

I. Introduction: Cultural Dualism

This research is a critically discussion of cultural dualism in Soyinka's *Jero's Metamorphosis* that explores the characters tension between native consciousness and Christianity in the light of how they are located in the in-between location. The conflicts representation of the native culture and Christian tradition is the central focus of the study. Jero' cultural dualism neither can assimilate himself to both cultures at the same time nor can he ignore both or take one and shun the other because he does not know whether he is right or not for being Christian: "You are sure it is not wrong? (*Jero's Metamorphosis* 177). Neither the native nor the Christianities consciousness seems to guide Jero but his consciousness moves towards the inbetween spaces which incorporate the entities of two different elements that represents Bhabha's concept of inbetween space as Jero says; "we are on the threshold of bringing the highest and the mightiest under our spiritual guidance" (203). As a result, postcolonial people are always at the crossroads of two or more culture and tradition.

Wole Soyinka (1934), often regarded as a universal man: poet, playwright, novelist, critic lecturer, teacher, actor, translator, politician, and publisher, is the first African to win the Nobel Prize in literature who has established himself as one of the most compelling literary forces in the continent. Most of his plays offered a critique of pre-colonial history while diminishing the cultural significance of the colonial period; "Many of the themes of Soyinka's later plays are present in this complex work: the notion of the three parallel and interlocking worlds of the past, the present and the future . . . the need for sacrifice; the role of the artist in society" (Banham 1014). Likewise, Jacobus states; "Soyinka's drama has been an investigation of the political, religious, and

other forces in Nigerian culture” (1175). Hence, these stereotypes, Said tells us, confirm the necessity and desirability of colonial government by endlessly confirming the positional superiority of the west over the positional inferiority of East (Gandhi 77). Hence, inbetween location is necessary to understand the colonial dominance on the colonized people.

This cross road in Bhabha’s language is “in between space” which means neither the one nor the other but something else beside, inbetween (219). Likewise, Soyinka also views about the Jero's identity in between cultural differences: "He will negotiate for the other side" (207). Soyinka advocates the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature and this space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures. Soyinka in his book *Myth, Literature and the African World* explains that the Yoruba myth and religion is also influenced by the Greek as well as western traditions. He further considers about the Greek and the Yoruba religion and finds parallels between them. He says: "That Greek religion shows persuasive parallels with, to stick to our example, the Yoruba" (14). Soyinka has his roots in the Yoruba people’s myths, sites, and cultural patterns, and he has adapted a number of classic plays to suit the African context. Beuson and Conolly argue that Soyinka exploits the European traditions in Nigerian context. They say; “Soyinka access through the Yoruba language and dance” (1528). By disestablishing the established boundaries of singularity and plurality it sets" the limits of any claim to a singular or autonomous sign of difference –be it class, gender or race" (219). Hybrid space is also an in between space, which lies between past and the present. in Bhaba's words, it gives rise to " an interstitial future "that " emerges in between the claims of the past and the needs of the present" (219). The cultural connection itself is apparent in the

lives of people. Jero also implies the fact that fully expressed identity is not possible in such situation. His experience is seen as the experience of a colonized man. His achievements are eternal colonial concepts that are protected in ambivalence situation. He is good at creating the identity, but unable to maintain. He adopts European practices because of ambivalent mentality.

Considering Bhaba's postulation it can be argued that discourses on hybridity represent not only the post colonial contest against the notions of fixity. It is a space of contest because it provides the writers (post-colonial) a new situation and reality to write back the colonists. It is a space of negotiation because the people of postcolonial world have to negotiate to adjust in the postcolonial mosaic culture. Since most of the postcolonial cultures bear the legacy of hybridity, it is the fundamental reality of the space and its inhabitants. Bhabha describes the inbetween position of hybrid existence as a third space which emerges between the traits of two mixed cultures. Soyinka provides an interesting look to acknowledge the recent expressions of inbetween space and the postcolonial world. Hybridity suffers Soyinka like his character Jero: "as a child he became increasingly aware of the pull between African tradition and Western modernization" (Brains 2). Soyinka and his characters consciousness could be called the twilight consciousness because of its affinity with hybrid-like dual positions and its cultural manifestations epitomize the post-colonial claims of identification that is characterized by the asymmetrical relation of power, incomprehension, suffering and pain; "enforcing the cultural centrality of its historical homeland, the language has proved to be a generous and accommodative traveler" (Boehmer 210).

Third place offers moments of wonder and revelation, mutual understanding and new wisdom where people historically and geographically separated come into contact with each other and establish relation, usually involving conditions of coercion, racial inequality, and intractable conflict. Such situations is often felt when the cultures are cut across the race and ethnicity and intersect the frontiers, and when people have been dispersed forever or certain time from their roots; “where groups can constitute themselves as horizontal, homogeneous, sovereign communities with high degree of trust, hared understandings temporary protection form legacies of oppression” (Pratt 71). Such people often show a strong relation with their places of origin and their practice. In other words, they stand upon the poised traditions, the traces of particular cultural, traditions, languages and histories by which they were already shaped. And this claim finds its theoretical base in the discourse of "in-between space" especially that of Homik K. Bhaba. This space, which Bhaba call the "Third space", is the space of contestation and negation. This space often is highly asymmetrical relation of domination and subordination- like colonialism, slavery perspective emphasizes how their relations to each other constitute in subjects.

When a culture gets hybridized it turns to be a contact zone as well as a space in-between two cultures. In this sense the inbetween spaces and the hybrid cultures of the postcolonial world are the realities of the space. Thus these spaces are both the signifier and the signified for the postcolonial writers. Neither can he assimilate these two cultures at the same time nor can he ignore one and take the side of another. Hence, the cultural dualism becomes unresolved tension for postcolonial people; “both distance and engagement, both recognition of inalienable otherness and genuine care for difference”

where identity remains open to “loose strands and unparsed possibilities in oneself” (Beuson and Connolly 160-61). In such situation, the feeling of dislocation and alienation necessarily haunts colonized people, therefore, they try to adopt the newly emerging identities, but it never gives them the sense of unity 'within' rather it creates the sense of ambivalence. Soyinka by bringing into contact of the people's belonging to two different cultures has shown a tension between colonized mind and inner desire that creates the situation of ambivalence because Bhabha says; “the master discourse was interrogated by the natives in their own accents, produces as autonomous position for the colonial within the confines of the hegemonic discourse” (Qtd in Parry 22). Bhabha’s study of the effects of colonial representation was central to the cultural interaction with colonial societies in literary circle. This was part of attempt to signify the political, linguistic and cultural experience of societies that were former European colonies and concerned to focus on the material effects of the historical condition of colonialism.

Culture gives the individual their identity and shapes the human behavior that helps people to guide their action. The traces of asymmetry in culture, place and descent raises the question of the terms of the mixture, the condition of mixing and *mélange*. At the same time it’s important to note the ways in which hegemony is not merely reproduce but refigured in the process of hybridization. People cannot assimilate into newly changed culture that brings identity crisis in the lives of individuals; "cultural with its superior position has the power to authorize, to dominate, to legitimate, denote, interdict and validate" (Said 9). Ambivalence treats the relation among colonizer and colonized self and other, native and the non-native in terms of co-presence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within asymmetrical relation of power that is

inscribed and reproduced within hybridity. The legacy of subordination is placed for healing and mutual recognition in which to construct shared understandings, knowledge, and claims on the world that they can bring in to the in-between location. The superiority of new culture dominates individuals as they feel inferiority of their culture in new culture.

Through a host of uprooted and alienated characters from their original culture, Soyinka observes the predicaments of these outsiders in an alien culture. Furthermore, Soyinka uses Yoruba songs translated into English and adopts old rituals and dances to produce particular dramatic effects on the modern stage that criticize violence and corruption in the society, for example, “*The Lion and the Jewel* offers a comic view of Nigerian attitudes towards European values left over from the colonial period” (Jacobus 1175). The world has become a global village and experience has become a common form of experience of migration or exile, generating fissured identities and hybridities alongside problems of dislocation and dispossession and a larger problem of a lost center and someone nurtured in one culture is placed in another so she/he may face cultural dislocation and ambivalence and the resultant reactions may be anger, frustration, fear, curiosity, fascination, repulsion, hatred or confusion.

In Africa, the shift from the limited concerns of colonizer-colonized exemplified in Prospero-caliban and Columbus and Cannibalism complex to a more diversified and complicated idiom relevant to the twentieth century is evident. Deprived of a secure sense of personal identity like Jero, his protagonists are emotionally too incapacitated to encounter the hazards of social-life, ethnic and spiritual. Their emotional sterility is the cause and consequence of their failure to achieve an authentic location. However, the

idea of 'contact zone' denies the homogeneous, sovereign 'community' embodying values like equality, fraternity and liberty, which the societies profess but systematically fail to realize; "a process of interpretation and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated by them in a common cultural life" (Dallmayr 14).

Soyinka treats the cross-cultural relationship between the colonizers and the colonized and satirizes colonial African regimes by verbal inventiveness; "*A Dance of the Forests* was written to celebrate Nigerian independence, but it also alerted people to Nigeria's past violence and warned against its return" (Jacobus 1175). People from different culture and race try to develop a bond of mutual understanding on a common cultural ground despite difference. At times they preserve their heterogeneity but their sole concern is to develop a reciprocal relation in order to share a common cultural way of life. Identity becomes an issue; the insiders undergo different sets of political and social crisis and are uprooted by calamities of a different nature than the foreigner or outsider since whatever the nature of the problems, the loss of personal identity, the sense of homelessness and the fear of insecurity are alike for postcolonial people and their suffering comes from isolation, randomness and meaninglessness in the way of living.

Jero's Metamorphosis treats the theme of ambivalent cultural response depicting two cultures. The norms, values and traditions of African society are contrasted to the confronting the cultures of the colonizers. Soyinka is a versatile and the most politically involved of Anglophone African writers. Moreover, most of his plays are based on the beliefs of his Yoruba background; "*The Swamp Dwellers* is a powerful play condemning

African superstition” (Jacobus 1175). In connection with the concept of the co-existence of the three worlds; the dead, the living and the unborn, Soyinka emphasizes the importance of new moral consciousness. Apart from exhibiting a distinct and deep awareness of the social, economic and cultural realities around him, Soyinka also succeeds in effectively assimilating and transmuting these realities and experiences into his writing. Multiplicity of thematic patterns and poly-angular perspectives in his writing clearly bring forth the multicultural ethos that forms the basis of his writing. The writers articulate important questions in their works regarding tradition versus modernity, dwindling of the conventional value system, marital discords, collapse of the joint family system, social and economical disparities, ambivalent cultural responses to the impact of the west etc.

Soyinka’s character Jero is a self-centered and introverted whose relationship with two cultures creates hybrid recognition that projects the conflict between traditional values and the lure of the western materialistic prosperity. In such situation fascination with the country is soon disillusioned. He remains unhappy because he tries to resist Christian culture instead of being absorbed by it. In addition, Soyinka's political sympathies led to a term in prison where he was placed in solitary confinement. He continued his writing out of prison to give hope to his political allies; “Soyinka’s play *Death and the King’s Horseman* reworks a moment in Nigeria’s colonial past from inside the Yoruba metaphysic” (Jacobus 1175). Furthermore, the unfold theme of separation and union, fission and fusion, hatred and love, acceptance and negation the phenomenon of hybridity and ambivalence. The ideal of integration is the quest of an individual to come to terms with his/her universe-a process of cultural mediation. The vastness of hybridity

and ambivalence are keenly observed and the complex cultural forms are observed by Soyinka. Due to the long-term contact with the colonialism, the natives are forced to adopt certain cultural traits offered by them.

The colonized people fail to attain authentic selfhood and are victimized by their own illusion, though they try to be familiar with both cultures because they cannot behave as demand by the native at the time they feel alone and unhappy because of their unsuccessful revisit but they try the attempt to link themselves with the past in order to overcome the loneliness and suffering; "Soyinka tries to resolve issues of modern civil violence in terms of those Yoruba beliefs" (Ousby 938). Although he uses Yoruba myth, religion and employs traditional masks, drums and dance, he expresses modern themes in contemporary African settings. Soyinka's plays are able to satirize the darkness of men's hearts old as well as new values (Matlow 717). In-between space is a third space marked by the spatial and temporal co-presence of subjects previously separated by geographic and historical disjuncture where disparate culture meet, clash and grapple with each other.

II. METHODOLOGY

Hybridity and In-Between Space

The history of cultural hybridity of cultural mixing and its textual expressions go back to the era of colonial occupation when the European colonizers intruded in the militarily less powerful countries and established their rule. The contact between aboriginals of the colonized and the European colonizers had multifaceted impact on the land and culture of the native people. Not only this, the large movement of labors and slaves from Asia and Africa to Europe and the Caribbean region brought together the people of different cultural and traditions. All such movement namely migration, exile and supply of indentured labors gave rise to hybrid culture across the colonized world. Cultural complexities of native people are the cause of their birth and brought up. Generally, postcolonial interpretation of hybridity suggests that it is a source of suffering and pain but for Bhabha it is a source of profound creativity.

The sense of hybrid articulation is there in all aspects –biological and culture that conditioned Bhabha's manhood. Hence, the consciousness of native people has been shaped by the spilt state of hybrid existence. So, before concentrating on the relations, it is relevant to elaborate the different facets of hybridity. According to Jacobs:

The concept of hybridity implies that postcolonial effects are no longer only unconscious by-products of colonialist constructs. They are the creative remaking of the colonial past by the colonized in the service of a postcolonial present/future. Through hybridity a postcolonial effectiveness is returned to the colonized, who steer a subversive returns to the colonial heart. (28)

In the context of the post-colonial literature and discourse, it suggests the cultural as well as biological hybridity caused by the contact and cross co-habitation between the cultures and people of the colonized and the colonizers. In general concept, hybridity is a biological terms that denotes the cross breeding between two species. Biological understanding of the term suggests that hybrid is something that is the product of mixture of two or more different things. Based on the premise that hybridity emerges from the cross breeding of two species and things.

The most pervasively inferred consequences of cultural hybridity are the sense of alienation, isolation, rootlessness and displacement. While such ideas get translated into literary writings, the underlying motif always remains to be the demand for cultural root and reconciliation with the uncontaminated form of cultural past. Hybridity, in literature and literary writings, suggests the experiences of cultural mixing felt and experienced by writers who have been the victim of such a state of being. As Jeremy Hawthoran has suggested, Homi K Bhabha says about hybridity as:

Hybridity is the sing 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 through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. It displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. (159)

The individual and collective response of the people of hybrid cultures and societies towards their own situation has often taken the form of anger and frustration. In

postcolonial writing such effects of hybrid articulation has been felt and expressed in diverse ways.

Postcolonial writing accepts the existence of both the cultural patterns of the oppressors and the distinct culture of the oppressed. Hybrid articulation in postcolonial writing is considered as a source of an artistry, a creative power which violates the binary categories of pure and impure, and the authentic and unauthentic. The hybrid modality also challenges the assumption of the "pure and the "authentic" concepts upon which the resistance to often stands" (*Post Colonial Reader* 9). Jacobs further quotes Bhabha as:

While Bhabha's notion of mimicry proposes a colonial absorption of agency, his concept of hybridity attempts to return it to the colonized. . . . Hybridity is not just a mixing together; it is a dialogic dynamic in which certain elements of dominant cultures are appropriated by the colonized and rearticulated in subversive ways. In Bhabha's word hybridity is about the seizure of the sign . . . a contestation of the given symbols of authority. Such subversions are uncanny returns, where disavowed and repressed subjective and knowledge enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority – its rules of recognition. (27-28)

Jero's consciousness exemplifies the consciousness of his hybridity as he is governed by the "Third Space", the in-between space. The in-between spaces provide the writer with many locations corresponding to his own hybrid identity. Such identities offer a way of imposing an imaginary coherence on the experience of dispersal and fragmentation.

Postcolonial attempts to heal the cultural wound caused by colonial intervention. Though hybrid articulation is the product of colonialism, it represents a bastardized face of

a human finger made by colonialism. There is neither any purity as sought by either the colonizers or it necessarily fulfills the colonial desire of servitude. A hybrid articulation is not only mimetic; it is also a state of life and experience that becomes the sources of resistance as Bhabha in *Location of Culture* says:

The strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal.[...] it unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but triplicates its identification in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the "Third space" culture that Bhabha advocates is the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature. This space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures. So it is a multicultural and multinational space, which could be called the global culture. This space, which is neither the one nor the other, "inbetween", provides terrains for postcolonial hybrid writers to define their own selves discriminated back upon the eyes of power. (112)

This space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures. So it is a multicultural and multinational space, which could be called the global culture. This space, which is neither the one nor the other, "inbetween", provides terrains for postcolonial hybrid writers to define their own selves.

Hybrid articulation lies between two edges, that is, between the pure and impure, and between past and present since it inherently encompasses opposite categories, the "Third space" culture that Bhabha advocates is the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature. By disestablishing the established boundaries of singularity and plurality it sets the limits of any claim to a singular or autonomous sign of difference –

be it class, gender or race" (219). Hybrid space is also an in between space, which lies between past and the present. In Bhaba's words, it gives rise to an interstitial future that "emerges in between the claims of the past and the needs of the present" (219).

In-between location is the space that incorporates the complexities of postcolonial realities. Bhabha in *Location of Culture* describes this space as a productive space because it enables us to address both colonial and postcolonial issues at the same time:

It is significant that the productive capacities of this third space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into the alien territory may reveal that the theoretical recognition of the split space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of culture, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity. To that end, we should remember that it is the 'inter"-cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the inbetween space- that carries the burden of the meaning of culture [...]. And by exploring this "Third Space", we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the other of ourselves. (38)

Jero's articulates his confusing loyalties to the African tradition and Christianity. He concentrates on cultural duality, which has alienated him from his own culture. Even if he longs for the African culture, he criticizes the African and abuses the fertile spaces of their native land. Jero's feeling about his cultural heritage appears ambiguous because he does not stick to either side ignoring the pitfalls of each culture.

Considering Bhaba's postulation it can be argued that discourses on hybridity represent not only the post colonial contest against the notions of fixity like standard,

singular and pure but it is also “the cultural spaces for opening up new forms of identification [...]” (179). Bhabha describes the inbetween position of hybride existence as a Third Space which emerges inbetween the traits of two mixed cultures.

In the exhibition of their hunger for power both aboriginal hard liner African and British are equal for Jero. Hybridity does not come alone from the cultural mixture or encounter but it is related to the history of his ancestry at the same time. So, his hybridity is also biological. In his poetic career, he is constantly haunted by the images of the European white culture and tradition. His articulation seems to guide his poem towards the spaces which incorporate the entities of two different element that are " something beside" the both. The phenomena of ' in- between ' that figure in Jero's consciousness resemble Homi K.Bhaba's concept of "in between space." Regarding the same issue of resistance and negotiation, Jacobus says:

The 'Postcolonialisms' described hereafter are not always neatly 'against' colonialism's residual and revived formations, part of the seductive realm of resistance. I do not deny the possibility of resistance but instead I suggest that it is one articulation of many which work against or slip outside of colonialism. The colonized engage not only in resistance but also in complicity, conciliation, and even blithe disregard. It is a revisionary form of imperialist nostalgia that defines the colonized as always engaged in conscious work against the 'core'. (15)

Postcolonial writings are always at the crossroads of two or more cultures and tradition. This cross road in Bhaba's language is “inbetween space” which means "neither the one nor the other but something else beside, in between" (*Location of Culture* 219). When the

question of identity comes in the state of diaspora, it is only hybrid. Straut Hall, while talking on Caribbean concept of identity says; "[d]iaspora identities are those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference" (Mongia 120). Searching of identity is always like searching, of 'signified' as Freud has said which always slides over its 'signifier' that can never be attained. Through hybridity a postcolonial effectiveness is returned to the colonized, who steer a subversive return to the colonial heart.

The concept of hybridity implies that postcolonial effects are no longer only unconscious by products of colonialist constructs. They are the creative remaking of the colonial past by the colonized in the service of a postcolonial present/ future:

I cannot possibly claim an ant colonial politics and, what is more, might simply work to embellish the 'core' I might involve a postcolonial notion of some 'inbetween space' as a way of legitimating my transgression. I might argue that postcolonial negotiation are 'space' that are conveniently not the center nor of the other, an orphaned surplus of hybridity for which anyone might speak. Such spaces are produced in the politics of colonialism and postcolonialism. Yet while the implications of hybridity for the issues of authorization are ambiguous, this should not establish opportunities for speaking which are outside on unavoidable politics of power. (Jacobs 8)

All perspectives of this type position colonial subjectivity as having primary and native or subaltern subjects as secondary subject effects within the discourse of empire.

The recovery of the agency of the colonized is still often found between the lives of colonial discourses. Their responses allude to the same trouble. That the various documented histories of overt resistance of colonialism are displaced by articulations of subversive accesses, which too closely inhabit the colonial. Colonialism is the process of invading the foreign land or territory and exploiting its culture, lifestyles, and the natural resources.

It is the direct rule over the people, a form of cultural exploitation, which replaces the indigenous values with those of the colonizers. It developed with the expansion of Europe over last 400 years. The main concern is with the field of colonial discourses rather than anti-colonial discourses and formations. The effort of the indigenous people's struggle to restore their native culture and language is often studied under postcolonialism. After the independence too the once colonized nations or states were 'colonized' due to the use of English language as their first language, Bible as their Holy Scripture, and Christmas as their religious festival. Colonialism according to Said; "the implanting of settlements on distant territory" (Said 8). No society attained full freedom under colonial system. It caused many problems for the former colony. The system made slave of the people and their mind. It caused fear among the colonized of being lost, fragmented and dislocated. So with such fear people started searching their racial as well as cultural identity. Postcolonialism depicts the autonomous identity and their effort to re/define and re/create the tradition and the culture and the language which has become creolized.

Ambivalence

Hybridity for Bhabha is caused by the 'cultural cross-over' of various sorts emanating from the encounter between colonizer and the colonized. Following Bhabha, Ashcroft, et al. has defined ambivalence as: "[T]he complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizer and the colonized, where colonized people work in the consent of the colonizer" (12). Since the age of colonial slave trade to this age of mass media, there lies the great shape of modern identities. As cultures mix and overlap, globe has the hybrid production of culture and identity. Such hybrid production leads to Diaspora. With these diaspora identities, people try to create their own identities so as not to feel alien and isolated. But the newly emergent identities never give them the sense of unity within. To be united they embrace writing, which helps them to have their identity to provide them a solace. Ambivalence is one of the most widely employed and most disputed terms in the postcolonial theory. It commonly refers to the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zones produced by colonization.

The state of loss of identity is vulnerable because of the spatial and spiritual dislocation from the native place. Most of the contemporary writers, most notably V.S. Naipaul express nostalgia for stable cultural identities from the stage of cultural crisis. They think themselves as 'culturally exiled' and continuously try to rejoin themselves with the root especially in their writings, which are never attainable. They are sometimes even charged of being 'others' in the name of being 'us'. Their identities are always in crisis as Spivak laments, "We postcolonial intellectuals are told that we are too western" (Spivak 8). Thus identity is always in crisis for postcolonial intellectuals. The crisis of

identity occurs due to the failure of the diaspora people to identify themselves with the place they really belong and the place they reside.

The relationship between colonized and colonizer is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer. By assimilating or becoming similar to the dominant or hegemonic culture people lose their own culture so their identity which is known through their culture is always in crisis. Hybridity has frequently been used in postcolonial discourse to simply mean cross-cultural exchange and hybridization means the process by which colonized mime the colonizing people's language, western ideas and practices and the rejection of native social-cultural aspects. The ultimate point of choosing one's identity is to provide meaning and direction to life. After assuming an identity, of course, people might find it unsatisfactory and want to take another. Their newly emerged identities never give them the senses of comfort within, such identities are forever questioned and actual "crisis" remains at the heart of their doubtful structure.

Ambivalence is a term developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and achieving its opposite. Ambivalence is an important feature of colonial discourse that dependent on the concept of fluctuation in the ideological construction. It describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizers and colonized. Ambivalence, as the sign of cultural/ historical difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation. Then there arises the feeling of alienation which all the time haunts them of having fluctuating identities. Straut Hall opines; "identities are not fixed but subject to the continuous "play" of history, culture and power... identities are the names we give to

the different ways we are positioned by and position ourselves with the narratives of the past” (Mongia 11). It is power that gives a person an identity to control or to delimit one's life as a person. Hence a person feels the crisis of identity and the crisis of identity is felt when the culture is cut across and when it intersects natural frontiers and when people have been dispersed forever or temporarily from their homelands. According to Ashcroft et al:

Ambivalence therefore gives rise to a control version proposition in Bhabha's theory, that because the colonial relationship is always ambivalent, it generates the seeds of its own destruction. This is controversial because it implies that the colonial relation is going to be disrupted, regardless of any resistance or rebellion on the part of the colonized. Bhabha's argument is that colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalence because it never really wants colonial subjects to be exact replicas of the colonizer- this would be too threatening (13).

Ambivalence suggests that resistance exist in fluctuating relation within the colonial subject that characterizes the way in which colonial discourse relates to the colonized subject.

It has both impact exploitative and nurturing at the same time to recognize the stereotype as an ambivalent mode of knowledge and power demands a theoretical and political response that challenges the deterministic or functionalist modes of conceiving of the relationship between discourse and politics, and questions dogmatic and moralistic positions on the meaning of oppression and discrimination. Postcolonialism is related to nationalism. As the identity of the people is closely related to the nation, nationalism is

very important. And it is clear that with the loss of nation there is loss of individual identity. The reading of colonial discourse suggests that the point of intervention should shift from the identification of images as positive or negative, to an understanding of the process of subjectification made possible through stereotypical discourse.

The problem for colonial discourse is that it wants to produce compliant subjects who reproduce its assumptions, habits and values – that is, mimic the colonizer. But instead it produces ambivalent subjects whose mimicry is never very far from mockery. With the process of decolonization, the newly independent nation states are making an effort to negate the cultural effects of colonization. It was felt essential to be free of biased Eurocentric images and create both national and individual identity. Thus postcolonialism emerged as a device to judge the biased perspective of the Europeans. Hence, postcolonial world is so pathetic that it drains even the last drop of self-respect from the colonized.

The continual feeling of being lost and dislocated made the once colonized people wander to reconstruct their lost identity in the heterogeneous postcolonial world. Their original cultures change too much and it is difficult to return to the root. The relationship of the nation is very important because one gets used to one's country as one gets accustomed to one's mother's body. Postcolonialism is a way of examining an unconsciously changed culture through its literature and it creates discourse of oppositional that was brought into being by colonialism. Cut up in cultural roots the migrants lose their native place, their ancestors or their history but also their identity, which counts a lot for them. The theory of ambivalence is related to imperial discourse that describes the fluctuating relationship between mimicry and mockery. The

fundamentally unsettling to colonial dominance is not necessarily disempowering for the colonial subject; but rather – powered, the effect of this ambivalence is to produce a profound disturbance of the authority of colonial discourse.

The role of discriminatory knowledge that depend on ' presence of difference, is to provide a process of splitting and multiple/ contradictory belief at the point of enunciation and subjectification. The authority of colonial discourse depends crucially on its location in narcissism and the imaginary. The concept of stereotype as such is recognition of the ambivalence of that authority and those orders of identification. The borderline, margin, doubtful responds by constituting the centre as an indeterminate ambivalence, but the concept of ambivalence is not reversal of binary opposition. As Ashcroft et al have suggested, Bhabha views that ambivalence is related to hybridity:

But this is not a simple reversal of a binary, for Bhabha shows that both colonizing and colonized subjects are implicated in the ambivalence of colonial discourse. The concept is related to hybridity because, just as ambivalence, decentness' authority from its position of power, so that authority may also become hybridized when placed in a colonial context in which it finds itself dealing with , and often inflected by, other cultures.

(14)

The mimicry of European learning is hybridized and therefore ambivalent. Imperial discourse should be ambivalent in order to resist. The term mimicry has been crucial of the ambivalence of colonial discourse that is the process by which the colonized subject is reproduced as almost the same. Ambivalence is the process of mimicry, which reveals the limitation in the authority of colonial discourse, almost as though colonial authority

inheritably embodies the seeds of its own destruction. The features of ambivalence is some how related to hybridity. The colonial discourse in relation to colonized culture has domination and control, which leads to ambivalence.

It is right to point to the instabilities of colonialism produced by the hazy subversions made possible by the ambivalence of colonial discourse itself. But these instabilities can also arise in sharper counter- colonial movements of, say, certain nationalisms that may well mobilize essentialist notions of a pre-colonial identity. It is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency, ensure its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures, informs its strategies of individuation and marginalisation; produces that effect of problematic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in excess of what can be empirically proved or logically constructed.

The function of ambivalence is one of the most significant discursive and psychological strategies of discriminatory power- whether racist of peripheral or metropolitan. Furthermore, all negotiations of identity are located within very specific hierarchies of power and particular political and economic frames. In the context of the struggles of non-western people, identity- based understandings of domination need always to be located in the material politics of everyday life. It is not solely that discursively constituted notion of identity have material effects, but that the sheer uneven materiality of the lives of people affected by imperialism must inform the moral and ethical function of critical postcolonial studies.

The consequences of this for post colonial studies are put profound for what emerges through his flow in colonial power is writing, the ambivalence of which is

menacing to colonial authority. The menace of mimicry does not lie in its concealment of some real identity behind its mask, but comes from its 'double' vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority. The menace of post colonial writing, then does not necessarily emerge from some automatic opposition to colonial discourse, but comes from this disruption of colonial authority from the fact that its mimicry is also potentially mockery. As understood within the domain of postcolonial criticism, hybridity is the result of the orientalist project of the west. The term has something to do with the traumatic colonial experience, since it is the 'ambivalent relationship' of the colonizer and the colonized.

The colonial settlers, once they arrived in alien land, felt the necessity of establishing new identity since they were displaced from their own point of origin. In a colonized society there emerged a binary relationship between the peoples of two cultures, races and language and such relation produced a hybrid or cross –cultural society. Hybridity at best can be understood by referring to Bhabha's notion of 'ambivalence'. For Bhabha, it is the 'cultural cross-overs' of various sorts emanating from the encounter between colonizer and the colonized. Ambivalence is the mixture of the colonizer and the colonized, where colonized people work in the consent of the colonizer.

The relationship is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simple and completely opposed to the colonizer. Hybrid culture do exist in colonial society where people occupy an 'in-between' space by the 'mimicry' of the colonizer. Likewise the stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always on place already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated as if the essential duplicity of the Asiatic or

the bestial sexual license of the African that needs no proof, can never really, in discourse, be proved, it is the process of ambivalence, center of the stereotype, that may essay explore as it constructs a theory of colonial discourse.

Mimicry

Mimicry locates a crack in the certainty of colonial dominance and an uncertainty in its control of the behavior of the colonized and it has often been an overt goal of imperial policy because the method by which the mimicry was to be achieved indicated the underlying weakness of imperialism that should be imported by a class of interpreters between which and the millions whom the white govern-a class of persons 'Other' in blood and color but English in tastes, opinions, in morals and intellect; thereby the mimicry of European learning is hybridized and ambivalent:

There is little doubt that Bhabha's psychoanalytic perspective on colonialist discourses has productively by Edward Said. In so far as Bhabha's understanding of the ambivalence of colonialism dislodges the surety of colonial power, his analytic perspective is post colonialist yet Bhabha's postcolonial analysis has not gone uncivilized. (Jacobs 27)

The colonized subjects take up the genes of the colonizer that place agency within the equivocal circulation of colonial constructs. The mimetic performance of the colonized subject subvert colonialism not because it might be a conscious act of misappropriation, but because it has a menacing effect which is produced by colonialism's own paranoia. Bhabha's work has also been called into question by its own ambivalence towards the agency of the colonized are produced by the agonistic ambivalence of colonialism itself rather than the agency of colonized.

While Bhabha's notion of mimicry proposes a colonial absorption of agency his concept of hybridity attempts to return it to the colonized. In this essay 'Sings taken for wonders' (1985), Bhabha's concern turns to the way in which colonial ambivalence produces hybridization, an inevitable, 'splitting' of subjection. Hybridity is not just a mixing together; it is a dialogic dynamic in which certain elements of dominant and rearticulated in subversive ways. (27-28)

The people who follow the culture of the other are caught up in a state of double articulation of their identity. Mimicry is the sign of a double articulation, a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which appropriates the other as it visualizes power; "Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate; however, a difference or recalcitrance, which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance and poses an immanent threat to both normalized knowledge and disciplinary powers" (Bhabha 78). The notion of the unsettling postcolonial surplus of colonialism is a component in a wide range of postcolonial formation that is expressed in variable ways and in distinct settings.

Mimicry reveals the authority of colonial discourse, almost as though colonial authority inevitably embodies the seeds of its own destruction. Comparatively nonwestern subject relates it to the imitation of so-called high and western culture. When colonial discourse encourages the colonized subject to 'mimic' the colonizer, by adopting the colonizer's cultural habits, assumptions, institutions and values the result is never a simple reproduction of those traits. Rather, the result is blurred copy of the colonizer that can be quite threatening. This is because mimicry is never very far from mockery, since it

can appear to parody whatever it mimics. The threat inherent in mimicry then comes not from an overt resistance but from the way in which it continually suggests an identity not quite like the colonizer is always potentially and strategically insurgent.

A complex strategy of appropriates is also the sign of the inappropriate; however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses an immanent threat to both normalized knowledge. Despite the 'imitation' and 'mimicry' with which colonized people cope with imperial presence the relationship becomes one of the constant or implicit, contestation and opposition. Indeed, such mimicry becomes the very site of that conflict, a transparency which is dependent for its fixity on the underlying negativity of imperial presence which is seems to duplicate. Bhabha starts his discussion of mimicry with a quotation from Jacques Lacan; "the effect of mimicry is camouflage" (85). Mimicry does not mean that opposition is not rejected, but rather it is seen to encompass more than overt opposition. Opposition is not simply reduced to intention, but is implicit in the very production of dominance whose intervention as a dislocate presence paradoxically confirms the very thing it displace. The resulting hybrid modalities also challenge the assumption of the 'pure' and the 'authentic' concept upon which the resistance to imperialism often stands.

Bhabha's analysis which is largely based on the Lacanian conceptualization of mimicry as camouflage focuses on colonial ambivalence. On the one hand, he sees the colonizer as a snake in the grass who speaks in "a tongue that is forked" and producees a mimetic representation that "emerges as one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge" (Bhabha, 85). Postcolonial theory has come to describe the 'ambivalent' relationship between colonizers and calumniated. Post-colonial cultures are

inevitably hybridized, involving a dialectical relationship between European ontology and epistemology and the impulse to create or recreate independent local identity. Mimicry can be both ambivalent and multilayered. But hegemony and mimicry come together in the process of acculturation, which suggest disparagement of the tendency to emulate the colonizer. The mimicry of the postcolonial subject is therefore always potentially destabilizing to colonial discourse and locates an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of imperial dominance. The colonial space is therefore an agonistic space. Indeed, hybridity rather than indicating corruption or decline, may be the most common and effective form of subversive opposition since it displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and dominance.

Though mimicry is the process of reproduction of colonial subject, the copying of the colonizing culture, behaviour, manners and values by the colonized contains both mockery and a certain 'menace', so that mimicry is at once resemblance and menace. Decolonization is a process, not arrival; it invokes an ongoing dialectic between hegemonic centralist systems and peripheral subversion between European or British discourses and their post-colonial dismantling. Bhabha analyses the slippages in colonial political discourse, and reveals that the jaunts face attitudes towards the colonized lead to the production of a mimicry that presents itself more in the form of menace than resemblance more in the form of rapture rather than consolidation. Hybridity subverts the narratives of colonial power and dominant cultures.

The series of inclusions and exclusions on which a dominant culture is premised are deconstructed by the very entry of the formally excluded subjects into the mainstream discourse. The appropriate objects of a colonial chain of command are also inappropriate

colonial subjects because what is being set in their behavior is something that may ultimately be beyond the control of colonial authority. The antecedents for this discourse lie in an intricate negotiation between colonial objectness and modernity's new historic subject, who are both colonizer and the colonized. Postcolonial critics interpret along mimic men as they asserts the part object of metonymy of colonial desire, end of emerging as inappropriate colonial subjects. By producing a partial vision of the colonizer's presence, this inappropriateness disrupts the normality of the dominant discourse itself. Since it is not possible to create or recreate national or regional formations wholly independent of their historical implication in the European colonial enterprises, it has been the project of post colonial writing to interrogate European discourse and discursive strategies from a privileged position within two worlds to investigate the means by which Europe imposed and maintained its codes in the colonial domination of so such of the rest of the world.

Soyinka exposes and expresses the trauma of dislocation, alienation and identity crisis in her works. On the one hand, his plays crystallize exile, migration and its problem and on the other hand they deal with the situation of ambivalence felt and expressed in a variety of ways. He focuses on the outsider the expatriate; the marginalized and native is depicted as a hybrid social space. He deals with the various experiences of outsider people. It revolves around Jero, a native endeavoring to adjust himself in inbetween location.

Jero's Metamorphosis treats the theme of ambivalent cultural response depicting two cultures through the story of a family who resides in Africa. It deals with the problems of relationships between two different cultures and their respective roles in traditional African society. The norms, values and traditions of African society are contrasted which may be termed as the situation of attraction and repulsion.

III. Cultural Ambivalence in *Jero's Metamorphosis*

This research is a critically discussion of cultural dualism in Soyinka's plays that explore the characters tension between native consciousness and Christianity in the light of how they are located in the in-between location. The conflicts representation of the native culture and Christian tradition is the central focus of the study. Soyinka's characters are fall in the situation of cultural dualism that locates in the in-between location. Jero's cultural dualism in *Jero's Metamorphosis* neither can assimilate himself to both cultures at the same time nor can he ignore both or take one and shun the other because he does not know whether he is right or not for being Christian: "You are sure it is not wrong? (*Jero's Metamorphosis* 177). Neither the native nor the Christianities consciousness seems to guide Jero but his consciousness moves towards the inbetween spaces which incorporate the entities of two different elements that represents Bhabha's concept of inbetween space as Jero says; "we are on the threshold of bringing the highest and the mightiest under our spiritual guidance" (203).

Neither the native nor the Christianities consciousness seems to guide Jero but his consciousness moves towards the inbetween spaces which incorporate the entities of two different elements that represents Bhabha's concept of inbetween space as Jero says; "we are on the threshold of bringing the highest and the mightiest under our spiritual guidance" (203). According to Bhabha, postcolonial people are always at the crossroads of two or more culture and tradition. The conflicts representation of the native culture and Christian tradition is the central focus of the study. Jero' cultural dualism neither can assimilate himself to both cultures at the same time nor can he ignore both or take one

and shun the other because he does not know whether he is right or not for being Christian: "You are sure it is not wrong? (177).

This cross road in Bhabha's language is "in between space" which means neither the one nor the other but something else beside, inbetween (219). Likewise, Soyinka also views about the Jero's identity in between cultural differences: "He will negotiate for the other side" (207). In the same vein, Jacobus says; "His work, especially his drama, has been an investigation of the political, religious and other forces in Nigerian culture" (1175). Soyinka advocates the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature and this space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures. Jero in Soyinka's *Jero's Metamorphosis* evokes his tension between native consciousness and Christianity.

Neither can he assimilate these two cultures at the same time nor can he ignore one and take the side of another:

Jero: Not that I would regret it. We could do with the elevation to eternity of some of our dearly beloved brother prophets on this beach, and if they choose the way of the hangman's noose or elect to take the latest short cut to heaven facing a firing squad at the Bar Beach Show, who are we to dispute such a divine solution? Only trouble is it might give the rest of us a bad name. (175)

Hence, the cultural dualism becomes unresolved tension for him. Neither the native nor the Christianities consciousness seems to guide Jero but his consciousness moves towards the spaces which incorporate the entities of two different elements that are something beside the both or inbetween space as Jero says; "Have we a united body or not?" (206). The world has become a global village and experience has become a common form of

experience of migration or exile, generating fissured identities and hybridities alongside problems of dislocation and dispossession and a larger problem of a lost center and someone nurtured in one culture.

Deprived of a secure sense of personal identity like Jero, his protagonists are emotionally too incapacitated to encounter the hazards of life-social, ethnic and spiritual. Their emotional sterility is the cause and consequence of their failure to achieve an authentic location. However, the idea of 'contact zone' denies the homogeneous, sovereign 'community' embodying values like equality, fraternity and liberty, which the societies offer profess but systematically fail to realize; "a process of interpretation and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated by them in a common cultural life" (Dallmayr 14). Similarly, Soyinka treats the cross-cultural relationship between the colonizers and the colonized and satirizes pre-colonial African regimes by verbal inventiveness. People from different culture and race try to develop a bond of mutual understanding on a common cultural ground despite difference:

Jero: [offering a glass]. You will join me, Sister Rebecca?

Rebecca: No Brother Jero, but you must have one.

Jero: You are sure it is not wrong?

Rebecca: All things are God's gifts. It is not wrong to use them wisely.

Jero: You comfort me greatly, Sister Rebecca. The times are indeed trying.

Believe me, it is no time for half-measures. (176)

At times they preserve their heterogeneity but their sole concern is to develop a reciprocal relation in order to share a common cultural way of life. Identity becomes an issue; the

insiders undergo different sets of political and social crisis and are uprooted by calamities of a different nature than the foreigner outsider since whatever the nature of the problems, the loss of personal identity, the sense of homelessness and the fear of insecurity are alike for postcolonial people and their suffering comes from isolation, randomness and meaninglessness in the way of living.

Jero's Metamorphosis treats the theme of ambivalent cultural response depicting two cultures. The norms, values and traditions of African society are contrasted to the confronting the cultures of the colonizers. Soyinka is a versatile and the most politically involved of Anglophone African writers. In connection with the concept of the co-existence of the three worlds of the dead, the living and the unborn, Soyinka emphasizes the importance of new moral consciousness:

Jero: That was before I read this precious file which you brought to Christ as your dowry. An unparalleled dowry in the history of spiritual marriages Sister Rebecca. And before...[He takes down the picture on the wall, inspects it at arm's length nodding with satisfaction.]...yes, I think we have neglected our earthly inspirations. (176)

The highly creative sensibility is one that goes beyond binary thinking and the straightforward 'clash of cultures' thesis that often lies behind oppositional readings of these novels. As Ashcroft et al has suggested, Bhabha says colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalence because it suggests that "resistance exist in fluctuating relation within the colonial subject that characterizes the way in which colonial discourse relates to the colonized subject" (13). This obscures the anxiety of the irresolvable, borderline culture of hybridity that articulates its problems of identification and its

ambivalent position in an uncanny, disjunctive temporality that is, as once the time of cultural displacement, and the space of the untranslatable.

Apart from exhibiting a distinct and deep awareness of the social, economic and cultural realities around him, Soyinka also succeeds in effectively assimilating and transmuting these realities and experiences into his writing. Multiplicity of thematic patterns and poly-angular perspectives in his writing clearly bring forth the multicultural ethos that forms the basis of his writing. The writers articulate important questions in their works regarding tradition versus modernity, dwindling of the conventional value system, marital discords, collapse of the joint family system, social and economical disparities, ambivalent cultural responses to the impact of the west etc. Soyinka's character Jero is a self-centered and introverted whose relationship with two cultures creates hybrid recognition that projects the conflict between traditional values and the lure of the western materialistic prosperity. In such situation fascination with the country is soon disillusioned. He remains unhappy because he tries to resist Christian culture instead of being absorbed by it:

Jero: Picture my blood sinking into the sand and mingling with the foam, your feet sinking into the gruesome mixture and growing heavy with the knowledge of eternal damnation . . . but I knew it was not in you to perform such an evil act. It was, obviously, the work of the devil. Your mind was turned away from the light of reason and your judgment clouded for a while. (194)

In addition, Soyinka's political sympathies led to a term in prison where he was placed in solitary confinement. He continued his writing out of prison to give hope to his political

allies. Furthermore, the unfold theme of separation and union, fission and fusion, hatred and love, acceptance and negation the phenomenon of hybridist and ambivalence. The idea of integration is the quest of an individual to come to terms with his/her universe-a process of cultural mediation.

Hybridity suffers Soyinka like his character Jero because as a child he became increasingly aware of the pull between African tradition and Christianity. Soyinka and his characters consciousness could be called the twilight consciousness because of its affinity with hybrid-like dual positions and its cultural manifestations epitomize the post-colonial claims of identification that is characterized by the asymmetrical relation of power, incomprehension, suffering and pain; “enforcing the cultural centrality of its historical homeland, the language has proved to be a generous and accommodative traveler” (Boehmer 210). Third place offers moments of wonder and revelation, mutual understanding and new wisdom where people historically and geographically separated come into contact with each other and establish relation, usually involving conditions of coercion, racial inequality, and intractable conflict:

Jero: [moves aside and detachedly observes Chume in ecstasy]. I had my doubts for a while but I should have known better. These Salvation Army brothers may be washed in the red blood of the Lord, but the black blood of the Bar Beach brotherhood proves stronger every time. [Sudden shout, turning to Chume.] Hallelujah, Brother, Hallelujah! [He joins Chume for a few a more moments, and then taps him in the shoulder.] (195-96)

Jero follows the culture of colonizer so that he caught up in a state of “neither the one nor the other” and they lie in its concealment of same real identity behind its mask that comes

from its double vision that is disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse (Bhabha 219). Soyinka faces the same situation; “increasing aware of the pull between African tradition and Western modernization” (Brains 1). Furthermore, Soyinka in his *Myth, Literature and African World* illustrates the tension between two western and native cultures: “the Greek religion shows persuasive parallels with, to stick to our example, the Yoruba is no means denied” (14). Thus, the tension remains not only in the character but also in the writer and his tradition. The vastness of hybridist and ambivalence are keenly observed and the complex cultural forms are by Soyinka. Due to the long-term contact with the colonialism, the natives are forced to adopt certain cultural traits offered by them.

The inbetween space provides him several images corresponding to his own hybrid articulation as Hall says; "Such images offer away of imposing an imaginary coherence upon the experience of dispersal and fragmentation" (112). Soyinka plays with articulation that represents postcolonial endeavors to heal the cultural wound caused by colonial intervention. Soyinka provides a textual version of his hybrid articulation. To articulate the conflict within his 'self', he evokes characters' ambivalent situations. His hybridity, thus, does not appear alone from the cultural mixture or encounter but it is related to the history of his ancestry at the same time. In his career, he is constantly haunted by the images of Islamic traditions. His articulation seems to guide his thought towards the spaces that incorporate the entities of two different elements that are something beside the both. His plays exemplify the consciousness of his hybridity as the 'Third Space', the inbetween space, which governs his writings:

Jero: [turns and beams on the gathering]. And now, dear brother shepherds of the flock, let us waste no more time. We are mostly known to one another so I shall not waste time in introductions. The subject is progress. Progress has caught up with us. Like the ocean tide it is battering on our shore-line, the doorstep of our tabernacle. Projects everywhere! Fun fairs! Gambling! Casinos! The servants of Mannon have had their heads turned by those foreign fleshpots to which they are drawn whenever they travel on their so-called economic missions. (200)

Hybrid space is also an in between space, which lies between past and the present that gives rise to an interstitial future; the claims of the past and the needs of the present. Soyinka in his book *Myth, Literature and the African World* explains that the Yoruba myth and religion is also influenced by the Greek as well as western traditions. He further considers about the Greek and the Yoruba religion and finds parallels between them. He says: "That Greek religion shows persuasive parallels with, to stick to our example, the Yoruba" (14). Soyinka has his roots in the Yoruba people's myths, sites, and cultural patterns, and he has adapted a number of classic plays to suit the African context. Beuson and Conolly argue that Soyinka exploits the European traditions in Nigerian context. They say; "Soyinka access through the Yoruba language and dance" (1528). By disestablishing the established boundaries of singularity and plurality it sets "the limits of any claim to a singular or autonomous sign of difference –be it class, gender or race" (219).

Post-colonial cultures are inevitably hybridized, involving a dialectical relationship between European ontology and epistemology and the impulse to create or

recreate independent local identity. Considering Bhaba's postulation it can be argued that discourses on hybridity represent not only the postcolonial contest against the notions of fixity. It is a space of contest because it provides the writers a new situation and reality to write back the colonists as Jero says; "He will negotiate for the other side" (207). It is a space of negotiation because the people of postcolonial world have to negotiate to adjust in the postcolonial mosaic culture. Since most of the postcolonial cultures bear the legacy of hybridity, it is the fundamental reality of the space and its inhabitants. The twilight consciousness creates hybrid-like dual positions and its cultural manifestations epitomize the post-colonial claims of ambivalence as Jero says; "A white man. He is not one of us. And you know yourself he's a hypocrite. All white men are hypocrites" (193). And this claim finds its theoretical base in the discourse of in-between space especially that of Homik K. Bhaba. This space, which Bhaba call the "Third space", is the space of contestation and negation.

Soyinka's basic theme is identity crisis and the problems caused by it. Most of his books/writings display the traumas of cultural complexity because it includes a number of characters from two cultural backgrounds, which encounter problems in different time, spaces and cultural backgrounds. In their writings, we find the idea that alienation is the problem of modern world. This sense of being alienated confuses a person and it unendurably frustrates him. That's why, it has been the project of postcolonial writing to interrogate European discourse and discursive strategies from a privileged position within two worlds to investigate the means by which the west imposed and maintained its codes in the colonial domination to rest of the world. Bhabha describes the inbetween position

of hybrid existence as a third space which emerges between the traits of two mixed cultures.

Soyinka provides an interesting look to acknowledge the recent expressions of inbetween space and the postcolonial world. When a culture gets hybridized it turns to be a contact zone as well as a space in-between two cultures; "I do not believe that you are on Christian terms at all, sir. Your soul is in danger" (183). In this sense the inbetween spaces and the hybrid cultures of the postcolonial world are the realities of the space. Thus these spaces are both the signifier and the signified for the postcolonial writers as Jero says; "Excuse me while I get ready for the negotiations" (208). When we talk of power-discourse relationship, Antonio Gramsci's term "hegemony" is thought to be necessary for studying and analyzing colonial discourse. Gramsci studied and investigated how the ruling class maintains its power in society by winning the consent of the ruled. His most widely accepted concept 'hegemony' describes how cultural and ideological domination of the majority over minority functions, and how that domination is accepted by both groups.

In other words, a social class achieves predominant influence and power within the society, and that the subordinated classes unwittingly accept and participate in their own oppression. Hegemony is not a general domination of one by another. That is to say it is not domination by force rather domination by consent. For example, postcolonial critics Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin define Gramsci's notion of "hegemony" in the following word by describing it as, "the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all" (66). The ruling classes exercise power upon subordinated or ruled classes not through force and fraud but through shaping the

"common sense" of people. For instance, another postcolonial critic Ania Loomba redefines Gramscian notion of 'hegemony' by saying that "hegemony is power achieved through a combination of coercion and consent" (29). This indicates that power is exercised not only through force alone but also through consent of colonized.

In addition, the colonized willingly accept to being ruled because they think the ruling class is superior to them. This term is important for describing the success of imperial power over a colonial people because colonial regimes achieved domination through manufacturing consent of the colonized. In other words, power is not totally exercised from above, but is operated by the consent of both of them. Soyinka locates himself strategically within that portentous moment of suspension when an increasing defensive imperialism begins making plans for a final reckoning with eachothers:

Jero: Prophet Chume has left the ranks of the enemy and cast his lot among us. With his help, with the intimate knowledge which he has acquired of the workings of that foreign body to which he once belonged we shall re-create ourselves in the required image. We shall manifest our united spiritual essence in the very form and shape of the rulers of the land. Nothing, you will agree could be more respectable than that. [Rises.]

Sister Rebecca, bring out the banner! (204)

The cultural ambivalence becomes unresolved tension for postcolonial people; both distance and engagement, recognition of inalienable otherness and genuine care for difference where identity remains open to loose strands and unparsed possibilities in oneself. In such situation, the feeling of dislocation and alienation necessarily haunts

colonized people, therefore, they try to adopt the newly emerging identities, but it never gives them the sense of unity within rather it creates the sense of ambivalence.

Soyinka by bringing into contact of the people's belonging to two different cultures has shown a tension between colonized mind and inner desire that creases the situation of ambivalence because the colonizer's discourse is interrogated by the natives in their own accents produces an autonomous position for the colonial within the confines of the hegemonic discourse. Soyinka's study of the effects of colonial representation was central to the cultural interaction with colonial societies in literary circles. Social, cultural and political history is allegorically enveloped in this play. The colonial history fictionalized the narrative of empire itself and legitimizes the Other. This play addressed unprecedented imperialism attraction in Soyinka's attentions. The emphasis of much of this text is decidedly cultural, emerging as it does from literary studies, but its effects have reached into a wide range of disciplinary fields:

Brothers, Brothers, this is no time for our private little quarrels. We must not envy Brother Matthew his spiritual influence in her . . . certain fortunate quarters when we are on the threshold of bringing the highest and the mightiest under our spiritual guidance. (203)

Soyinka has come to be known as colonial discourse analysis that shows the ways in which discursive formation worked to create a complex field of values, meanings and practices through which the colonizer's Self is positioned as superior and colonized as placed as an inferior. This binary opposition is possible due to the colonial mentality of the colonized people:

Jero: [turns and beams on the gathering]. And now, dear brother shepherds of the flock, let us waste no more time. We are mostly known to one another so I shall not waste time in introductions. The subject is progress. Progress has caught up with us. Like the ocean tide it is battering on our shore-line, the doorstep of our tabernacle. Projects everywhere! Fun fairs! Gambling! Casinos! The servants of Mannon have had their heads turned by those foreign fleshpots to which they are drawn whenever they travel on their so-called economic missions. (200)

Ambivalence, as the sign of cultural/ historical difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of repetition. Thus, ambivalence also stands for the strength and rigidity of white mechanism that refers to the destructive characteristics of colonial agents. One of the key contributions made by this research is to demonstrate the vulnerability of imperialist and colonialist power.

This thesis highlights the way that how western power and ideology never fully realized by the colonized people. Colonial discourse energizes the meanings, significance and value of colonialism. The mimetic performance of the colonized subject subverts colonialism not because it might be a conscious act of misappropriation, but because it has a menacing effect, which is produced by colonialism's paranoia. Ambivalence is the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterize the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized.

Negotiation is not only influenced by hegemony of political and cultural events but also operates through a range of cultural processes. For instance, European constructs of Self and Other provided the fundamental building that blocks for the hierarchies of

power. It creates the centre for legitimizing the colonized people as margin but the colonized subjects can resist from the space of negotiation:

Jero: Please give me the credit of having done my home-work. You forget we have had a formidable ally in the person of Colonel Rebecca, your former Confidential Secretary. And we have drawn on that precious file which your Eviction Officer so generously loaned us. There is no duplication, check it if you wish. (211)

Thus, the colonized people have to accept the concept that is constructed by western power: "under colonialism, negative contractions of the colonized other established certain structure of domination through which the colonizer triumphed (Jacobs 2). Colonial discourse and power has operated through a complex intersection of social constructs that affects the psychology of the colonized people. Ambivalence treats the relation among colonizer and colonized self and other, native and the non-native in terms of co-presence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within asymmetrical relation of power.

The superiority of new culture dominates individuals as they feel inferiority of their culture in new culture. The legacy of subordination is placed for healing and mutual recognition in which to construct shared understandings, knowledge, and claims on the world that they can bring in to the in-between location. Through a host of uprooted and alienated characters from their original culture, Soyinka observes the predicaments of these outsiders in an alien culture. Furthermore, Western discourse has always functioned as power to dominate the orient. This discourse has not only shown how Europeans exercised institutionalized power over the non-Europeans to rule them but also an instrument to create to centralize them and inferiorize the colonized people. The emphasis of this research is on

the legitimized people and legitimized politics of differentiation. Although this is not intended to relegate other construct to the sidelines or to say that decolonization has nothing to offer the rethinking of colonial period, the colonized people can't be free from the grip of colonial mentality as Ashcroft et al in *Key Concept of Post-colonial Studies* has suggested; "Hegemony initially a term referring to the domination of one state within a confederation, is now generally understood to mean domination by consent" (116). Although the colonized people are politically independent, they represent everything about non-western as inferior, barbaric, other, uncivilized and irrational due to the colonial mentality.

Jero's mentality represents the hostility between the colonizers and the colonized. His sense of hatred, distrust and inferior complex to the native people are the cause of the colonial mentality. Having realized such motives of colonial mentality, Soyinka develops the concept of self versus other and discusses the issues of colonial psychosis. This misrepresentation is the cause of his colonial mentality that deals with the complex relationship between the colonizers and colonized. This mentality evokes the relationship between stereotypical images about the colonizers and the colonized. Thus, this mentality provides an approach to project European's stereotype of the orient.

This space, which is neither the one nor the other, 'inbetween', provides a terrain for postcolonial hybrid writers to define their own selves discriminated back upon the eyes of power. Hybridity lies between two edges i.e. between the pure and the impure; and between past and present since it inherently encompasses opposite categories. Jero has also discussed how the westerners dichotomize the non-westerners as Other and the westerner as the Self. Cultural dualism is a continuous process characterized by the fusion and adjustment of various cultural traits. It facilitates partial adaptation and final assimilation. Partial adaptation, in any case, involves a greater subtlety in self-other

relation. Rather than self-imposition of hegemonic situation, selective borrowing requires a willingness to recognize the distinctness of other culture, coupled with a desire to maintain at least some indigenous preferences:

Jero: [taking back the file]. Time is short, Brothers. We cannot afford to be over-sensitive. [Reads] ‘ . . . the so-called prophets and evangelists. All these are not only to be immediately expelled but steps must be taken to ensure that they never at any time find their way back to the execution stadium.’ (201-202)

Jero feels the crisis of identity and the crisis of identity is felt when the culture is cut across and when it intersects natural frontiers and when people have been dispersed forever or temporarily from their homelands. When a person feels alienated she/he remains deep-rooted in her or his psychology and always fails to link oneself with the metropolis. The hybrid modality also challenge the assumption of the "pure and the "authentic" concepts upon which the resistance to often stands."(*Post Colonial Reader* 9). Overall it is general problematic feeling of loss of original language, land and other cultural belongings for each individual. Migration is the ongoing process that is essential and defining characteristics of mankind; from the day the first humans left East Africa to populate the world. It is a multicultural and multinational space, which could be called the global culture. This novel also examines the ways in which colonial discourse operated as an instrument of power:

On a crude scale that ranges from "oppressor" to" oppressed" within contemporary neo-colonial international relations, the political location of such nation may differ fundamentally, and this raises a question as to

whether both kinds of ex-colonial states ought to be thought of equally as " post-colonial nations ". (Slemon102)

Regarding the same manner Ashcroft et al view about Fanon that the effects of colonial domination on the psyche of the colonized remain due to the white colonial powers (99). Jero is the native of higher standard but the way he treat himself is not different from the way westerns treat to the colonized people. He misrepresents his father and mother as the other. He seems to be educated and creative; however, he has the feeling of hatred and distrust to the native people. He wants to leave African tradition for the sake of his bright future.

As Slemon has said Jero as an oppressed, represents the western as superior, educated civilized and active and his people as the uncivilized. No matter what he reads and known, he feels inferiority due to the colonial psychosis. It is either forceful or intentional movement from the place of origin to the unwanted or strange places. It can both be temporary or permanent. These days it has become a political issue because it challenges and questions the identity of the migrants as language, nation and after all culture is different in the host country. Soyinka's protagonists' negotiations are closely affiliated to the process of acculturation. Within the acculturating group, individuals lose their ties with the original cultural background, and acquire values; habits and behaviors form the dominant culture. It is usually applied to policies in some western or westernizing nation and the idea of the nation-state. When two diverse cultures meet, the mode of social and cultural interaction conflict occupies in an in-between space of human history so that conflict is the chief trademarks of human relations through which communication or dialogue between cultures is possible.

Postcolonialism is related to nationalism. Based on the premises that hybridity emerges from the cross breeding of two species and things: "The *ozo* title lost its appeal in the twentieth century when colonial officers stripped traditional Igbo chiefs of their power and then subordinated them to British-appointed warrant chiefs and western-educated Africans" (Ohadike xxvii). The modern move to position hybridity as a disruptive democratic discourse of cultural citizenship is distinctly anti-imperialist and antiauthoritarian development. Imperial discourse should be ambivalent for the purpose of resistance. Even after the political independence, the once colonized nations or states were 'colonized' again with English language as their first language; Bible as their Holy Scripture and Christmas as their religious festival.

Due to the colonial psychosis, he does not think that he is victimized by the westerners. Jero, in some context, has felt the Europeans as corrupt, exploiter but he has shown his colonial mentality as well. Africa is an exotic terrific, barbaric and mysterious land for Jero. As a result, he does not present his native land and people without being victimized by the colonial mentality. This research explores the third space of the colonial people in relation to Soyinka's *Jero's Metamorphosis*. This space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures. It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but triplicates its identification in strategies of subversion that turn the space of the third world culture advocates the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature. This space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures. Moreover, he is corrupted and spoiled by the European technology because he accepts the European as the superior, powerful, and the ruler. He also wants to share the same attitude with the colonizers.

It is an important feature of colonial discourse that depends on the concept of fluctuation in ideological construction. Said says that cultural with its superior position has the power “to authorize, to dominate, to legitimate, denote, interdict and validate” (47). Thus, superiority of new culture dominates individuals, as they feel inferior of their culture in the new ones. Nationalism is important since people's identity is directly related to the nation; however, if there is loss of nation, there is loss of individual identity. Soyinka suggests first that the colonialist discourse of ambivalence is conspicuous illustration of its uncertainty. Secondly, it is migration of past ‘savages’ from their peripheral spaces to the homes of their 'master'. Ambivalence is a term developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite.

Soyinka provokes more discussions, in more countries, about the status of the literary than perhaps any other work of our time. The polemical debates that ensued over forced many people – readers and writers of all kinds – to reflect seriously about the effects and scope of literature, its responsibility and freedom. Ambivalence is a term developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and achieving its opposite. Ambivalence is an important feature of colonial discourse that dependent on the concept of fluctuation in the ideological construction. The mimicry of Soyinka's protagonist represents the strategies of colonial power and knowledge. Hence, self-imposition of hegemonic situation is selective borrowing that requires a willingness to recognize the distinctness of other culture, coupled with a desire to maintain at least some indigenous preferences:

Jero: Prophet Chume has left the ranks of the enemy and cast his lot among us. With his help, with the intimate knowledge that he has acquired of the workings of that foreign body to which he once belonged we shall re-create ourselves in the required image. We shall manifest our united spiritual essence in the very form and shape of the rulers of the land. Nothing, you will agree could be more respectable than that. [Rises.] Sister Rebecca, bring out the banner! (204)

Ambivalence is widely used in historical, political, sociological and economic analyses, as these disciplines continue to engage with the impact of imperialism upon third world societies. It includes the study and analysis of European territorial conquest, the various institutions of European colonialisms and the discursive operations of empire.

Jero caught in-between the 'natives', even nationalist, and a post-colonial metropolitan assimilates, the subject of cultural difference becomes a problem that they have described as the irresolution, the subject of resistance in the process of transformation. This play is centered on the colonial mentality among the African youth because they try to internalize the white ideologies in the form of politics, identity, culture, language and literary traditions. The subtle of subject construction in colonial discourse and the resistance of those subjects, the differing responses to such incursion and their contemporary colonial legacies in both pre-and post-independence nations and communities are concerned with the term ambivalence. They accept the Euro-centric belief of the westerners that white as superior and others as the inferior. The development of cultures necessarily questions essentialist models, interrogating the ideology underpins of unified, natural cultural norm, and one that undermines the centre/margin model of

colonialist discourse. Crucially, this statement is followed by a summary of Jero's own undesirable space of existence, as the certainties in his life slip away.

The characters are not presented to the reader; they are rather thrown into the fictional world. This hyperbolic nature of the postcolonial is identified as the abrupt entrance of the postcolonial subjects into the imperial center. The tense situation of ambivalence is only metaphors of the postcolonial situation. The list includes: language, familiar surroundings, customs, social position, and security. These things have either been lost entirely, or radically transformed; the process in the novels that describe this transformation is 'translation'. As Homi Bhabha argues that the culture of the 'in-between', dramatizes “the activity of culture's untranslatability; and in so doing, it moves the question of culture's appropriation beyond the assimilationist's dream” (9). Bhabha argues that each time the culture undergoes an attempted 'translation', the untranslatable element or cultural marker of existence and identity remains beyond assimilation, or beyond the fantasy of complete reproduction. In other words, the 'appropriation' of culture always breaks down as the appropriative gesture moves towards becoming 'an encounter with the ambivalent process of splitting and hybridity that marks the identification with culture's differences.

In this mode of writing, they should be viewed as the chronically of the unfettered migrant sensibility, that version of postcolonialism that unhooks historical tradition from place, and that creates new, self-conscious kinds of identity from a fragmentary vision. Jero also falls in the same situation since he fails to assimilate between two traditions. The play makes clear antithesis between the western modernization and the tradition by offering a comic view of Nigerian attitudes toward European values because it is not his

modern thoughts that reject the bride- price but “his rejection of traditional customs has a strong economic cause; he simply cannot afford” (Kronenfeld 205). Identity results in crisis when location of the culture is not in the specific time and space and culture. Homi K Bhabha finds positing one self in one location or image "problematic" since the posited subject "finds or recognizes itself through an image which is simultaneously alienating and hence potentially confrontational" (Mongia 46).

Ambivalence is the mixture of the colonizer and the colonized, where colonized people fall in the situation of attraction and repulsion towards the colonizer as Jero’s words; “in time of trouble it behoves us to come together, to forget old enmities and bury the hatchet in the head of a common enemy...no, better take that out. It sounds a little unchristian wouldn’t you say?” (175). Soyinka's protagonist, Jero evokes their complex mix of attraction and repulsion between colonizers and colonized because they are never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer. Their hybrid consciousness locates in in-between space; therefore, they have to mimic the colonizers. Jero's encounter does not always entail merger or fusion, but may lead to partial adaptation or negotiation, through a process of cultural ambivalence.

Cultural ambivalence happens when the two cultures face each other on a more nearly equal or roughly comparable basis. Ambivalence deals with the effects of colonization on cultures and societies. Jero has not only the repulsion but also the respect, reverence and love towards the Christian culture. Hence, they come to the clash of cultures and face the situation of mimicry. It is an account of ambivalent cultural response of the characters. They are created by the tension between innate desire and colonized mind. In such a situation neither he can fully negate/forget his original Yoruba

culture nor can he fully escape away from the culture of the colonizers. The notion of 'ambivalence' is the cultural cross of various sorts emanating from the encounter between colonizer and the colonized. This constant crossing has generated awareness that within hybridity the language-games or concepts of postcolonialism may irresolvably come into conflict.

When someone nurtured in one culture is placed in another, she/he may face cultural dislocation and ambivalence and the resultant reactions may be anger, frustration, fear, curiosity, fascination, repulsion, hatred or confusion. Therefore, the tension remains between their desire for western culture and unavoidable situation for the Yoruba tradition. As a result, Jero neither can fully avoid the western influence nor can he fully escape away from the culture of origin so that he faces the situation of "a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposites" (Ashcroft et al 12). This space of translation of cultural difference at the interstices is infused with temporality of the present that makes a moment of transition. Jero's struggling native cultures are dominated by the metropolitan cultures. The descendants of their ambivalent movements generated by colonialism have developed their own distinctive cultures, which both preserve and often extend and develop their original culture.

Such situations is often felt when the cultures are cut across the race and ethnicity and intersect the frontiers, and when people have been dispersed forever or certain time from their roots; "where groups can constitute themselves as horizontal, homogeneous, sovereign communities with high degree of trust, shared understandings temporary protection from legacies of oppression" (Pratt 71). Such people often show a strong relation with their places of origin and their practice. In other words, they stand upon the

poised traditions, the traces of particular cultural, traditions, languages and histories by which they were already shaped. And this claim finds its theoretical base in the discourse of "in-between space" especially that of Homik K. Bhaba. This space often is highly asymmetrical relation of domination and subordination- like colonialism, slavery perspective emphasizes how their relations to each other constitute in and subjects. When a culture gets hybridized it turns to be a contact zone as well as a space in-between two cultures. In this sense the inbetween spaces and the hybrid cultures of the postcolonial world are the realities of the space. Thus these spaces are both the signifier and the signified for the postcolonial writers. Neither can he assimilate these two cultures at the same time nor can he ignore one and take the side of another.

The adaptations of cultural identity are the positive affirmation of his hybridity. Ambivalence is the ongoing process, which is defining characteristics of mankind; from the day the first humans left East Africa to populate the world. It is either forceful or intentional movement from the place of origin to the unwanted or strange places. It can both be temporary or permanent. These days it has become a political issue because it challenges and questions the identity as language, nation and after all culture is different in the host country. That experiences of ambivalence differ is one of the crucial distinctions to be made in any discussion of the subject. The inbetween space creates homeland because a physical return was virtually impossible, an emotional or spiritual renewal was an ongoing necessity. They are always after the emotional or the spiritual renewal of their self.

This was part of attempt to signify the political, linguistic and cultural experience of societies that were former European colonies and concerned to focus on the material

effects of the historical condition of colonialism. Culture gives the individual their identity and shapes the human behavior that helps people to guide their action. People cannot assimilate into newly changed culture that brings identity crisis in the lives of individuals; "cultural with its superior position has the power to authorize, to dominate, to legitimate, denote, interdict and validate" (Said 9).

Cultural ambivalence caught between east and west is an extremely important topic in their fictions and play a decisive role in shaping out the intricacies of the plot. Once again the figure of the author contaminates the text because they also happen to be in the same place as his characters: he is also a stranger in a strange land and perhaps the prototype for his fictional creatures. They have made it a determining feature of counter hegemonic literature and politics. Soyinka is not alone in being fascinated by the liberator and metaphysical connotations that attach themselves to the concept. Cultural ambivalence refers not an only to the displacements of people in history but to a state of displacement that be falls humankind in general.

Such cultural hybridities is the consequence of the Orientalist projection of the west that results the 'ambivalent relationship' between colonizers and the colonized. With the process of decolonization, the newly independent identity is tried to make an effort to negate the cultural effects of colonization. Jero is felt essential to be free of biased Eurocentric images and try to create individual identity. They facilitate partial adaptation and partial rejection. Partial adaptation and partial rejection involves a greater subtlety in self-other relations. Resistance is necessary because individual's culture once dissimilar becomes similar,

share the same sentiments, values and goals and whereby attitudes of many persons are united and develop into a unified group.

Similarly, their intercultural engagements are equally prevalent in contemporary societies as it was in course of the development of human civilization. Cross-cultural dialogue is more numerous in the non-western post-colonial societies because the crux of post-colonial debates about cultural authenticity, hybridist, and resistance is most prominently drawn at the point of in-between location. In-between spaces, for Soyinka's protagonists, are a contact zone that includes identifying with the ideas, interests, and involves cross-cultural comparison between cultural forms. Their consciousness offer the spaces for him to uncover confront and reflect on suppressed aspects of roots that moves into the authenticity.

Through the colonial discourse, the colonial power gradually built up administrative systems based on European systems of government. Gradually, many colonial people were influenced by European ideas. Colonialism has changed the way of life of colonized people. Third World people went to live in European and they learnt new skill and crafts. They received education built by the colonial powers and they internalized the European ideas and thought. But they are unhappy because they are suppressed by the colonizer's attitudes. With these words, they initiate the discussion of the cultural ambivalence in his novel. The contact between aboriginals of the colonized and the colonizers had multifaceted impact on the land and culture of the native people. In a postcolonial society, the emerged binary relationship between the people of two cultures, races and languages and such relation produced a hybrid or cross-cultural society. This cross road situation is inbetween space which means it is none of the ones.

In-between space provides ground rules for communication across lines of difference and hierarchy that go beyond politeness but maintain mutual respect; a systematic approach to the concept of cultural mediation. The hegemonic influence is not only defined to advanced western countries but extends to non-western societies. The acquisition of western power opposing the independence movements and adopts a controlling power of representation in colonized societies. Therefore every controlling power of representation is urgently needs to reconstruct through the negotiation. That means the result of such borrowing that is assimilation, is not always motivated by the hegemonic influence rather it may turn the attraction. According to Bhabha, postcolonial people are always at the crossroads of two or more culture and tradition. Similarly, it examines the exploration of inbetween space and ambivalence conditions of the native people. The deep studies of Soyinka's plays are able to analyze the political, social and economic effects of colonialism to the non- European countries.

Likewise, Soyinka also views about the Jero's identity in between cultural differences because he has to negotiate between two cultures for his identity. The postcolonial culture is the culture of negation and interaction between cultures. Most of the problems that Jero encounter are the result of the postcolonial condition of the ambivalence. In terms of cultural identity there is nothing absolutely new in the world. Both texts celebrate hybridity, impurity, intermingling, transformation that comes of new and unexpected combinations of human beings cultures, ideas, and politics. This is their definition of hybrid; one they embrace in his novels. The texts effectively distribute the narrative voice and elements among several secondary characters that usurp the main story line and provide different reading and interpretations of the events.

Jero's Metamorphosis is the exercise in European postmodernity by a hybrid metropolitan intellectual who fail to show how deeply rooted it is in cultural and religious

traditions. They have generated a huge amount of criticism that debates and explores the relationships between Christianity and Yoruba tradition. That is to say, competing definitions of the literary generated by this publications have also depended upon, and predicated, competing definitions of the real. Another reading of the incident would see it as a more straightforward fantastic strategy employed as a metaphor of the postcolonial condition. Considering Bhaba's postulation it can be argued that discourses on hybridity represent not only the postcolonial contest against the notions of fixity. It is a space of contest because it provides the writers (post-colonial) a new situation and reality to write back the colonists.

It is a space of negotiation because the people of postcolonial world have to negotiate to adjust in the postcolonial mosaic culture. Since most of the postcolonial cultures bear the legacy of hybridity, it is the fundamental reality of the space and its inhabitants. Bhabha describes the inbetween position of hybrid existence as a third space that emerges between the traits of two mixed cultures. Soyinka provides an interesting look to acknowledge the recent expressions of inbetween space and the postcolonial world.

In-between space is a third space marked by the spatial and temporal co-presence of subjects previously separated by geographic and historical disjuncture where disparate culture meet, clash and grapple with each other. Jero's stories are the result of his inability to transcend the gap between cultures and inhabit this space as a hybrid. Since they are not attached to any culture, they keep bouncing between rejections, disassociated and uprooted. Mulder's approach sees migration from new angle. According to his approach, "Individual preference, resources, and constraints influence the extent to which certain events and circumstances in parallel career lead to migration" (qtd in Ainsaar 72). The colonized people fail to attain authentic selfhood and are victimized by their own illusion, though they try to be familiar with both cultures because they cannot behave as demand by the native at the time they feel alone and unhappy because of their unsuccessful revisit but they try the attempt to link themselves with the past in order to overcome the loneliness and suffering.

IV. Conclusion

Ambivalence is used in diverse way to include the study and analysis of European territorial conquest, the various institutions of European colonialisms, the discursive operations of empire, the subtle of subject construction in colonial discourse and the resistance of those subjects. The differing responses to such incursion and their contemporary colonial legacies are both pre-and post-independence nations and communities. Ambivalence is used in historical, political, sociological and economic analyses, as these disciplines continue to engage with the impact of European imperialism upon world societies. Jero has not only the repulsion but also the respect, reverence and love towards the Christian culture. Hence, he comes to the clash of cultures and faces the situation of mimicry. It is an account of ambivalent cultural response of Jero, protagonist of the play. He is created by the tension between innate desire and colonized mind. In such a situation neither he can fully negate/forget his original Yoruba culture nor can he fully escape away form the culture of the colonizers. Bhabha's notion of 'ambivalence' is the cultural cross of various sorts emanating from the encounter between colonizer and the colonized. Ambivalence is the mixture of the colonizer and the colonized, where colonized people work in the consent of the colonizer.

Jero evokes his complex mix of attraction and repulsion between colonizers and colonized because he is never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer. His hybrid consciousness locates in in-between space; therefore, he has to mimic the colonizers. Jero's encounter does not always entail merger or fusion, but may lead to partial adaptation or negotiation, through a process of cultural ambivalence. This happens when the two cultures face each other on a more nearly equal or roughly comparable basis. Ambivalence deals with the effects of colonization on cultures and societies.

Jero's negotiation is closely affiliated to the process of acculturation. Within the acculturating group, individuals lose their ties with the original cultural background, and acquire values; habits and behaviors from the dominant culture. It is usually applied to policies in some western or westernizing nation and the idea of the nation-state. When two diverse cultures meet, the mode of social and cultural interaction conflict occupies in an in-between space of human history so that conflict is the chief trademarks of human relations through which communication or dialogue between cultures is possible.

Ambivalence results because of the functional relation of the diverse cultural elements because the relation of the culture and power that most typically characterizes modern societies is best understood in the light of the respects in which the field of culture is now increasingly organized and constructed. Jero's cultural borrowing is a continuous process that is characterized by the fusion and adjustment of various cultural traits. He facilitates partial adaptation and partial rejection. Partial adaptation and partial rejection involves a greater subtlety in self-other relations. Resistance is necessary because individual's culture once dissimilar becomes similar, share the same sentiments, values and goals and whereby attitudes of many persons are united and develop into a unified group. Similarly, Jero's intercultural engagement is equally prevalent in contemporary societies as it was in course of the development of human civilization. Cross-cultural dialogue is more numerous in the non-western post-colonial societies because the crux of post-colonial debates about cultural authenticity, hybridity, and resistance is most prominently drawn at the point of in-between location.

In-between space, for Jero, is a contact zone that includes identifying with the ideas, interests, and involves cross-cultural comparison between cultural forms. His

consciousness offers the spaces for him to uncover confrontation and reflect on suppressed aspects of roots that move into the authenticity. In-between space provides ground rules for communication across lines of difference and hierarchy that go beyond politeness but maintain mutual respect; a systematic approach to the concept of cultural mediation.

The mimicry of Jero is as camouflage focuses on colonial ambivalence that sees "the colonizer as a snake in the grass" (Bhabha 85) who represents the strategies of colonial power and knowledge. Hence, self-imposition of hegemonic situation is selective borrowing that requires a willingness to recognize the distinctness of other culture, coupled with a desire to maintain at least some indigenous preferences. The hegemonic influence is not only defined to advanced western countries but extends to non-western societies. The acquisition of western power opposing the independence movements and adopts a controlling power of representation in colonized societies. Therefore every controlling power of representation is urgently needs to reconstruct through the negotiation. That means the result of such borrowing that is assimilation, is not always motivated by the hegemonic influence rather it may turn the attraction.

Works Cited

- Ainsaar, Mare. *Reasons for Move: A Study on Trends and Reasons of Internal Migration with Particular Interest in Estonian*. Finland: Turtu University Press, 2004.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., Tiffin, H, Eds. *The Post- Colonial Studies: Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- - -, Eds. *Key Concept in Post colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Banham, Martin. *The Cambridge Guide to Theatre*. Ed. Prof. James Brandon. New York: CUP, 1995.
- Beuson, Eugene and L.W. Connolly, ed. *Encyclopedia of Post-colonial Literature in English*. 3 vols. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Postcolonial Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992. 437-65.
- - - . *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Boehemer, Elleke. *Colonial and Post-colonial Literature*. New York: OUP, 1995.
- Brians, Paul. "Madman and Speacialist." *Back to World Literature in English Index* 6(Feb 2003): 12-20.
- Dallmayr, Fred. *Beyond Orientalism: Essays on Cross-cultural Enounter*. New Delhi: Rawat Publication, 2001.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. NewYork: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*. Ed. Padmini Mongia Delhi: OUP, 1997. 110-21.

- Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literaray Theory*. London: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Jacobs A. *Edge of Empire: Postcolonial and the City*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Jacobus, Lee A., ed. *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1993.
- Mongia, Padmini, Ed. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Oxford: Paperbacks, 2000.
- Ohadike, Don C. "Introduction: Igbo Culture and History." *Things Fall Apart*. Oxford: Heinemann, 2000. xix-xlix.
- Parry, Benita. "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse." *The Postcolonial Studies: Reader*. Eds. Ashcroft et al. London: Routledge, 1995. 36-44.
- Pratt, Mary Louse. "Introduction." *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and transcultation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1993.
- - - . *Orientalism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- Slemon, Stephen. "Post- colonial Critical Theories." *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Ed. Gregory Castle. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Soyinka, Wole. "Jero's Metamorphosis." *Collected Plays*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974. 170-215.
- Soyinka, Wole. *Myth, Literature And The African World*. U.K.: CUP, 1999.