat her as an outsider because she is not but also because she does not fit into any recognizable category. She begs food but is not a beggar. She

looks like a lady but has no money. When she offers to trade belongings for food, they rebuff her. When she seeks employment, they answer her evasively. When she seeks out the clergyman, he is unavailable. When she attempts to gain entrance to the Rivers home, Hunnah, both literally and symbolically, shuts the door on her. As a result, the isolation she experiences when she first arrives there is no more than simply a spiritual isolation; she is literally shut out from all aspects of life until St. John finally takes her into the Rivers home.

Even at Thornfield, by the very nature of her being a governess, she does not easily fit into established roles of either gentry or servants. As a governess, she is a dependent; yet she is better born and better bred then the other servants. Only Mrs. Fairfax is of the same social group, but their difference of age and interests make them merely superficial companions. As far as her relationship to the gentry is concerned, the way the Ingram party relegates Jane to the category of governesses also emphasizes Jane's place outside the social sphere at Thornfield. Blanche Ingram says of governesses, "I have just one word to say of the whole tribe: They are a nuisance" (Bronte 179). She then goes on to describe the Ingrams vicious treatment of them when they were children. In order for Jane to appear outside the community, the characters most actively exclude her, and among the various ways the characters transform Jane into the other, the labels and imagery with which they describe her are the most subtle, poignant, and effective. These labels consistently depict Jane as non-human, others call her "angel," "Cat," "Sprite," thing," "rat," and "fairy" -- to name just a few. In fact, such terms appear nearly a hundred times in the novel, and given their sheer frequency alone, they are more than merely incidental.

Early in the novel, characters describe Jane almost exclusively with derogatory labels. And by so doing, they marginalize Jane. When the Reeds call her an "imp" or a "rat," they both punish her by the insult a psychologically isolate her from their family. These terms also reinforce for the Reeds the goodness of their family by excluding on "imp" or "rat" from their community. Jane's otherness at Gateshead culminates in the red - room incident. Immediately after they call her "rat and " mad cat," they trust Jane into the red - room, a tomb-like room they had left undisturbed since Mrs. Reed's death. This symbolic interment, and the labels they use on Jane represent the physical and spiritual solitary confinement of which the Reeds relegate her. Jane's transformation into the Other is important for the Reeds, because if they can think of Jane as an animal or creature, then they can treat her as non-family (Bronte 240). A retrospective Jane understands her position; she says she was "an interloper not of her (Mrs. Reed's) race, and unconnected with her" (Bronte 16). During her feverish, deathbed ravings, Mrs. Reed reveals her motivation in excluding Jane from their community: such a burden to be left on my hands and so much annoyance as she caused me, daily and hourly, with her incomprehensible disposition, and her sudden fits of temper, and her continual, unnatural watching of one's movements:

> I declare she talked to me once like something mad, or like a fiend -- no child ever spoke or looked as she did: I was glad to get her away from the house . . . I hated it [Jane] the first time I set eyes on it -- a sickly, whining, pining thing ! It would wail in its cradle all night long-- not screaming heartily like any other child, but whimpering and moaning. Reed pitied it; and he used to nurse it

> and notice it as if it had been his own: more, indeed, than he ever noticed his own at that age. (Bronte 233)

Here, Mrs. Reed excludes Jane not only from her own family, but also from the human family as well. In this brief passage, she calls Jane "unnatural," "fiend," "thing," "beggar," "creature," and finally "It," thus emphasizing her relationship to Jane. Equally clear is the reason for Mrs. Reed's attitude: Jane represents a threat to her aunt's family. When Mrs. Reed says her husband used to "notice it [Jane] as if it had been his own: more indeed, then he ever noticed his own at that age" (Bronte 220), she expresses the unspoken concern that Jane is usurping the place of her own children. Mrs. Reed's natural protective instinct toward her children takes over, and she attempts to rid the family of Jane's ties to it. Her attitude toward Jane also sheds light on Mrs. Reed's withholding of Jane Eyre's letter. She suggests the act out of vengeance, but she also keeps Jane from joining her class through Jane's becoming a financial equal; as long as Jane's remains financially dependent she remains both outside the Reed's family and outside their social circle.

Separating the Others from society is perhaps the oldest and must basic of acts against those we regard as enemies. By transforming the enemy into something other than human in our minds, we can treat them others than humanely -- thereby avoiding guilt and possible retribution. Rene Girard, in speaking of scapegoats says:

> All our sacrificial victims, whether chosen from one of the human categories . . . or, a fortiori, from the animal realm, are invariably distinguishable from the nonsacrificeable beings by one essential characteristics: between these victims and the community a crucial

> social link is missing, so they can be exposed to violence without fear of reprisal. Their death does not automatically entail an act of vengeance. (3)

Of course, Jane functions less as a scapegoat at Gateshead then she does as the Other, but the underlying principle is the same. By transforming Jane into the other -- an animal, creature, or non entity -- her aunt avoids the guilt of crimes against her family and social group. Mrs. Reed diverts Jane of human, family, or social ties that could claim retribution. (Bronte 4). Consequently, Mrs. Reed has no fear of reprisal from conscience or from other people and in fact can view herself and her behaviour positively, in that she removes a threat of her family and society.

Besides the possibility of Jane's usurping her own children's place, Jane's fiery temper and strength also threaten Mrs. Reed. These characteristics challenge Mrs. Reed's authority as head of the family and as a member of the colonizer; they also threaten to influence the Reed children. In addition, Jane exposes the Reed's selfishness and uncharitability. This becomes particularly important, because Reed represents the ruling class as a whole. As a result, although Jane's threat as a child is primarily limited to the Reed's on a large scale her challenge to their authority also implies a challenge to the society and class they represent. This become clear as Jane grows and continues to challenge cultural norms concerning the role of women and class in society. Brocklehurst recognizes this threat to the Reed's and to society and says, to those at Lowood, "at last her excellent patroness [Mrs. Reed] was obliged to separate her [Jane] from her own young ones, fearful lest her vicious example should contaminate

their purity" (Bronte 67). with Jane relinquish "all interference in Jane's affairs" (Bronte 90).

Jane marginalizes herself sometimes beside being marginalized by the others which is potentially tragic. The most prominent example is when she looks into the mirror in the red room and thinks:

> The strange little figure there gazing at me, with a white face and arms speaking the gloom, and glittering eyes of fears moving where all else was still, had the effect of a real spirit: I thought it like one of tiny phantoms, half fairy, half imp, Bessie's evening stories, represented as coming out of lone, ferny dells in moors". (Bronte 14)

The lines couple the loneliness and isolation of Jane with the outwardly, non-human description of her image (appropriate for the red-room). Her visualization is representative of her spiritual situation. For Jane, because of her age and child-like impressionability along with the constant labeling by the Reeds, she becomes in her own mind as well a "phantom" or "imp". She sees herself moving through Gateshead either ignored or attacked and at all points an outsider . . . ultimately even to herself. Jane aligns herself with the non-human world, both as punishment and as explanation for her unusual belief that one of Rochester's class could consider Jane worthy of notice. And soon after arriving in Morton, Jane refers to her broken heart as being "impotent as a bird with both wings broken" (Bronte 328). At this time when Jane feels most isolated from those around her, most outside every social community.

The role then of negative labels is plain enough in their transforming Jane into a social outsider, but there are just as many positive terms describing Jane.

For example, among other things, she is called "angel," "fairy," "dove," and "genii." But regardless of whether the labels are positive or negative, their function is the same: that is, they marginalize Jane from the community, because in the minds of those who label her, she must be transformed into something other than human.

Rochester uses the majority of these eulogistic terms, and he also, like so many others, wishes to marginalize Jane. Even though he loves Jane, he clearly believes in the traditional role of women in the nineteenth century social order, and part of this view is the idea of women as idol. In order to worship Jane, however, he must first make her other than mere mortal. By calling her "angel" and "fairy," he separates her from other people and lifts her onto a pedestal. Jane fully understands the implications of this position and consistently rejects Rochester's attempts to turn her into what she is not. For example, when Rochester calls Jane and angle, she says, "I am not an angel" (Bronte 262); elsewhere she says, "Don't address me as if I were a beauty: I am your plain, "Quakerish governess" (Bronte 261). And other Rochester threatens to dress Jane in fine clothes and jewels, she says, "and then you won't know me, sir; any I shall not be your Jane Eyre and longer, but an ape in a harlequin's jacket, -- a jay in borrowed plumes" (Bronte 26). Jane's use here of "ape," "harlequin," and "jay" shows she recognizes that to change her as Rochester wishes would transform her into something she is not. And Jane wishes to be neither sub-human or super-human.

Similarly, Rochester uses non-human terms for Jane because she is an enigma to him, as she is for St. John later and for society in general. Some are threatened by this; others are merely puzzled. Those at Gateshead (except Bessie)

consistently find Jane different from most children. Abbot says, "I never saw a girl of her age with so much cover" (Bronte 12), and Mrs. Reeds says, "There is something truly forbidding in a child taking up her elders in that manner" (Bronte 7). At Gateshead, Jane's difference is threatening. However, others merely see Jane as unusual. Bessie says to Jane, "you are a strange child . . . a little roving, solitary thing . . . you're such a queer, frightened, shy little thing "(Bronte 39). St. John says to her, "you are original" (Bronte 379). And Rochester implies the same, when he says to her, "Any others Woman would have been melted to marrow at hearing such stanzas crooned in her praise" (p. 276). Rochester often cannot understand Jane's ideas or actions and if she becomes for him other than mortal, then he need not consider the implications of her views. yet Jane simply wants to be thought of as a normal human being. And this attitude is precisely the problem, in that her assertion of equality threatens to take her out of the nineteenth century feminine role of subservience in a male dominated world.

To twentieth century readers the threatening character of the novel is less apparent. But dearly such was not true for many of Bronte's time. Jane claims equal status with the Ingrams, based not on birth or wealth but rather on character, she rejects the usual criteria for evaluating class. In fact, at one point, she even claims a superiority to Blanche: "Miss Ingram was a mark beneath jealousy: she was too inferior to excite the feeling" (Bronte 187). And when Jane thinks Rochester "is not of their (the Ingrams) kind. I believe he is of mine; -- I am sure he is . . . though rank and wealth sever us widely, I have something in my brain and heart, in my blood and nerves, that assimilates me mentally to him" (Bronte 177), she again asserts her equality based on character not birth, and rejects the usual criteria for determining a mate. Similarly, when Jane says, "women feel just

as men feel; they need exercise for their faculties, and a field for their efforts as much as their brothers do; they suffer from too rigid a restraint, too absolute a stagnation, precisely as men would suffer" (Bronte 110), she questions the traditional roles of women, again asserting an equality based on character, not birth. In each instance, she threatens established social norms. And despite the fact that Jane's views ostensibly only affect her own life, she carries the seeds of change, and the implied changes represented by Jane's actions are unusually troubling to those of her time. Jane's strength of character and will along with her refusal robe forced into a submissive position seem very masculine. Rochester says, "Jane, be still; don't struggle so, like a wild, frantic bird that is rending its own plumage in its desperation". Jane replies, "I am no bird; and no net ensares me: I am a free human being with an independent will; which I now exert to leave you" (Bronte 256).

Rochester tries to type Jane as bird, but she rejects this label and insists on human status. He likes Jane's fiery strength, but for him Jane is a "bird" or a "fairy" at those times. If he were to think of her as a women asserting her independence, then his position as sole master would be threatened. consequently, even though Rochester's motives in marginalizing Jane are not malicious (as are the Reed's and the Ingrams), as is true for many of the character in the novel, Rochester can deal more easily with Jane if he can view her as other than normal.

Rochester willingness to engage in bigamy, and his desire to marry a woman so far below his social standing all show that Rochester rejects many of the social conventions of his day, and his willingness to move outside the social mores explains why his relationship with Jane becomes possible. One of the effects of Rochester's flouting social customs and Jane's marginalization is the

curious influence it has on the rapport between them. As Rochester becomes more and more interested in developing a romance with Jane, he begins more and more to use terms of animal and supernatural imagery to describe himself. He calls himself "devil" (Bronte 203), "ogre" (Bronte 273), "dog" (Bronte 451), among other things. And since Rochester has already come to view Jane as a "bird" and "Fairy", his self - labeling moves him into the non-human world inhabited by Jane and thus allows in his mind for the progression of their relationship, because Jane too picks up this labeling: she says Rochester's hair is "raven black", a "Caged eagle" (Bronte 436), so that finally, as a consequence of this labeling, they begin to inhabit the same world. Once their engagement occurs, Rochester says, "Wherever I sampled my hoof, your sylphs' foot shall step also" (Bronte 262). And when Jane returns to him, she says, "you talk of my being a fairy; but I am sure, you are more like a brownie" (Bronte 443). Later, she continues this idea when she says that Rochester is like "a royal eagle, chained to a perch .. . . forced to entreat a sparrow to become its purveyor "(Bronte 444). At this point in the novel, they realize they are different, and they both become inhabitants of the non-human world, a world where their relationship finally comes to fruition.

Similar interpretation of the relationship between Jane and Bertha emerges. Through the processes of cinemation suture, we glimpse a critical strategy more promising than Althusserian interpellation not only for reading Bronte's complex women's text but also for developing a womenist politics of reading. Unlike interpellation, suture articulates itself in relation to culturally imposed differences between the positions of men and women:

> As a process, a practice of signification, suture is an ideological operation with a particular function in relation to paternal ideology

> in that out of a system of differences it establishes a position in relation to the phallus. In so doing it places the spectator in relation to the position .. . . It is the imaginary unity, the sutured coherence, the imaginary sense of identity set up by the classic film which must be challenged by a feminist film practice to achieve a different constitution of the subject in relation to ideology". (Johnston 323)

If we imagine that Jane's "I" has become the "eye" of a camera, her characterization as an individualist self becomes extremely problematic.

> I now stood in the empty hall; before me was the breakfast - room door, and I stopped, intimidated and trembling: what a miserable little poltroon had fear, engendered of unjust punishment, made of me in those days ! I feared to return to the nursery, and feared to go forward to the parlour; ten minutes I stood in agitated hesitation; the vehement ringing of the breakfast - room bell decide me; I must enter. "Who could want me?" I asked inwardly, as with both hands I turned the stiff door - handle which, for a second or two, resisted my efforts. "What should I see besides Aunt Reed in the apartment ? - a man or a women ?" The handle turned, the door unclosed, and passing through and curtseying low, I looked up at - a black pillar ! such, at least, appeared to me, at first sight, the straight, narrow, sable clad shape standing erect on the rug; the grim face at the top was like a carved mask, placed above the shaft by way of capital ….
>
> "your name, little girl?"
>
> "Jane Eyre, sir."

> In uttering these words I looked up: he seemed to me a tall gentleman, but then I was very little; his features were large, and they and all the lines of his frame were equally harsh and prim. (p 31)

That Jane does not function as the individualist locus of her own meaning and activity emerges from her indeterminate stance in this passage. She is afraid to return to the nursery. Yet also afraid to enter the parlor; her only action is an "agitated hesitancy" which is may ways recalls the interpretive ambiguity of Pomba Gira. In fact, what "decided her, i.e., provides the resolution to Jane's hesitation, originates externally rather than internally in the ringing of the breakfast - room bell. In contrast to the patriarchal I/eye who sees events as if in control of them, Jane's I/eye is powerless, passive, and stripped of its won self - determination.

At this point, the text makes a telling "cut" to the next portion, whose most extraordinary aspect is its framing of Brocklehurst in explicitly phallic terms: the black pillar standing erect, whose grim face ejaculates the words (sperm) which engender "legitimate" meaning (biological and ideological patronymy). The significance of this context is understood by the patriarchal conception of the phallus as whole, unitary and simple, and its corresponding perception of the vagina a chaotic and fragmented, or in filmic terms, the negative inverse of the masculine frame. The shot angle of Jane's and consequently of the reader's-eye in this sequence is extremely revealing, for in contrast to high - angle shots which diminish the importance of the subject, low - angle shots emphasize his power. Jane's low-angle focus on Brocklehurst articulates his power as both the subject of her discourse and the masculine subject whose phallic presence implies her own

castrated absence. Jane herself corroborates this pejorative positioning of women by describing how Mr. Brocklehurst, "bending from the perpendicular . . . installed his person in the arm - chair." Just as Brocklehurst installs his person in Mrs. Reed's armchair, he textually installs a phallic personhood over against the castrated women hood of Jane. The cut described above "edits" the thoughts and association of the reader into a similar signifying ensemble in which Jane's undecidability becomes a signifier of Brocklehurst as phallus becomes the signified of Jane's undecidability. The ideological power of suture lies precisely in this editorial ability to reveal absence of the castrated female in order to stitch over even more closely her temptation "to skid off course, out of control, to prefer castration to false plenitude" (Silverman 232). As a strategy of reading, Jane as the feminist individualist-an autonomous and fixed entity-and foregrounds her position as a "Subject" the product of signifying activities which are both culturally specific and generally unconscious.

Then, the role between Jane and Brocklehurst also inscribes a subversive ambivalence, for it grants the reader an initial view of Jane and then a reverse view of Brocklehurst from Jane's perspective. Jane initially perceives Brocklehurst from the low angle perspective of Melanie, and then Jane from the high - angle perspective of Brocklehurst, "what a face he had . . . what a great nose ! and what a mouth ! and what large prominent teeth !" (Bronte 32). Although Jane ultimately escapes the wolfish phallus of patriarchy, suture enables a resistant reading of Bronte's text by forcing to live in the unsetting contradictions of Jane's subjectivity.

The relationship between Jane and Rochester expands the context of this textual war by demonstrating its particular tactics of in surgency. Rochester

attempts to turn Jane into his own version of the female fetish seems irrefutable from his premarital attempts to see her "glittering like a parterre" with jewels, satins and silks. "I will make the world acknowledge you a beauty, too,' he went on, white I [Jane] really become uneasy at the strain he had adopted" (Bronte 261). Jane vehemently resists Rochester's feteshization by declaring': "I had rather be a thing than an angle" (Bronte 264) a statement framed by an earlier decription of herself as a "heterogenous thing . . . a useless thing, incapable of serving their interest or adding to their pleasure " (Bronte 16). Even on the most basic visual level, Jane's inability to satisfy the pleasure of the look challenges the illusion of plenitude: small, dark and plain, a "heterogenous thing," (Bronte 115) she cannot and will not focus the determining masculine gaze, whether of Rochester of Brocklehurst of the viewing subject.

The Madwomen in the Thornfield figures as centrally in the concealing processes of suture as she does in the address of interpellation, for the fire which Bertha sets severely impairs the scope of Rochester's determining masculine gaze and lays bare the extent of her own woundedness her madness, imprisonment, and sexual rejection. However, the blindness which Rochester suffers as a result of Bertha's action paradoxically reverses the illusion of unity produced by suture, for rather than concealing subjectivity, it instead prevents Rochester from the pleasure of "seeing" Jane, or any women for the matter, as a fetishized object. "'My seared vision ! My crippled strength !, he murmured regretfully" (Bronte 449). Only when Rochester's inability to recognize others metamorphoses into a recognition of his own otherness does a marriage with Jane become possible: "It was mournful indeed, to witness the subjugation of that vigorous spirit …. He sat in his chair . . . the lines of now habitual sadness marking his strong features"

(Bronte 444). Jane's narrative presence once again edits our sensibilities by directing them to the lines of the narrative frame. Unlike the "harsh" lines which Brocklehust installed in the phallic chair of an imaginary omnipotence, Rochester's lines frame his position through partial vision and subjected impotence. The wounded "affirmatives" of Rochester and Jane, than, and not the triumph of their imperialist and unitary identies, allow Jane to declare in that all too familiar line: "Reader, I married him" (Bronte 447).

The "native" Berth is scarified "as an insane animal for her sister's consolidating through marriage" (Bronte 251), Jane affirms that she and Bertha share a subject position marginalized through difference:

> but how could Mrs. Reed really like an interloper, not of her race, and unconnected with her, after her husband's death, by any tie ? It must have been most irksome to find herself bound by a hard - wrung pledge to stand in the stead of a parent to a strange child she could not love and to see an uncongenial alien permanently intruded on her own family group." (Bronte 16)

This condemnation of herself as "an uncongenial alien" who is not of Mrs. Reed's "race" attests to Jane's self difference rather than Self-uniqueness, for as Henry Louis Gates remarks in "writing 'Race' and the Difference It makes, "race" has become a trope of ultimate and irreducible difference in its seemingly arbitrary articulation of the distance between cultures, linguistic groups, or adherents of particular belief systems (Bronte 5). Jane's discourse clearly embodies this arbitrariness, since congenitally she and Mrs. Reed belong to the same "racial" pool - that of the white English female. Thus, the trope of "race" not only evokes

Jane's subjection in, yet resistance to patriarchy, but also demands that one read Jane and Bertha as oppressed rather that opposed sisters.

The invisible woman Bertha Mason turns to visibility, especially since her suicide in *Jane Eyre* seems to cast her lot with all the other of our culture's politically "disappeared". Bertha must act out the transformation of her "self" into the other, set fire to the house and kill herself so that Jane might become the feminist individualist heronic of British fiction. She repeats her conflation of masculine and feminine subject position by comparing the function of Bertha's death to sati, the Hindu ritual of burning widows alive on the funeral pyres of heir husbands. Bertha the good wife - scarifies herself for the good of her husband - the white male. The attempt to expand the frontiers of the politics of reading not only falls short in its portrayal of the particular oppression of women, but also, by characterizing Bertha only as a victim fails to detect a far more subversive politics embedded within her violent act.

At first glance, it seems difficult to posit any direct meaning for Bertha's suicide since we only hear of it as minor incident, but after analysing the text from the theory of contrapuntal reading by Said - Bertha's death seems independent reality of the women from the colonies. However, the fact that Bertha commits rather than attempts suicide moves her into a very different position from the one just described; women who succeed at taking their won lives outwit and reject their "feminine" role at the only price possible: their deaths. We do not know what Bertha shouted at Rochester before she leaped from Thornfield's rood, but we could conjecture that her insistence upon the violent physical destruction of both Thornfield and herself constitutes an act of resistance not only to her status as a women in a patriarchal culture but also as a colonized

object. Bertha's self - imposed death tragically asserts resistance rather than defeat and provides a presence which encounters the invisibility imposed upon her-she dies on the pyre of feminist individualism. Like plain Jane's heterogeneity, Bertha's death maims the wholeness of the text with a visible wound which we can neither suture over nor erase within the white female palimpest.

To sum up, when the Saidian theory of contrapuntal reading is approached to charlotte Bronte's novel *Jane Eyre*, the dominant feminine voice is found to be threaded by British Imperial and Colonial attitude. The British patriarchy's domination to the British women therefore parallels the formers domination of the colonized.

IV. Conclusion

The text of feminist theory and those of post-colonial concurs on many aspects of the theory of identity of difference and of the interpellation of the subject by a dominant discourse. The experience of women in patriarchy and those of colonized subjects can be paralleled in a number of respects such as representation, identity, gender, economic and so on. Feminism, like post-colonialism, has often been concerned with the ways and extent to which representation and language are crucial to identity formation and to the construction of subjectivity. However, both feminists and colonized people, like other subordinate groups, have also used appropriation to subvert and adopt dominant language and signifying practices.

Similarly, *Jane Eyre* has been read from the perspective of the colonized group that brings to light the hidden colonial history that permeates nineteenth century European literary texts, and also to understand the colonialism and its evocation of self and Other, the colonizer and the indigenous people. Rochester in the novel enacts the role of omnipotent western patriarchy who presents himself as the colonizer. And Bertha, that of the native Other suffers from cultural deracination. Bertha's imprisonment might signify Britain's attempt to control and contain the influence of these subject cultures by metaphorically locking her in the Attic. And Jane the Anglo- European women constitute the social outsiders in the novel and have been marginalized.

During Bronte's time, women's conditions were pitiable. They were neglected mentally, economically and physically by society as inferior being. Their involvement outside was not allowed. The society wanted to keep women as an object to entertain and please male. For instance, Jane the central character

is shunned in a like manner. She becomes invisible due to the male dominated social structure. During her childhood Eliza, John and Georgiana were clustered round their mama (Mrs. Reed) in the drawing-room but she had dispensed from joining the group saying she should be kept at a distance. At Lowood and Marsh End she is excluded from their social spheres, Rochester uses non-human terms for Jane to marginalize her. He often cannot understand Jane's ideas or actions and if she becomes for him other than mortal. Bertha the "native" on the other hand is imprisoned at Rochester's house. Because of enforced imprisonment and isolation she becomes insane. She represents the confining and repressive aspects of Victorian Wifehood, suggesting that the lack of autonomy and freedom in marriage suffocates women, threatening their mental and emotional health. Rochester marriage to Bertha represents the British Empire's cultural and economic exploitation of its colonial subjects. In either case, Bertha might have evoked British anxieties above having to heal with the other cultures under Britain's dominion, and Bertha's imprisonment might signify Britain's attempt to control and contain the influence of these subject cultures.

Thus, Jane the central character is marginalized due to the male dominated structure. Because of her marginalization, the identity as an influential figure of the society is undermined. Bertha on the other hand is exploited by the presence of the colonizer. So the colonizers exploitation and suppression to the native parallels to the exploitation of the women in Britain.

Works Cited

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: OUP, 1995.

Bossche, Vanden. "Ideology Agency Class and the Novel." *Critical Inquiry* 13.1 (2005): 46-66.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Let's Post-Post-Post 'Victorientalism': A Response to Erin O'Connor." *Victorian Studies* 46.1 (Autumn 2003): 98-110.

Bronte, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. New Delhi: UBS Publishers, 2005.

Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. New York: Martin and Warbury, 1960.

Donaldson, Elizabeth J. "The Corpus of the Madwoman: Toward a Feminist Disability Studies Theory of Embodiment and Mental Illness." *NWSA Journal* 14.3 (Fall 2002): 99-120.

Flint, Kate. "Revisiting A literature of Their own." *Journal of Victorian Culture* 10.2 (Winter 2005): 289-96.

Forster, E.M.. *A Passage to India*. New York: Penguin, 1979.

Gandhi, Leela. *Post-Colonial Theory*. New York: Columbia University, 1998.

Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.

Jones, William "Victorian Age." Delhi: A.I.T.B.S Publisher, 2002.

Lawrence, James. *The Rise and Fall of the British Empires.* New York: Callier Books, 1998.

Mortimer, Mildren. "Edward Said and Assia Djebar: A Contrapuntal Reading." *Research in African Study* 36.3 (Fall 2005): 53-67.

Parker, Micheal. *Post Colonial Literature*. London: Mc Milan, 1995.

Peters, John G. "Inside and Outside: Jane Eyre and Marginalization Through Labeling." *Studies in the Novel* 28.1 (1998) 272-94.

Restuccia, Frances L. "Untying the Mother Tongue: Female Difference in Virginia Woolf's A Room of One's Own." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 4.2 (Autumn 1985): 253-64.

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

_ _ _. *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage, 1994.

Searle, Alison. "An Idolatrous Imagination" London: Queen Mary, 2006.

Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to contemporary Literary Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: Harvester Wheatshef, 1989.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest.* New York: CU, 2001.

Spivak, Gayatri C.. "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *Critical Inquiry 12* (1985): 242-61.

Waters, Lindsday. "In Response Begins Responsibility: Music and Emotion." *Boundary* 25.2 (Summer 1998): 95-126.

Woolf, Virginia. "A Room of One's Own.*" Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Florida: HBJC, 1992:272-80.