

Madness as Insurrection: Decolonizing the Doubly Colonized Female Self in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*

Sahar Zeeshan¹

ABSTRACT

Article History:

Received:

May 9, 2022

Accepted:

June 30, 2022

Funding:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

This research seeks to investigate the language of female madness as the central trope of the decolonizing struggle against double colonization. Rhys' female protagonist in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Antoinette, is alienated and deprived of her original identity in race and class. The hegemonic process of colonial patriarchy embedded in the victimization of the female subject objectifies her through her double marginalization at the hands of colonial apparatus and patriarchy. Her decolonizing outburst against double colonization, when expressed through an unconventional language, is viewed as an act of madness by the society. This research routes its argument through the so-called sanity of a societal structure rooted in the dispensation of colonial atrocity which, as a consequence, gives rise to mental imbalance (madness) of the female protagonist. This study, located in the qualitative paradigm, develops its methodology on the qualitative grounds with an interpretive and exploratory design. It uses textual analysis as research method and deploys theoretical support from Postcolonial Feminism with a focus on 'decolonization' and 'double colonization.'

Keywords: Female Madness, Double marginalization, Colonial Patriarchy, Decolonization, Postcolonial Feminism.

¹ Sahar Zeeshan is an Assistant Professor at The University of Lahore.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License \(CC BY-NC 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

“Madness” has stereotypically been associated with women since Victorian era. Showalter investigates that “the percentages of women in Victorian asylums increased, and by 1850s there were more women than men in public institutions” (1985, p.52). *Madness of Women* raises a question “why women are more likely to be positioned or diagnosed as mad than men?” (Ussher, 2011, p. 2). The answer may be derived from the norms of Victorian era itself as women were not permitted to be readers, authors, or even were not allowed to vote. Since they were silenced in every way, men described them in stereotypical modes as ‘angels’ or ‘monsters’. Women were expressed in a phallogocentric language by men, their emotions were curbed as they were tagged as ‘lunatic’ or ‘witches’; their psyche thereby remained a dark unexplored territory for men (Ussher, p. 142). Such tags needed to be dismantled through the signifier of madness itself to give vent to the revulsion that had long been capitulated. This resistance through the language (of madness) has to be “an explosive, utterly destructive return with a force . . . equal to the most forbidden suppressions” (Cixous, 1976, p. 886). Cixous delineates that women should write about women through their bodies, they must . . . express themselves through the “impregnable language” that will revert to “regulations and codes... including the word ‘silence’” (p. 886).

This essay addresses the proposition that female madness in *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1997) is another form of resistance from the colonial margin through the character of Antoinette. Antoinette’s madness is a decolonizing outcome against the double oppression (colonial and patriarchal) and Rochester, being white and male, plays both the roles aptly. Antoinette’s decolonization is expressed through her madness which is resistance against her double subservience. Since Rochester’s vengeance needs to be answered in an equally detestable way, Antoinette enters the saneness of madness to first justify how much rational she is; conversely, she also finds solace and liberation from the perturbing colonial and phallogocentric autonomy. Eventually, Antoinette succeeds in challenging the colonial as well as patriarchal hegemony through the subversive language of madness.

Double colonization is defined by Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin as the double oppression of women while “the colonial domination of empire and the male domination of patriarchy exert control over female colonial subjects” (2013, p. 66). This double marginalization of women showcases the spirit of decolonization that Ashcroft et al. term as “revealing and dismantling colonialist power in all its forms” (p. 56). The concept of ‘subaltern’ is crucially related to this paper because it studies the hegemonic process of power and control that asserts condemnation upon the “subaltern” (Spivak, 1988, p. 288). The female subject has to doubly resist the control of colonial power as well as the colonized male as her oppressor. Gayatri Spivak observes that, “in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow” (p. 287). But this study nuances the available scholarship in that it is foregrounded on the revulsion of the female subaltern towards the colonial as well as male autocracy through the signifier of madness. Madness therefore is an apt medium to

answer back the power dynamics (of both the colonizers and the male). This research further challenges the conventional viewpoint of society towards female madness as it is a mode of resistance that is ascribed as madness.

This study, however, does not focus on the victimization of Antoinette; it rather celebrates her madness through her newly acquired spirit of decolonization which counters colonization and male-centric order. Linked with this line of argument, this analysis investigates madness not from the lens of society through the introspective sight of the so called “mad” labeled by society. Therefore the madness of Antoinette is proved as a justified reaction against her double colonization. This investigation, therefore, seeks to answer the following questions: How is colonial patriarchy a cause of female mental derangement in Jean Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea*? How does madness play out as an apt signifier of decolonization in the text? How does the mad female subject challenge the colonial and male hegemony and their supporting discourse?

This paper develops its methodology on the qualitative grounds and progresses in an argumentative mode with the help of theoretical support deployed for textual analysis of the text. While subscribing to the theoretical paradigm of Postcolonial Feminism, it draws on two of its important constructs: ‘decolonization of the female self’ and ‘double colonization of the colonized woman.’ The concepts are drawn from the writings of Michel Foucault (*History of Madness*, 1990), Ania Loomba (*Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, 2005), Chandra Talpade Mohanty (*Feminism Without Borders*, 2003), Bill Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffins (*The Empire Writes Back*, 2000), and Frantz Fanon (*The Wretched of the Earth*, 1963) respectively. Antoinette’s ambivalent and miscegenated identity is explored in the light of Homi K. Bhabha’s concept of ‘ambivalence’ expounded in *The Location of Culture* (1994). The critique on ‘double colonization’ owes to the acclaimed Postcolonial Feminists, Gayatri Spivak, and French feminist theorist, Helene Cixous.

Alshammari refers to Michel Foucault who states in his book, *Madness and Civilization* that madness is constructed by society. Foucault, Alshammari notes, dismantles the idea of madness and sanity as detachable, rather they co-exist just like reason and unreason are inseparable (1967, p.4). Foucault emphasizes the intertwining of madness and sanity which, he holds, are “confusedly implicated on each other...existing for each other, in relation to each other” (1967, p. xxviii). Therefore Antoinette’s madness simultaneously carries a sense of sanity that becomes resistance against the colonial and patriarchal oppression. Alshammari notes that, in Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea*, madness and death ironically “threaten society’s definition of normal: as such the female protagonists are able to disrupt society’s oppressive notions-even” (2016, p. 139). While commenting upon Antoinette’s quest for freedom through suicide, Alshammari remarks that it is “an attempt to break free from the societal restraints that have kept her subordinated and oppressed” (ibid). Her death therefore “is not a tragic one, and she is able to

recover a part of her past, her history and a part of her sense of self through her death” (p. 48).

Gayatri Spivak seconds Foucault’s stance in her acclaimed essay “Can the Subaltern Speak?” She clearly annotates the position of females as doubly affected in a colonial culture: “If, in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow” (p. 287).

Ania Loomba asserts in *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* that colonial brutality engenders resistance as its counterpart: “within the framework of psychoanalytic discourse, anti-colonial resistance is coded as madness” (2007, p.119). She enunciates elsewhere that it is not the colonized subject but the colonizer’s madness that plagues and “distorts human relations and renders everyone within it sick” (p.43).

In *The Empire Writes Back*, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, referring to Frantz Fanon’s viewpoint, proclaim that “the act of writing texts of any kind in postcolonial areas is subject to the political, imaginative, and social control involved in the relationship between colonizer and colonized”, and this has created “the possibility of decolonizing the culture” (2000, p. 28). Furthermore, they consider Jean Rhys’ texts as one having the feminist perspective while overlapping postcolonial theory (p. 30). This argument further brings into account the correlation between the dominant and dominated that inevitably lets the postcolonial writers adopt “subversive strategies” (p. 32).

Chandra Talpade Mohanty gives the western eyes’ perspective of viewing a difference between the Third World Woman and the First World Woman in *Feminism without Borders*. While defining resistance, Mohanty exclaims that “resistance clearly accompanies all forms of domination and inheres in [all] gaps, fissures and silences of hegemonic narratives” (2003, p. 83). She suggests modes of resistance that should invent “new forms of encoding resistance” (p. 79), gives centrality to the process of decolonization, and calls it a “feminist collective struggle against hegemonic power structures” (p. 254).

Helene Cixous, in “Laugh of the Medusa,” proposes the need of a “new language” that is capable of “translating those moments when language fails us and the body attempts to speak” (qtd. in Abigail, 2004, p. 37). Cixous suggests the urgent implementation of women’s own language to liberate them from codes and conventions of phallogocentric order. She emphasizes the mode of writing that demands the inclusion of women in their texts so that they can remake their own history through female mode of expression (1976, p. 875). This resistance through language has to be “an explosive, utterly destructive return with a force . . . equal to the most forbidden suppressions” (p.886). Antoinette’s emotional turmoil befittingly finds expression through the signifier of madness. It raises a revolutionary decolonizing voice to answer back the schizoid colonial atrocity.

Gallagher and Kinana Hamam's work is useful in terms of women's madness in colonial times. Gallagher, in *Colonial Madness*, considers Foucault's views on madness as a fundamental discourse in an age of reason. While commenting on *Wide Sargasso Sea*, she exclaims: "Mr Rochester serves as a double oppressor; coming from England he stands for British colonialism, but since he is also male he is also at the top of the patriarchal hierarchy" (p.536). Kinana Hamam quotes Reyes' argument about the madness in *Wide Sargasso Sea* as a "gendered driven metaphor for anger, depression, levels of insanity and emotional disenfranchisement" (Reyes qtd. in Hamam, 2014, p.130). That is how, through madness, Rhys implies resistance against colonial mindset and patriarchy.

The notion of madness has commonly been associated with women and tagged by men. In Victorian era, the deviated behaviour of a woman from the masculine tradition was regarded as a mad. Ironically, physical mental illness was diagnosed more in men than women; however "madness in women was associated with their sexuality and, as a result, demonized as something unnatural or wicked" (De Villiers, 2019, p. 2). In "Madness, language and reclaiming meaning", Jeffs considers madness [in women] as a triumphant position of sanity to be celebrated each day where no one can thrust his thoughts upon the mad; it provides the mad her own space to exercise individual liberty. Madness is the most befitting expression to give voice to "the furious fire that ignites the passion", and thereby becomes a mode of women empowerment. (1998, p.38).

This research paper adds up to the existing body of research by proclaiming the female mad as sane and, therefore, intervenes in Postcolonial Feminist studies. Moreover, the scholarship on female madness does not refer to double colonization as the cause of female madness. It does not pinpoint the need for the radical change in the schizoid colonial patriarchy and societal schizophrenia. Therefore this research problematizes the current literature by proposing a new way of seeing the sane who actually is termed as insane by the society. Furthermore, it explores Antoinette's madness as characterized by the spirit of decolonization and a justified resistance to double-colonization of colonial insanity and patriarchal schizophrenia.

Double colonization of the "marooned"

Antoinette's imprisonment by Rochester is a metaphor of double colonization, a term coined by Petersen and Rutherford to refer to "twice colonization" (McLeod, 2020, p.175) both in the hands of colonialist and patriarchal representations. The female protagonist of the novella becomes a victim of colonizer's despondency from birth. Her ambivalent Creole identity as a "white cockroach" (Rhys, p.4) heightens her sense of "ambivalence" (1994, p. 121), a term defined by Homi K. Bhabha as a state of oscillation "between white presence and (its) black semblance" (p. 129). This unsettling diasporic identity becomes a stigma for her, as she is neither purely white like Rochester nor purely black like Tia or

Christophene. Moreover, she is always othered and left “marooned” (Rhys, p. 6) by her family and society. Antoinette’s mulatto as well as miscegenated lineage leaves her in a perpetual exile of non-belongingness and ambivalence. While questioning her identity she says: “English women call us white niggers. . . . I often wonder who I am and where is my country and where do I belong and why was I ever born at all” (p. 64).

Rochester’s malicious impulse to enslave Antoinette begins from the beginning of his marriage. He married her for materialistic pursuit, she exclaims: “I have no money of my own at all, everything I had belongs to him” (Rhys, p.71). This makes her “suffer both as a female and a postcolonial subject” (İÇEN, 2020, p.37). Antoinette is not only financially bankrupted by Rochester but he also deprived her of her identity by strategically calling her with derogatory names. He played the role of the colonizer well by dictating “how she should laugh, act and speak and what her name ought to be” (Alshmmari, 2016, p. 46). He never calls her with her own name throughout the novel, rather begins to call her “Bertha” and “Marionette”, at which Antoinette exclaims many a time, “Bertha is not my name. You are trying to make me into someone else, calling me by another name, I know that’s obeh too” (Rhys, p. 94). Rochester takes up the godly authority of changing her into a mere puppet that only ventriloquizes his voice: “say die and I will die. Say die and watch me die” (p.110). Her own voice is snatched and she speaks as if she is a doll: “the doll had a doll’s voice, a breathless but curiously indifferent voice” (p. 86).

Rochester, after promising Antoinette, “peace, happiness and safety” (Rhys, p. 48) dismantles his assurance by giving her hatred, mental anguish and hellish existence: “[I]f I was bound for hell let it be hell. No more false heavens” (p. 110). Antoinette’s mental serenity is intentionally turned into anguish by her colonial husband as he knows how to rob her of her happiness of living in Granbois. Antoinette loved to live in Granbois: “[I]t was a beautiful place-wild, untouched, with an alien, disturbing secret loveliness. . . . I loved it more than anything in the world” (p.54-55). In another instance, she shows her affiliation with the island: “this is my place and this is where I belong and this is where I wish to stay” (p.68). Rochester always derived a sadistic pleasure out of her anger. In order to amplify Antoinette’s remorse, he slept with Amelie, a half-caste servant just to add fuel to fire, which gave rise to Antoinette’s outrageous reaction: “it is not the girl, not the girl. But I loved the place and you have made it into a place I hate” (p. 94).

Antoinette’s entrapment into the societal roles and her exile from the places where she belongs make her feel confiscated. Consequently, she is predisposed to enter into the realm of darkness, silence, and eventually into madness. Her fractured colonial identity, coupled with male atrocity, proves to be strangling for her since she becomes a target of double marginalization. As a result, her silence bursts into a voice of revulsion through the medium of madness.

Decolonizing the female self

Postcolonial premise is built around the notion of resistance, of opposition as subversion, or antagonism. Madness which, at times, is inevitable and a logical reaction to double colonization, “speaks out against both patriarchy and Empire” (Alshammari, 2016, p. 4). Female madness thereby can be termed as “a logical response to the irrationality of patriarchal rule” (Felski, 2003, p. 66). The reason of this ingress of the female subject into the realm of madness is proposed by Hedges for whom “it is only madness through which she can attain freedom” (p.120). Decolonization of the female may be treated at two levels: one, by justifying her revolt against double oppression through madness; second by decolonizing her from the stereotypical societal canon that tags her ‘mad’. It rather tags society and male victimizer as ‘mad’, since it is their own insane and inhuman oppression owing to which the victimized female has to act violently.

Antoinette’s madness as a trope of resistance takes its background from her mother’s perturbed psyche. Annette’s madness was also the aftermath of the schizophrenic colonial and patriarchal structures. Mr Mason proved to be a colonizer as well as a chauvinistic husband who did not approve of the threats Annette saw while living in Coulibri: “I will not stay at Coulibri any longer . . . [I]t is not safe for Pierre” (p. 17). Annette in a way was imprisoned in Coulibri by her husband but when Pierre died, out of the same fear for which she alarmed Mr Mason, she went mad. Christophene, while commenting upon Annette’s madness, clarifies: “When she lost her son she lost her self for a while and they shut her away” (p. 127). The fiery death of Coco whose wings were clipped foreshadow Annette’s and Antoinette’s imprisonment and their spiritual death. The extinguishing of their souls is symbolized by the fire scene.

Before her post-traumatic disorder, Antoinette attempts to explain to Rochester about the cause of her mother’s madness: “You want to know about my mother, I will tell you about her, the truth, not lies (p. 82) . . . in a few words because words are no use, I know that now” (p. 85). But Rochester remained unmoved, hard as a stone and was barely listening to her: “I have tried to make you understand but nothing has changed” (p.86). After this last attempt to speak through language, Antoinette’s voice is almost lost in the novel. She denounces to speak and determines not to answer any of Rochester’s questions by proclaiming her wish, “I wish to stay here in the dark where I belong” (p. 87).

It is argued that the discourse of resistance and abrogation penetrates the medium of silence (Ashcroft et al., 2003, p.83). As a rebellion, Antoinette determines to wage a war of hatred now with Rochester, “[B]efore I die I will show how much I hate you . . . but first I will destroy your hatred” (p.95). Antoinette’s hatred is apt to be expressed in a remorseful language of madness, a revolutionary language of the female to address the incomprehensible male ear: “[H]er words fall almost always upon the deaf male ear, which hears in language only that which

speaks in the masculine” (Cixous, 1976, p. 881). Therefore, a subjective female language is indispensable. Finally, when everything about Antoinette remains beyond his understanding, Rochester tags her mad by suspecting “murder in her eyes”, calls her “red-eyed wild-haired stranger” (Rhys, p.95) and “a drunken lunatic” (p. 106). In order to satiate his revenge, it is the easiest way for Rochester to blind himself up from reality; and, in order to do this, he has to cross the Sargasso Sea of anxieties and apprehensions that may burden his soul in case of self-confrontation.

Rochester’s last resort to exercise his patriarchal impulse is to imprison her in a dark room. By locking her up, Rochester actually buries her female self into the secretive, hostile and unexplored continent of darkness. Antoinette is now only left with the language of madness as the means to break with the masculine; since “it is time to liberate the New Woman from the old without delay” (Cixous, p. 878). Antoinette attacks Rochester with a knife that itself is a phallic symbol to return the gaze: “You rushed at him with a knife and when he got the knife away, you bit his arm” (Rhys, p.119).

Cixous sees the madness of the colonized female as naïve. She affirms that madness provides her a window for her own liberation contrary to Gilbert and Gubar who view female madness as a threat to female creativity. Madness for Antoinette has become another subversion for emancipation from the societal confiscation as well. Therefore, madness provides self-expression that is accompanied with personal liberation that has long been curbed. This paper substantiates that Antoinette’s reaction through madness is not only against her husband but it is a war waged against colonizers as well as patriarchy curb female individualism and sense of identity.

Madness is termed as an “expressly political act. [and its] talk and text invert the language of oppression, reclaiming disparaged identities and restoring dignity and pride to difference” (LeFrançois et al., 2013, p. 10). The patriarchal hegemonic practice in *Wide Sargasso Sea* is strategically designed by the male victimizer. Rochester’s maddening impulse of deprecation intends to deracinate his wife. Christophene says, “all you want is to break her up” (p. 96). But Antoinette denies being broken up by her husband, answers him back rationally and logically through madness, a language that befits his eccentricity in order to decolonize herself through return of the gaze. Antoinette’s suicide and extinguishing of Thornfield Hall is therefore perceived as a “refusal to be broken up” (Frickey, 1990, p.205).

This investigation attempts to partially answer Spivak’s seminal question: “Can the subaltern speak?” by foregrounding Antoinette’s resistance and unacceptability of the phallogocentric order (both the colonizer and the male), a gesture tantamount to answering back the colonizer. She protests against the colonial and patriarchal madness since no other language will be justified as well as understood by the colonial sovereignty. Antoinette’s silence erupts in a volcanic burst that could not be expressed in any other medium but madness. Azam justifies

Antoinette's ingress into madness by saying, "madness is her key of gaining attention, speaking, expressing and being heard . . . and becomes Antoinette's loudest weapon" (2017, p. 241). Hers is not an act of desolation – but a "final aggressive act of assertion, reaffirmation, and self-liberation." (Anderson, 1982, p. 57).

Antoinette's asthmatic existence insinuates her to break away from the ties of the so called "sane world" in order to enter into her own selected realm of sanity that may be termed madness by others. Therefore Antoinette's madness¹ (as she is perceived mad by others) becomes a means of emancipation. It is a radical gesture and an act of defiance adopted in her quest for peace. Madness is therefore a territory where she is sheltered and is not forced to play a stereotypical role defined by society. While embracing insanity, she can easily enter into the free world of her own mental serenity.

Antoinette gets victorious through the language of madness as it betrays the phallogocentric syntactical language. Antoinette's burning of the old mansion therefore symbolizes the obliteration of the patriarchal tradition and reveals the saneness of her psyche. Her language exhibits her defiance against the patriarchal stranglehold: "Now at last I know why I was brought here and what I have to do" (Rhys, p. 124). She is headstrong and clear about her destination now for the first time in life. She decides to leave the imprisoned life by choosing death after destroying the attic, a symbol of Rochester's entrapment.

Madness and reason

In *Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon claims that decolonization "thoroughly challenge(s) the colonial situation" (2007, p. 1-2) in a manner that "the colonized are called upon to be reasonable" (p. 8). Antoinette's madness, embedded in the spirit of decolonization, is equally just and rational in the face of colonial and patriarchal intimidation.

The transformed and newly acquired revolutionary spirit of Antoinette resists the societal, colonial and patriarchal domination. Chandra Mohanty alludes to Frantz Fanon's assertion that the secret behind successful decolonization lies in a "whole social structure being changed from bottom to top" (qtd. in Alia, 2005, p. 153) and this decolonizing process may need a "profound transformation of self" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 7) through resistance to psychological structures and social hegemony. This study therefore vindicates that it is not the "mad" but the society who fails to understand the distinction between reason and unreason, rational and irrational, mad and sane. In a sense, Alshmmari notes, "women who aim to break down cultural, ideological, and social structures are labelled as 'mad'" (2006, p. 3). Therefore, it is very logical for the mad (as society calls them) to act belligerently as she is justified in doing so. These laws, patriarchal and colonial, need to be questioned. It would rather have been madness on the part of Antoinette if she had not turned mad. While commenting upon Anette's (Antoinette's mother) madness,

Christophene also puts a responsibility on society in turning her mad: “[T]hey drive her to it . . . [T]hey tell her she is mad, they act like she is mad” (p.127).

Antoinette’s antagonism and hostility are relocated towards Rochester as rational and endemic in order to cope up with her precarious subjectivity. Rochester, the male oppressor, proves through his irrational actions and suspicions that he himself suffers from derangement. His illicit relationship with Amelie, calling Antoinette “Bertha” and “Marionette” instead of her own name, puts a question upon Rochester’s sanity. By locking up Antoinette, Rochester, in reality, directs the claim of madness upon his own self and ironically shuts his own self down into the dark dungeon of insanity, where he loses the ability to rationalize. He entraps Antoinette into a thick walled room with no trace of light, though she has always been yearning for a “brazen sun” (p.107). This room, strategically designed by Rochester to break her up, buries Antoinette into a coffin-like existence. His intentionally disfurnishing it from every minor necessity that she has ever desired for, a life without a looking glass and a brazen sun, leaves her flabbergasted: “[T]here is no looking glass here and I don’t know what I am like now . . . what I am doing in this place and who am I?” (p.117). Alshmmari pinpoints that “it is Rochester’s actions that are unreasonable, yet never once is he accused of madness” (2016, p. 46). Dostoevsky, while commenting upon the insane, claims that “[i]t is not by locking up one’s neighbor that one convinces oneself of one’s own good sense” (qtd. in Foucault, 2013, p. xxv).

Along with Antoinette’s so-called madness, this essay pointedly engages with Rochester’s deranged psyche (as a colonizer and a male persecutor) also. He seeks sadistic pleasure by victimizing his wife in every way. Antoinette, as a result, escapes from the maddening impulse of Rochester into the seclusion and liberation of her own sanity (termed insanity by others).

This research finds out that the paranoia of the doubly colonized female figure in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Antoinette, is part of her decolonizing struggle. It intervenes in the current scholarship by tracing women’s madness as a means of empowerment against and subversion of their double marginalization. It argues that female madness is not only a mode of personal emancipation but also an emblematic signifier. Madness in women, in the times of colonial patriarchy, is a revulsion that I call *Paralingual Decolonization*². This signifier of madness creates a deafening voice of resistance and revolt against the patriarchal despotism as well as colonial autocracy. This study itself is a decolonizing voice and liberates the so-called mad woman from the tag of madness. This is done by creating a voice of resistance against the stereotypical societal eye-view that itself is perturbed while exercising double oppression. It is an attempt to decolonize the societal autocracy that takes every right to colonize the marginalized and subservient women.

This essay further criticizes the schizoid and deranged societal autonomy that predisposes the sane to enter the realm of the insane. The female victim is rather sane to challenge the colonial insanity through the befitting signifier of

madness. Since there is no possibility to express her chaotic and macabre state of existence through a coherent male language, she chooses the language of madness that reflects her chaotic existence in a justified way. From the territory of exile, she arrives into the land of her selected mental delirium. Therefore, her resistance through madness deploys purposeful deviance to disrupt all conventions and hierarchies through the spirit of decolonization. Through the power of her madness, she is freed from the hell of entrapment (of Rochester) and she embraces her emancipation. Consequently, she is taken away from the dark passages of colonial insanity towards the saneness of madness.

Declaration of conflict of interest

The author declared no conflict of interest with respect to the authorship and publication of this article.

Notes

¹ When I term Antoinette as mad, it is the tag used by society for her. However this paper deconstructs the notion of her mental derangement.

² I term “Paralingual Decolonization” as the resistance of the colonized subaltern, against the colonial hegemony through a non-linguistic medium.

References

- Abigail, B. (2004). *Hélène Cixous: Writing and sexual difference*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Alia, V. (2005). *Media and ethnic minorities*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Alshammari, S. (2016). *Literary madness in British, postcolonial, and Bedouin women's writing*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Anderson, P. G. (1982). Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*: The other side/ “both sides now.” *Caribbean Quarterly*, 28(1-2), 57-65.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2013). *Post-colonial studies: The key concepts*. Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2003). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. Routledge.
- Azam, N. (2017). Madwoman in the post-colonial era: A study of the female voice in Jean Rhys' *Wide sargasso sea*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(7), 236-242.
- Bhabha, H. K. (2012). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Cixous, H., Cohen, K., & Cohen, P. (1976). The laugh of the Medusa. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society*, 1(4), 875-893.

- De Villiers, S. (2019). Metaphors of madness: Sylvia Plath's rejection of patriarchal language in *the bell jar*. *English Studies in Africa*, 62(2), 1-11.
- Hamam, K. (2014). *Confining spaces, resistant subjectivities: Toward a metachronous discourse of literary mapping and transformation in postcolonial women's writing*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Frickey, P. M. (Ed.). (1990). *Critical perspectives on Jean Rhys* (Vol. 14). Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Fanon, F., Sartre, J. P., & Farrington, C. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (Vol. 36). New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (2008). *Black skin, white masks*. Grove press.
- Felski, R. (2003). *Literature after feminism*, Chicago, U. *Chicago P*.
- Foucault, M. (1990). The history of sexuality: An introduction, volume I. *Trans. Robert Hurley*. New York: *Vintage, 95*.
- Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. trans. Richard Howard. Random House Inc.
- Gallagher, N. E. (2007). Colonial madness: Psychiatry in French North Africa. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 40(3), 534-536.
- Gilbert, S., & Gubar, S. (2004). *The madwoman in the attic: The woman writer and the nineteenth century literary imagination*. Yale University Press.
- Hamam, K. (2014). *Confining spaces, resistant subjectivities: Toward a metachronous discourse of literary mapping and transformation in postcolonial women's writing*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- IÇEN, H. (2020). *Madness as an anti-authoritarian agent in Wide sargasso sea and the bell jar* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Jeffs, S. (1998). Madness, language and reclaiming meaning. *AQ-Australian Quarterly*, 70(3), 36-38.
- LeFrançois, B. A., Menzies, R., & Reaume, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Mad matters: A critical reader in Canadian mad studies*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Loomba, A. (2007). *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. Routledge.
- McLeod, J. (2020). Beginning postcolonialism. In *Beginning postcolonialism (second edition)*. Manchester University Press.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Reyes, A. D. (2002). *Mothering across cultures: Postcolonial representations*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Rhys, J. (1997). *Wide sargasso sea*, Angela Smith (ed.), London: *Penguin Books*.
- Spivak Gayatri, C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, 271-313.
- Showalter, Elaine. (1985). *The female malady: Women, madness, and English culture, 1830-1980*. Virago.
- Ussher, Jane M. (2011). *The madness of women: Myth and experience*. Routledge.