

A Strategic Autobiography: Jean Rhys's *Voyage in the Dark*

「戦略的自伝小説——ジーン・リースの『暗闇の中の航海』」

HITOTSUYANAGI (KOBAYASHI) Eri *

The heroines in Jean Rhys's novels have been called "the Rhys woman" because their seeming passivity to their predicament both as a woman and a colonial invites us to construe them as reflections of the author herself: such critical tendency can be found in some Rhysian critics, for instance, Paula Le Gallez, in her analysis of Rhys's protagonists as "the same woman at different stage of experience . . . depicted as a 'passive victim'" (2). Certainly, the identification of her heroines with the author might risk reducing the complexity of her texts to a simple phrase, "the Rhys woman," but a comparison in this essay between autobiographical novels written by Jean Rhys and those of Asian Americans could cast critical new light upon the intricacy of their writings. In so doing, one of Rhys's inter-war novels, *Voyage in the Dark* (1934), may stand out as a strategic autobiography, making critiques of the text much sharper and reconceptualizing autobiographical novels as a complex example of the literature of injury and wounding viewed from postcolonial discourses. Furthermore, it will be worked out why the apparently full embodiment of strategic "difference" in the Rhysian version of "hybridity" -a female "White Creole" -does not seem to enjoy such a privileged status bestowed and demonstrated by some contemporary hybridity theorists as discursive mobility, displacement or indeterminacy, in the face of the present-day reality of accelerated moves toward multi-culturalism and globalisation.

I . The Elusiveness of a Female "White Creole"

Before her emigration to England, Jean Rhys developed a tendency to see things from the "other side" : she was a woman born on the island of Dominica in the Lesser Antilles, a former Crown Colony of England from the eighteenth century before becoming independent in 1978, and brought up by an English-Scottish family with a history of slave-owning in the erstwhile British West Indies. This "other side," however, is not equivalent to "the Caribbean side" at all. In fact, there is something elusive about her to refuse any clear categorisation in racial, class, and-especially-"identical" terms. Living in Dominica with a sense of "racial superiority and colonial inferiority" (Ashworth 30), leaving the island for the place of "the intimate enemy" in the phrase of Ashis Nandy, and thus moving from the periphery of the British Empire to that of metropolitan English society, Rhys always had no sense of belonging anywhere, even in her own supposedly territory-either in the English community in the West Indies or metropolitan English society in the centre of Empire. The complexity of this insider-outsider situation explains why critics almost always face a crucial problem in the consideration of her texts: it is the placement of her heroines and, by extension, of Jean Rhys herself.

This elusiveness becomes most remarkable if Rhys's racial identity is taken into full critical deliberation. It is complex and equivocal in the sense that, strictly speaking, Jean Rhys was a white female, but, culturally speaking, she was an other who felt isolated both from the English society in the metropolis, resulting from her lack of wealth and social status, and from the Afro-Caribbean community in the West Indies, being a descendant of a slave-owner who had been complicit in the system of oppression. Probably, the most important (but also most difficult) issue in the exploration of "the Worlding of Jean Rhys" in the term of Sue Thomas as a whole comes down, in the end, to the fact that she was by birth a "White Creole." White Creoles were, on the one hand, those who were distinguished from the black community by the clear racial difference of their whiteness and by their subsequent feeling of racial superiority toward black people. However, on the other hand, even in the metropolis, they were suspected, being born and brought up in a colony, of products of ensuing

Key words : Jean Rhys, autobiographical novels, a white Creole, Asian Americans, abjection

*平成8年度生 比較文化学専攻

miscegenation,¹ thereby to become the object of discrimination culturally as well as racially. In addition to this double estrangement, the development of the phrase itself, “White Creole,” was marked by a complex process. This term was, in the first place, produced out of a discretionary racial desire that attempted to differentiate distinctly between white people and black people. Judith Raiskin explains the process of how “White Creole” was formed:

The term [Creole] has a variety of contradictory meanings. It originally referred to those of Anglo-European descent born in the colonies and was used to indicate so-called racial purity. The term was also used to refer to slaves and animals locally born, rather than imported, and so the adjective “white” was later added to distinguish white from black Caribbeans.

(A Footnote to *Wide Sargasso Sea*, 39)

In short, the Creoles are “always already” perceived to have something to do with a racial mixture, as seen in the arbitrary bestowment of the additional adjective “white.” This racial purity was a matter of especially momentous importance for those who emigrated from the colonies to settle in the metropolis. Rhys’s family was no exception, for, as one of her biographers, Carole Angier, writes, Rhys’s mother-side family, the Lockharts, were “proud of their ‘pure English’ descent” (7) in the nineteenth century on Dominica. Judging from this evolution of the phrase “Creole,” then, either in its term’s sense or in its cultural one, it is understandable that “White Creoles” were placed in a very unstable position.

Torn precariously between the position of a descendant of a slave-owing family mixed with guilty consciousness in a former British colony and that as a member of a so-called minority with colonial inferiority in the metropolis, the “White Creole” was “a double outsider” (328) to borrow the phrases of Helen Tiffin. This double perspective of a “White Creole” woman was further complicated by what Ashworth calls “an imported patriarchal system to which, being female, she too was subordinated” (32). The predicament of being a woman is thus added to the sense of guilty consciousness caused by her family’s history as a slave-owner and to her marginalization by being a member of a minority. Before writing her novels, Rhys gained and incorporated within herself this “hybrid” but “distorted” or “uneasy” consciousness.

Naturally, Rhys’s precarious syncretism influenced her constitution of the protagonists in her novels, all of whom share this complicated, triple Otherness. It leads to her heroines’ eluding any dichotomic racial or social categorizations, which regard it as possible to draw a clear line between “white” and “black” or between “the ruler” and “the ruled.” Her female protagonists are subversive in the sense that their very existences are hard to define within the frame of such a binary opposition as “English people” vs. “the Caribbean.” Therefore, they remain ambiguous, problematic, and, as it were, enigmatic. To put it another way, the formidable “Rhys woman,” by being a female “White Creole,” resists and destabilises all easy classifications, whether racial, gender, class or national. A young heroine, Anna in *Voyage in the Dark*, for example, rejects being easily categorised racially, socially and culturally: this is partly because she also is a female “White Creole,” placed between the metropolis and the colony, and partly because she sees a double vision, positioned at the crossroad between her vague memory of her distant home island and her unfamiliarity with the metropolis. She is white, but she “always wanted to be black” (27), a chorus girl but “always look[s] ladylike” (10), and an impecunious teenager but refuses to “ask. . . for money” (58). She thus resists any easy definition. Born in the West Indies, Anna Morgan emigrated to England as a teenager without much help from either of her step-mother in England nor from her uncle in the West Indies, living on the small income of a chorus girl.

Voyage in the Dark portrays the tragedy of Anna, a “fallen woman,” who drifts from being a chorus girl through being a masseuse to becoming someone who is understood by others as a prostitute; as a result, she undergoes a subsequent pregnancy and a nearly fatal abortion. We read of these incidents through the multiple voices of her several layers of consciousness, which Mary Lou Emery criticises as “fragmented voices, often in conflict with one another, that appear to speak with purely subjective irony, or even irrationality” (27). For Anna, who, as a Creole girl, lacks a strong sense of connection to any specific place or culture, England is still perceived as only dreamlike: “Sometimes it was as if I were back there and as if England were a dream. At other times England was the real thing and out there was the dream, but I

could never fit them together” (7-8). Ironically enough, even the memory of her home island does not secure her identity. She is estranged even from her home island and most painfully from the people with whom she seeks friendship, but from whom the history of colonialism has separated her. This dilemma is most distinctly represented in a flash-back scene, in which she recollects that, in spite of her desperate trial to identify herself with a black friend, Francine, it was no use since Anna “knew that of course she [Francine] disliked me [Anna] too because I was white” (62).

In theory, Anna could be placed in what is called in the contemporary postcolonial criticism “in-betweenness,” “strategic differences” or “hybridity,” but it should be highlighted that we encounter in her situation “pain,” “defection,” “alienation” or “aporia” rather than the valorisation of such postcolonial tactics themselves. Her double estrangement as a “White Creole” appears to make it much more difficult to attempt to regain her “lost narcissism” than the Asian Americans in the argument of Rey Chow on their autobiographical novels. Asian Americans are those who, as is often pointed out, “are omitted from mainstream representation . . . lack of proper societal representation, the absence of societal approval” (Chow 64), so their writings of their own experiences become the site of the occasion for recalling and remembering their colonial, therefore “painful,” experiences as Asian Americans. Notwithstanding many startling resemblances between the protagonists in Jean Rhys’s text and those of the Asian Americans in Chow’s discussions, they nevertheless mark remarkable differences as well, as will be argued in what follows.

II .The Retrieval of a Lost Narcissism in Autobiographical Novels

In one of her autobiographical essays, *Smile Please* (1979), Rhys reveals why she began to write, making clear her will to describe what she felt as “abject” life in her novels: “I must write. If I stop writing my life will have been an *abject* failure. It is that already to other people. But it could be an *abject* failure to myself. I will not have earned death” (163, emphasis added). In her analyses of Rhys’s works as a whole, Elaine Savory examined the process of Rhys’s novelistic development, saying: “Rhys made an impressively swift transition from an *amateur* writer of *therapeutic* diaries, with the instinct to use writing *to erase painful memories*, to a professional and impressive writer who was reviewed in powerful literary publications” (36, emphasis added). Certainly, one of Rhys’s purposes of writing might be “to erase painful memories,” but the word “therapeutic” could be thought to fully convey the meanings of her “painful” memories in the real sense of the word. It seems to me that the employment of the adjective “therapeutic” serves only to diminish the acuteness of the “pain” of Jean Rhys to something commonplace, trite, less significant, and consequently “amateur.” Besides, what concerns me most is that there lies something more desperate, more pressing, and more intense in her frank disclosure about her painful experiences and memories as a female “White Creole” -a doubly, or sometimes thrice, marginalized other-who is determined to write about herself as such. Most importantly, however, the gravity of her pain in her writings enables us to read each of her novels within what Rey Chow calls “an autobiography that writes about the failure of a narcissism . . . that was, culturally speaking, always already blocked and silenced” (67). Indeed, what appears most urgently necessary is to trace the memory of others in their texts-to put it another way, as Brett de Barry rightly calls for, “more complex readings of the literature of injury and wounding” (404).

Undoubtedly, Jean Rhys’s major fictions can be called “the literature of injury and wounding” as Brett de Barry named, in the exact sense that they were generated by the author’s painful experiences that remained tacitly but vividly in her mind. Analysing one of the characteristics seen in the autobiographical novels of Asian Americans, Chow first directs our notice to the aspect that “the point of representation lies in the act of remembering” (68). Asian Americans are those who are, as is often pointed out, others in a WASP dominating society. Since they are not allowed to develop their narcissism (in Sigmund Freud’s sense), or since they have to abandon it in the face of the mainstream society, their writing about their own life becomes the site for retrieval of their “lost or wounded narcissism” (65). In this point, the autobiographical novels of Asian Americans curiously bear a similarity to those of Jean Rhys.

After revisiting Stuart Hall’s famous essay, “Cultural Identity and Diaspora” (1990), and reconsidering the politics of

“becoming” in order to emphasize any element of mobility, dynamism, or something “in process,” Rey Chow takes up a collection of essays by Asian Americans edited by Garrett Hongo for her discussion. She first cites a stimulating investigation of Azade Seyhan that immigrant writings are “almost exclusively autobiographical in nature” (62); she then attempts to find the reason for the discrepancy between the concept of “hybridity” suggested by Hall, containing the progressive and subversive aspects, and the reality of “autobiographical novels” -viz., “what seems to be a retreat into the personal; a withdrawal, that is, in terms of temporality, a retrospective search, a looking-back through the fragments of history” (62) written by a group of “hybridised” writers. Admitting it is “the most banal, yet unshakable, issue of writing about ethnicity” (62), Chow arrives at her provisional conclusion that, underlying the disparity, there is “problematic of self-formation, around which hybridity produces important consequences . . . instead of a valorization of hybridity itself, what we encounter [in Hongo’s collection] is, rather, *ambivalence, anger, pain, melancholy, shame, and abjection*” (62, emphasis added). Indeed, these unstable empathic devices in literature -frustrating rather than promising heterogeneity-are what we encounter without exception in the autobiographical fictions of Jean Rhys.

Surely, in theory, everybody does indeed lose his/her narcissism, but it is not irrelevant to assume that it is absolutely those whose social positions are located in the so-called minority who most acutely miss his/her lost narcissism. Because they are neither allowed to develop the love of self-namely, an affection that is almost essential for self-preservation-nor to enter mainstream society, their attempt to regain their narcissism becomes for them, among other things, a more desperate and inescapable process than for others. Recognising, “At this juncture, representation such as writing becomes an intricate matter” (65), Chow confronts a crucial question that is contradictable but unavoidable in their writings: “How is the experience of an inaccessible narcissism to be “represented” ? How can something that has not, as it were, been allowed to develop, and is therefore not empirically available, be written about?” (65) She directs our notice to a feature that “it is at this limit of what is representable. . . that the tendency to be autobiographical among immigrant writers takes on special significance” (65).

As a response to the vital issue presented above, Chow provides us with her temporarily reached conclusion that accounts for the writings of the Asian Americans; it also probably serves as a reply to the “hybridised” but “painful” autobiographical novel of Jean Rhys:

Seen in this light, autobiographical writing is perhaps not simply a straightforward account about oneself but more a symptomatic attempt to (re)gain access to a transindividual narcissism . . . it is the act through which it becomes possible, perhaps for the first time, to connect and compose oneself, and thus to gain the “self-regard” that seems to be absent all along. Moreover, it is access to such self-regard that might serve to vindicate the group’s identity-the elusive yet undeniable something called “Asian-Americanness.”

(65-6, emphasis in the original)

At the crossroads between the attempts to retrieve the “self-regard” that society forced them to dispose of, and the inscription of their painful and agonising experiences in autobiographical novels, both Asian Americans and a “White Creole” intersect and overlap. It is in the very act of writing that, even for a moment, both of them are capable of recovering their wounded narcissism that has been blocked and silenced for a very long time; at the same time, this act becomes the very site for their self-formation as an “Asian-American” or a “White Creole” for the first time. It is quite understandable that autobiography is the very proof of their “abject” but “substantial” existences, which are surely difficult to define but still more difficult to deny.

III. Not Allowed To Become “the Abject”

Seen from Chow’s view, the following scene in *Voyage in the Dark* takes on a new aspect on the painful memory of an ethnic group, in which, in the midst of her trauma at being abandoned by Walter, Anna abruptly cites text-book information about the indigenous Carib people, particularly with regard to their persecution, as if to acknowledge,

re-present, and speak for their whole history of their existence from their rebellion against the colonialist British rule to their extinction by a massacre:

“The Caribs indigenous to this island were a warlike tribe and their resistance to white domination, though spasmodic, was fierce. As lately as the beginning of the nineteenth century they raided one of the neighbouring islands, under British rule, overpowered the garrison and kidnapped the governor, his wife and three children. They are now practically exterminated.” (91)

The sudden insertion of the history of Carib indigenous people, which is highly associated with British rule, massacre, or extinction, shows that Anna empathized herself with that ethnic group: Anna, dejected and in the trauma of separation from Walter, seems to identify herself with the defunct native people who are certainly no longer existent, but rebellious and proud of their ethnicity, resisting vigorously against the British domination. This scene is also significant in that Anna connects herself not only with the insurgent group but also with the entire ethnic group: she makes blur the line which divides an individual and a collective group.

Anna, identifying with and provoked by the memories of the Caribs' collectively mobilized resistance, dreams the dreams of her defiance, that is, the dream of her affiliation to her native land, and, probably furthermore, the dream of the overthrow of the colonial and male patriarchy, as is implicitly suggested by her unsuccessfully finished relationship to Walter. The despondency which results from his abandon and by her vain attempt to retain his love are both projected into the episode of the extinct Carib, in which the members of the tribe were trying to attain hegemony over the land on the island, even though they were exterminated in the end despite their harsh resistance.

Ironically, however, her nostalgic identification is “always already” pervaded with, and therefore tainted by, her complicity with the colonial imperialism, being an offspring of a slave-owner: Anna's family employs a few servants of black or coloured people, including Francine as well. It is precisely in her shock of recognition of not understanding “patois” (62) spoken by Francine that she realises Francine is racially different from her:

Francine was there, washing up. Her eyes were red with the smoke and watering. Her face was quite wet. She wiped her eyes with the back of her hand and looked sideways at me. Then she said something in patois and went on washing up. (62)

What is critical here is that any recovery of Anna's lost narcissism is thus very transient at best: no sooner does she identify with those who are on the side of the colonised, her guilty consciousness arises as a coloniser and an accomplice in British Imperialism.²In the face of her desperate aspiration to belong to the Carib and black people, or, more precisely, to have emotional solidarity with them, it is absolutely impossible because she is a “White Creole.” As long as she is a white, she is “always already” complicit with the history of colonialism. This sense of double-bind that Anna is forced to have puts “White Creole” in more complicated situation than Asian Americans that Chow describes.

However, no matter how intricate or problematic a dead-end Anna is caught at, there seems to be a possibility for her to escape from this impasse, with the help of the concept of “abjection.” This concept was first introduced by Julia Kristeva and developed by Chow in her argument of subversiveness in the Asian Americans' writings. In spite of a clear contrast between the texts of Asian American writers and those of Jean Rhys, Chow's speculation can be regarded as helpful for the re-interpretation of both works of the ethnicities.

According to Kristeva, the abject is the name of “[what] does not cease challenging its master” (2), “something rejected from which one does not part . . . Imaginary uncanniness and real threat” (4), or “what disturbs identity, system, order . . . does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite” (4). In other words, it is something potentially subversive to the dominant, something ambivalent to the subject, and, accordingly, something challenging to the Subject. It is what one wants to reject only to fail to part with. Elizabeth Grosz takes as examples of abjection “tears, saliva, faeces, urine, vomit, mucus” (qtd. in Chow 198)-all of which are closely related to body metabolism. As Grosz summarises, it is something “neither simply part of the body nor separate from it” (198); thus, it remains ambivalent. However, it should be noted that the very fluidity, mobility and precariousness of the abject mark the possibility of its power to undermine.

Not only Chow but also Kristeva is concerned with such binary oppositions as subject/object or pure/impure under the guise of the flesh/blood opposition. By calling attention to these opponents, Kristeva attempts to demonstrate the complex dynamics of “the cathexis of maternal function—mother, women, reproduction” (91). As stated by Kristeva, in the subject-formation the subject tries to separate from what she calls “the abject” so as to protect the very subject and to provide rules or orders for itself. However, precisely because “the abject” is something that can never be expelled from the subject, being vital for the body and remaining a precondition of the corporeal, the subject confronts ambivalence to be caught in aporia. However, it is precisely in this chaotic state of abjection that the occasion for subversiveness arises.

It is worthwhile to see such subversiveness exists also in the intricate but powerful dynamism of maternal function—a mother and a child. Interestingly, in *Voyage in the Dark*, there is such a kind of dynamics similar to the unstableness of the notion of abjection, which might serve as an opportunity to undermine the subject, if we make an investigation on the two versions of the ending of the novel.

Voyage in the Dark has two endings. In the final, published version, Anna survives after a back-street illegal abortion, as is indicated by the doctor’s comment, “She’ll be all right . . . Ready to start all over again in no time, I’ve no doubt” (159). The very end of the novel is as follows:

When their voices stopped the ray of light came in again under the door like the last thrust of remembering before everything is blotted out. I lay and watched it and thought about starting all over again. And about being new and fresh. And about mornings, and misty days, when anything might happen. And about starting allaver again, all over again. . . . (159)

However, Jean Rhys herself preferred another ending, in which Anna dies as a result of the illegal operation:

And the concertina-music stopped and it was quiet very like just before you go to sleep and it stopped and there was a ray of light like the last thrust of remembering before everything is blotted out and blackness comes. . . .

(A manuscript in the Jean Rhys Collection)³

In this original ending, Rhys allows Anna to die in the midst of her memories, to dissolve into a “blackness” which succeeds everything else. In a hallucination after the operation, Anna might be capable of doing everything or even “becoming” anything—for example, of allowing herself to identify completely with Francine without any guilty consciousness of her family’s slave-trading history. However, in the published version, Anna has to live on, only to go back to the drifting life again on the back streets of the metropolis. Jean Rhys had to give up her preferred ending: she was persuaded to keep Anna alive by her publisher, who insisted “the ending be more optimistic to make it easier for readers to accept” (Savory 90-91).

If we provisionally regard Anna as the subject, it theoretically follows that her unborn child becomes the abject, since it is unwanted—whether Anna is incapable of financial support or whether she is not culturally allowed to raise it. In the published version, where Anna and the child are forcibly disconnected in order for Anna to keep living, the subversive potentiality is lost forever on account of the very desire to separate the two, a desire which Kristeva believes to be founded on the clear-cut division between mother/child or life/death, or human-being/embryo. In the unpublished version, however, subversiveness remains, no matter how implicit and seemingly inconceivable: it is quite difficult to separate the child from Anna, because they are in a chaotic union headed toward death, making unclear and ambiguous the boundary between mother and child. In the very fusion of them, there is a chance for Anna (the subject) to become the abject (the child), since they are inseparable, making even more obscure the dividing line between the subject/ the abject. In other words, unless she is dissociated from the embryo, which can easily be included as an item in Grosz’s abjection list that is related to the body, Anna will become subversiveness capable of undermining identity, system, or order.

However, the fact is, since Jean Rhys was not allowed to publish her preferred ending, which is therefore not available to general readers, it becomes difficult for such readers to conceive of Anna as subversive. Certainly, it can be said that, as long as Anna’s life continues, she will possess such an undermining potentiality within herself, posing a threat to normal English society as a cultural other. However, because of the rejection of Rhys’s first, preferred ending, there is no denying

that at least one possibility is lost forever—the possibility that Anna as a theoretical object will destabilize the boundary between mother/child, empowering Jean Rhys to provide readers with a powerful, intensive, and explicit subversiveness. The renunciation Rhys had to accept at the request of her publisher and readers at that time seems to me almost identical with that of Anna, who lost an opportunity to articulate and express herself, confronted with the estrangement either from black community or from English society. It seems as if Jean Rhys was not even allowed to make her strategic choice to “become something” positively reconceptualized and advocated by Hall. Perhaps, the most significant reminder is that, even in the space of difference—among those who are excluded from the predominant society—there are still “differences” ; even among the politics of difference there exist multi-layered “differences.” The comparison between the texts of Asian Americans and those of Jean Rhys as well as the critique of the two endings of *Voyage in the Dark* compels us to gravely reconsider, despite being a fully-embodied personification of “the object,” “hybridity,” and strategic “differences,” the female “White Creole” has yet to succeed in fully expressing herself in spite of her desperate cry for recognition.

¹As to the cultural meanings of the colonial females in the context of sexuality in the late 19th century and early 20th century Europe, see Sander Gilman, “Black Bodies, White Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century Art, Medicine, and Literature,” *Race, Writing, and Difference*, ed. Henry Louis Gates, Jr. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985) 223-61.

²For considerations of the ambivalence of white women toward colonialism, see Nupur Chaudhuri and Margaret Strobel et al., eds., *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992); Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* (London: Verso, 1992).

³This is a transcript of an unpublished version kept in the Jean Rhys Collection, McFarlin Library, The University of Tulsa.

Works Cited

- Angier, Carole. *Jean Rhys: Life and Work*. Boston: Little Brown, 1990.
- Ashworth, Andrea. "The Construction of Cultural and Personal Identities in the Works of Jean Rhys." Diss. U of Oxford, 1996.
- Chow, Rey. "The Secrets of Ethnic Abjection." *Traces 2* (2001): 53-77.
- De Barry, Brett. "Editing Journal." *Traces 2* (2001): 399-413.
- Emery, Mary Lou. *Jean Rhys at "World's End" : Novels of Colonial and Sexual Exile*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1990.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers in Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1982.
- Le Gallez, Paula. *The Rhys Woman*. London: Macmillan, 1990.
- Nandy, Ashis. *Intimate Enemy*. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Rhys, Jean. *Smile Please: An Unfinished Autobiography*. 1979. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1981.
- . *Voyage in the Dark*. 1934. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.
- . *Wide Sargasso Sea*. 1966. Ed. Judith L. Raiskin. New York: W. W. Norton, 1999.
- Savory, Elaine. *Jean Rhys*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Thomas, Sue. *The Worlding of Jean Rhys*. Westport and London: Green Press, 1999.
- Tiffin, Helen. "Mirror and Mask: Colonial Motifs in the Novels of Jean Rhys." *World Literature Written in English* 17.1 (April 1978): 328-41.

「戦略的自伝小説——ジーン・リースの『暗闇の中の航海』」

一柳（小林） 英里

本論文では少数民族による自伝的小説の定義を従来よりも広義に解釈し、これらが単に個人の体験の記述にとどまらず、主流社会により手離すことを余儀なくされた少数民族としての「傷つき失われたナルシズム」（レイ・チョウ、2001年）を回復しようとする試みであることを例証するものである。まず、白人クレオール女性として英国社会で絶えず疎外感を味わってきた作家ジーン・リースの手による『暗闇の中の航海』（1934年）という自伝色の濃い小説と、アジア系アメリカ人の自伝小説を比較検討し、この作家たち——近年ポストコロニアル批評で評価されている「雑種性（ハイブリディティ）」という概念をまさに体现する存在——が描く自伝的な作品と、雑種性が含意する攪乱性や流動性を強調（そして賞賛）してやまない思想家たちの理論とのあいだには、まぎれもなく乖離が存在している点を指摘した。その理由を、いわゆる文化的社会的「他者」に位置づけられる作家が書記行為を通しておこなう自己形成の複雑さにあることに求め、いわば「傷についての文学」（ブレット・ドバリー、2001年）を慎重に読み解き議論する必要があることを示唆した。さらに、ジーン・リースが時代の要請により『暗闇の中の航海』の結末部を書き変えざるを得なかった事実に着目し、リースはポストコロニアル批評で戦略の一つとみなしうる「エスニックなおぞましきもの／棄却（アブジェクション）」（チョウ）になることさえも許されず、「白人クレオール女性」として承認を求めた彼女の試みが中断された点についても考察した。

キーワード：ジーン・リース、自伝的小説、ホワイト・クレオール、アジア系アメリカ人、
棄却（アブジェクション）