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Abstract

Third-Wave Feminism digs its roots in intersectionality and coalition, which were not fully realised in Second-Wave Feminism. However, the movement is usually under attack for lacking a clear agenda. Recent scholarship strongly suggests that third wavers get back to third-world writers, like Audre Lorde, to realise an anti-racist and inclusive feminism. Lorde occupies a distinctive position in feminist literature; a poet who resides in too many margins being black, female and lesbian. This essay draws an analogy between third wave intersectionality and postcolonial hybridity, and argues that Lorde's use of hybridity is a 'third space' that she opens up in her poetry to disrupt spheres of supremacy through its interdependence and reciprocal construction that defy dualisms, hence realising coalition. The analysis is anchored by HomiBhabha's definition of hybridity in colonial discourse.
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"Who Said It Was Simple!"
Third-Wave Feminist Coalition and Audre Lorde's Intersectionalist Hybrid Poetics of Difference

"My poetry comes from the intersection of me and my world"
Audre Lorde.

Third-wave feminism emerged in the 1990s and established itself as a paradigm different from postfeminism and second-wave feminism. What distinguishes third wavers is refuting postfeminist claims that feminism is a passé story, and embracing intersectionality and coalition, which were not fully realized in the second wave. The notion of intersectionality lies in the meeting points of sexism, classism, racism, and heterosexism; whereas coalition is the endeavor to retain those differences to realize diversity. However, the movement is usually under attack for lacking a clear agenda and a transformative approach. In order to amend these inadequacies and realize an anti-racist and more inclusive feminism, recent scholarship suggests that third wavers return to writers like Gloria Anzaldúa, Maxine Hong Kingston, Hazel Carby, Patricia Hill Collins, Ana Castillo, Audre Lorde, and others. Lorde, in particular, occupies a curiously distinctive position in the feminist canon as a poet residing in too many margins being black, female and lesbian. She celebrates difference and strives to break binaries set by a white, racist, patriarchal, heterosexual discourse. Hers is poetry of resistance drawing from a coalition which is a union of incongruities. In addition to re-reading those writers, third wavers also need to extend their ideological realms to other minority-oriented discourses to help them create a polyvocal agenda; among such discourses is postcolonialism. This article attempts to open up a new progeny for third-wave intersectionality by drawing an analogy between it and hybridity in postcolonial discourse in Lorde's poetry.
The article limits the focus on third-wave feminism; I am not arguing that it is the single successor of the second wave, for other paradigms have also proved to be quite significant. I am aware of the limitations of the metaphor 'wave' against which resonant calls have risen recently. However, this is the name these feminists chose when they first launched their school, and this is how they still refer to it. Besides, no alternative term gained consensus in the academy; the metaphor is still used despite its inadequacies. This article attempts to widen the scope of third-wave intersectionality in order to benefit from other discourses and feminist doctrines to attain coalition eventually. At the beginning of the article I historicize third-wave feminism through some of its groundbreaking books, discussing certain fortes and impasses. I then introduce intersectionality as a crucial component in third wave and examine its advantages and drawbacks. After that, hybridity in postcolonial discourse, as a hermeneutic of difference, is compared to intersectionality, drawing primarily upon their points of similarities. Having established this analogy, I move on to contextualize the work of Lorde in the feminist canon and I read two of her poems as intersectionalist hybrid pieces striving to attain coalition.

**Third Wave Feminism: Giving Voice to the Voiceless**

Following the anti-feminist backlash in the 1980s and the fact that the second-wave failed women of certain races, ethnicities, classes and sexual orientations, third-wave polemic emerged to redeem such drawbacks by women who refused to live in limbo. The term dates back to Rebecca Walker's 1992 article which closed with her declaration "I am not a postfeminist. I am the Third Wave." Later Walker collected articles relating personal experiences in To Be Real: Telling the Truth and Changing the Face of Feminism (1995) and another volume of similar pieces, Listen Up: Voices from the Next Feminist Generation (1995), was edited by Barbara Findlen. Both volumes displayed a conspicuous disappointment with second wavers marking the first endeavors to bring
into existence a new feminist agenda under a different rubric from the predecessor school.

Walker attacked how middle-class white women wanted to enforce their experience as every woman's story; she drew a line clarifying that third wavers "have done the difficult work of being real (refusing to be bound by a feminist ideal not of their own making)."6 Walker continued what third-world feminists had started in the 1970s. 7 Breaking away with the white feminist idol is acknowledging a difference that had long been ignored in the second wave. Walker also believed that adopting the white feminist icon is pigeon-holing other women into an "identity [that] will dictate and regulate [their] lives, instantaneously pitting [them] against someone, forcing [them] to choose inflexible and unchanging sides."8 By refusing to ventriloquize the words of white women, third wavers are refusing stereotypical binaries which limit identities to an either-or dichotomy where adopting one inexorably entails rejecting the other. Walker's argument makes room for in-betweenness and embracing multiple aspects in identity. Articles in this volume extend prescribed boundaries and introduce an idiosyncratic approach to women's issues without a slippage of categories. Identity politics should be tolerant of differences for those feminists reject the female model of second wavers.

Findlen equally stresses that women face different experiences arguing that the "splintering of this generation often comes from an honest assessment of our differences as each of us defines her place and role in feminism."9 Her work introduces difference as a key word in feminist discourse. She advocates action and empowerment since "[i]ndividual women's experiences of sexism have always been an important basis for political awareness and action."10 The book covers a plethora of issues including sexism, HIV, abortion, bi-sexuality and self-discovery, depicted from disparate perspectives, and locates differences in the centre of its argumentations. Written by women of diverse
backgrounds as Native American, African American, Indian, Asian, and lesbian, the articles raise ascriptions of differences, coalitional identities, cultural dualities, and links the personal and the political. The volume, nevertheless, lacks coherent historicizing of feminism and a unified stance toward the new wave, but it remains quite significant for striving to break the silence and rightfully indicating that feminism is not a one-way street.  

Despite their shortcomings to operationalize identity politics, Walker and Findlen set the stage for a new movement based chiefly on difference. Their oeuvres mirrored their generation with its socio-economic and political inertias. However, they lacked clear definitions and did not offer transformative agendas. Other volumes tackling third wave that appeared later and proved to be quite influential are Leslie Heywood and Jennifer Drake's *Third Wave Agenda: Being Feminist, Doing Feminism* (1997) and Rory Dicker and Alison Piepmeier's *Catching a Wave: Reclaiming Feminism for the 21st Century* (2003). Both volumes try to fill in the gaps left out by Walker and Findlen. Heywood and Drake display a formidable judicious cognizance of difference arguing that "contradiction – or what looks like contradiction, if one doesn't shift one's point of view – marks the desires and strategies of third wave feminists."

This contradiction enhances differences and builds a discourse embracing, not transcending, them. Unlike Walker and Findlen, they display no antagonism towards second wavers; quite the opposite, they contend that "the second and third waves of feminism are neither incompatible or opposed." They argue that it is impossible to universalize feminism as second wavers tried to do; such endeavors get circumvented with admonitions about inherent differences. Still, their volume remains a venture to maintain a continuum with second wave, which serves more purposes for the whole feminist cause and widens its scope to include more oppressions targeting women. However, they seem to volitionally
avoid all forms of classification or categorization and fail to offer an explicit definition of their school arguing that "we are products of all the contradictory definitions of differences within feminism, beasts of such hybrid kind that perhaps we need a different name altogether." Unfortunately, they do not provide that different name.

Dicker and Piepmeier, as well, celebrate difference without adopting disjunctive stances against second wavers. They clarify that third wave is different through its emphasis on paradox, conflict, multiplicity, and messiness. This generation's feminism is often informed by postmodern, poststructuralist theories of identity as well as the ways in which gender may be a performance that can be manipulated and politically altered as it is performed.

Their work is crucial because they introduce fractured selfhood resulting from poststructuralist and postmodernist notions of identity as fragmented and multi-layered; it creates room for diversity, casting aside monolithic images of women. Gender is not enough to categorize women, the mantra of race, class and ethnicity must be included as an imperative permutation to acknowledge differences. The volume is divided into five parts covering a wide range of topics such as hip-hop feminism, hard rock, Arab-American feminism, feminist movements in colleges, feminism in the media and literature, grrrl studies, and feminism on the web. Their work is also significant because it wreaks havoc with the depoliticized agenda of postfeminism by raising awareness and insisting that the personal is political; it is only through this consciousness that women can realize change.

**Intersectionality: Oppressions Joining Hands**

Although third wavers are still grappling with their agenda and providing clear-cut definitions, they dig firm roots in the deep-seated notions of intersectionality and coalition. The term 'intersectionality' was
coined in 1989 by Kimberlé Crenshaw in her work on Black Feminism and identity politics for black women who are seen as victims of sexism only or racism only, but never of both. She concludes that such incomplete positionality leaves black women in no man's land for "feminists and civil rights thinkers as well have treated Black women in ways that deny both the compoundedness of their situation and the centrality of their experience to the larger classes of women and Blacks." Crenshaw's first use of the term focused on the intersection of gender and race, but later she developed it as a manifold intersection of arguing that "[i]ntersectionality may provide the means of dealing with other marginalizations as well." Crenshaw asserts that identity is not a uni-dimensional entity; gender, race, class and ethnicity intersect comprising a different experience and establishing a coalition emerging from the intersections. It is through such intersectionality that feminism can eventually reach an all-inclusive approach that does not elide differences but realizes diversity. Crenshaw's intersectionality challenges conventional conceptualizations in feminist discourse crossing the threshold to an interdependent approach tackling the inchoate complexity and situatedness of many-sided marginalized women. All categories of oppression join hands and are put on equal footing to scrutinize different experiences and achieve change.

Intersectionality is not an additive approach which simply adds up race to women's experiences. By historicizing and contextualizing race, intersectionality examines it as a major component in feminist discourse. Intersectionality has been taken up by third wavers as a milestone in their theoretical explorations of feminist politics and cultural action. Delia Aguilar explains that "the brilliance of intersectionality inheres precisely in its infinite open-endedness, purposeful ambiguity, and the welcome it extends to any and all interpretations that enterprising academics can concoct." Such interpretations come into existence because intersectionality encompasses multiple axes of identity, challenges foundationalist assumptions, demolishes hierarchies, defies exclusions and
rebuts essentialism. The purposeful ambiguity raised by Aguilar corresponds to postmodernist concepts of identity as fragmented; the ambiguity results from the skepticism towards a whole unified self. Another attribute given to intersectionality is paving the way for coalitions to materialize. According to Carisa Showdent third wave is "a movement that takes intersectionality as its epistemological grounding […]. Rather than eschewing identity, identity categories on this account could be rearticulated, complicated, and used critically." Renegotiating female identities will hence result in founding feasible coalitions to challenge shifting and unremitting systems of concomitant oppressions. By launching a paradigm with different historical, social and political contexts, intersectionality dismantles the essentialist paradigms of second wavers that tried to sanction the experience of white middle-class women as a prototype for all women.

As promising as intersectionality might be for third wavers, it remains fraught with fluidity that cloaks it in ambiguity even for Crenshaw who declared in 2009: "I'm amazed at how it gets over- and underused; sometimes I can't even recognize it in literature anymore." Intersectionality sidesteps many of the second wavers' pitfalls; still it is not the panacea that will solve all conundrums of third wavers for it remains problematic in some aspects. Leslie McCall acknowledges that it is possible to "say that intersectionality is the most important theoretical contribution that women's studies […] has made so far." However, the term raises some methodological problems that render it ostensibly reductivist in some aspects. She establishes a tripartite taxonomy related to the complexity of identity: the anti-categorical approach which is poststructuralist in scope; a deconstruction of all categories, the intra-categorical approach which embraces colored women's issues focusing on one dimension only either race or gender, and the inter-categorical approach which widens its range to include more groups of different identities caught at multiple intersections. She rightfully points to the simplistic usage of the term and the inherent
methodological problems. The social relationships and inequalities among diverse groups are too complex; she consequently argues that the way intersectionality has been used reflects dimensions within and not across categories by restricting the compass to one dimension, rendering the analysis problematic.

McCall's article is one of the imperative critiques tackling intersectionality. But instead of embracing the three approaches as complementary and delineating intersectionality across all categories equally, McCall favors the inter-categorical approach and believes that only it can resolve the complexity of intersectionality since it "begins with an analysis of the elements first because each of these is a sizable project in its own right." Yet, her argument falls short by dismissing the anti-categorical and intra-categorical approaches which are also crucial for third waviers to be all-inclusive instead of this exclusivist positionality. Her inter-categorical approach also overlooks some differences and she generally treats her categories in a rather rigid form, although they are quite dynamic. Marta Jorba and Maria Zárate point out that McCall "does not specify the relation between the intercategorical approach and the particular methodology that should be used." Their argument augments her problematic stance and inability to verify the complexity upon which she is building her thesis. Nikol Floyd also argues that McCall takes black women out of the big picture by focusing on complexity, whereas "[t]he issue is one of subjugation, not complexity." Floyd brings back oppression to the center of feminist discourse, but she also falls prey to exclusivism by propagating for an intersectionality focusing on black women alone. Floyd is thus essentializing the black women's experience as the only intersectionalist female experience which is the opposite of what intersectionality is attempting to realize.

In order to fulfill their goals, third waviers should reconsider intersectionality from wider perspectives. Jennifer Nash advocates re-
thinking the term to deal with assumptions that reinforce it as a vantage point to "continue working to dismantle essentialism, to craft nuanced theories of identity and oppression, and to grapple with the messiness of subjectivity" which will eventually enable feminists to construct "a coherent and theoretical agenda." In addition to identity theories and the troubling forging of female agency amid aporias of oppressions, intersectionality can benefit from other fields addressing similar issues from different positionalities. One of those fields is postcolonial studies, which is concerned with oppressed subjects that have been muted by a totalizing Other. In postcolonialism hybridity depicts multiple positionings and plays an imperative part in defining the relation between the oppressed and the oppressor, and the eventual production of the cultural parlance. It holds several points in common with intersectionality and it has much to offer the fledgling term in third-wave agenda.

**Hybridity and Intersectionality: Loci of Differences**

Hybridity is one of the tools of theorizing differences. Being the outcome of the crossbreeding of two different species, hybridity refers to a third hybrid species that carries the diverse characteristics of both. Hybridity, however, remains one of the dubious terms in the premise of critical theory as it goes beyond the defined limits of scientific cross-pollination. By and large it passes on transcultural forms that emerge within the boundaries of contact established by culture. It can be represented in scores of forms, be them linguistic, cultural, political or racial. It does not dwell upon a catholic unity, but unity of anomalies which falls between the conceptual boundaries of self and other. Hybridity between human races lies at the very heart of racism; the utopian egalitarianism and universal equality proclaimed by the eighteenth century were harshly crushed by the racism of the nineteenth century. This racism was central to the Western culture, concealed albeit pungent, where the white race was placed in the zenith and the black one in the nadir. Similar to intersectionality which lies in the meeting points
of racism, classism, and sexism, hybridity also lies at the crux of racism, culture and civilization.

Like intersectionality, hybridity does not attempt to transcend differences. It does not jettison differences as a disunifying agent to identity formation; instead they are embraced and maintained in tandem. Anjali Prabhu argues that hybridity "entails a dynamic process in which difference continues to function and proliferate as a constitutive reality and as a basis for thought and action." Difference thus lies at the core of hybridity. The propensity to de-historicize and de-locate cultures from fixed contexts is a righteous attempt to reach some unanimous concept that can get over cultural differences. However, this is not the absolute solution to such a thorny question. The differences are always there in the actual cultural vista; the inequality with all its cultural, political and economic impacts is too manifest to be ignored. Repudiating or overlooking the differences implied in hybridity would be a misreading of the term. Hybridity does not exclude differences; it acknowledges them, as Robert Young argues: “[h]ybridity is itself an example of hybridity, of a doubleness that both brings together, fuses, but also maintains separation.”

Intersectionality ventures to dismantle tainted essentialism in feminist discourse to defy hierarchies that generate debilitations. Hybridity also, being the unpreventable process of interrelating among diverse cultures, seeks to cart off essentialist identities. HomiBhabha sees it as the inadvertent outcome of colonialism; hybridity becomes the true form of postcolonial sedition of imperialism and the implied racism which enforces the essentialist silhouettes of the superiority of one culture over another:

Hybridity is […] the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal […] the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. It displays
the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but reimplicates its identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power.\textsuperscript{30}

Hybridity in the hands of Bhabha dislocates power relations as the oppressor does not have the upper hand and the oppressed is allowed self-expression. Thus the entire construction of authority is challenged opening up realms for the oppressed by establishing a political inversion in discourse.

Hybridity becomes synonymous with what Bhabha calls the ‘Third Space.’ He emphasizes the reciprocal construction of the subjectivity of both the oppressor and the oppressed. He argues that cultural statements are established within the framework of this ‘Third Space’ and this is the point where cultural identity comes into being. Like intersectionality, this space maintains features of ambivalence and antipathy which become the foundation upon which Bhabha establishes the indefensibility of claiming hierarchy among races. Acknowledging this ambivalence can help in trouncing the uncanny nature of cultural differences rooting for acknowledging the influence of the role performed by hybridity in those cultural differences:

It is significant that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into that alien territory […] may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity.\textsuperscript{31}

It is in this in-between space that the core of culture is founded. The entire cultural construction submits itself to a drastic change in terms of unraveling the self and the other; the hybrid moment is
neither of them, it is something located in between where both intersect and fuse, and it is in this liminal space that Audre Lorde resides; she occupies the margins but refuses to be marginalized. Her identity is constructed at a big intersection being different in race, gender and sexual orientation. In her poetry, she creates a 'third space' and draws upon her different legacies bringing into existence a hybrid intersectionalist mythopoesis. She celebrates differences as means of demolishing dualisms set by a heteronormative, white, patriarchal discourse and realizes coalition by launching her battle against racism, chauvinism, classicism and heterosexism.

**Audre Lorde: An Intersectionalist Hybrid Poetics of Difference**

Lorde occupies an intersectionalist hybrid positionality *par excellence*. The black experience in America is a big *modus operandi* of organic hybridity since African Americans are biologically hybrid and their blood is historically mixed with numerous races. Lorde is an African American who defines her hybrid self as "forged in the crucibles of difference." She believes that the real problem is not difference, but our reaction to it. Being different in America, according to her, entails being inferior, marginalized, and even wrong, Lorde hence argues that "we have all been programmed to respond to the human differences between us with fear and loathing and to handle that difference in one of three ways: ignore it, as if it is not possible, copy it if we think it is dominant, or destroy it if we think it is subordinate." The three reactions lead to divisions, separation and ultimately isolation. Lester Olson argues that difference in this case "translates into devaluation and distance, a justification for exclusion and lack of communication, [...], complex hierarchical dynamics of power, moral judgment, and social privilege." Differences create penitentiary spaces, where each one is incarcerated within boundaries and communication becomes impossible. But Lorde is a boundary crosser; her argument calls for acknowledging differences to attain equality, which is a resonant call since African American historical endeavors for integration and even assimilation into
white America always ended up by their suffering some loss, and still failing to realize equality. Keeping differences is antithetical to imposing an essentialist identity or universalizing one experience while discarding others, it is opening up realms for hybrid identities to emerge from intersections of oppression, hence changing the existing conditions instead of re-producing them.

Difference becomes Lorde's means of empowerment, a politics of resistance, and fashioning of a de-homogenizing poetics. According to Joan Martin "difference functions epistemologically as a form of knowledge embedded in human nature. It is a methodological tool for understanding and constructing nondomintant mutuality and vision." Differences, being dialogic in nature, become the means for the self to attain perception and reach out. To fulfill this Lorde adopts a dissident enunciation that attempts to forge a reverse in power relations "for the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change." To achieve this rupture of power structures, she advocates unity across differences and multiple sites of oppression. It is a hybrid and intersectionalist unity since it retains all differences while challenging discursive categorization. Lorde defies the essentialist ideologies of the second wave zeitgeist that fail to acknowledge differences stating that "[a]ssimilation within a solely western europeanherstory is not acceptable." In her lifetime Lorde had been misunderstood, attacked and even ignored for this subversive stance. Hers is a subalteran agency that embraces contradictions, suffers from displacements and displays fragmentation, but manages to attain a Whitmanesque celebration of contradictions and differences.

Lorde establishes a space for negotiating cultural authority through myth which becomes her metanarrative; a displaced speech and an over-arching narrative schema to hold on to her inner strength. She returns to what Bhabha calls the "houses of racial memory" where "each
'unhomely house' marks a deeper historical displacement. Through the palimpsest of African mythology Lorde faces the unhomely and myth becomes her rhetoric of liberation. African mythology is her legacy; by reviving those myths, she creates poetic personae occupying enunciatory sites, in which they are able to see the inside from the outside. She believes that "places of possibility within ourselves are dark because they are ancient and hidden." Those dark places are emmatized in the Black Goddess who comes from the timeless zone of myths to endow strength upon her black daughters. African myths also do not fall into the 'master's tools' hence enabling Lorde to dismantle his house. Charlene Ball argues that Lorde not only uses African myths, but she also is a revisionist mythmaker who "fills a need in women's mythology, helping women of all colors re-vision their mythic journeys. She stands in the liminal place between 'what we were and what we have not yet become.' As Lorde rearticulates African myths from her respective intersectionalist and hybrid identity, she subverts its traditional patriarchal norms and re-sets power relations.

"The House of Yemanjá" roams the mythical terrains of the holistic goddess; the mother of all gods and goddesses in Yoruba pantheon. Lorde cites in the glossary of The Black Unicorn (1978) the legend of Yemanjá. The matriarchal goddess escapes twice; from a son who attempts to rape her and a husband who mocks the size of her breasts. She eventually drowns and dissolves into the river bringing about fertility. AnnLouise Keating points out that by "reversing the traditional religious conception of a white, male god, her metaphor of the black goddess challenges the dualistic mode of thinking which elevates Black, male over female and reason over emotion." Lorde's choice of Yemanjá destabilizes arbitrary domination and situates the black goddess in the center.

The poem delineates a perturbed mother-daughter relation seen from the daughter's perspective. Dualities are established from the start
creating both ambiguity and hybridity: "My mother had two faces and a frying pot." The double-faced mother cooks up her daughters to become girls in this frying pot; a harsh kind of education for black girls' femininity to come to terms with a racist patriarchal society. The mother is a Janus-like figure. One of the jobs of Janus had to do with birth, which further draws the mother to him. The double faces of Janus denote that he resides in beginnings and endings, thus establishing the mother as a ubiquitous figure of ultimate authority in the poem occupying the center. The persona introduces herself by extending the cooking metaphor through the "broken pot" for, unlike her sister, she is unable to come up to her mother's expectations; the mother "hid out a perfect daughter / who was not me." The gap created between mother and daughter gives rise to the uncanny. The Freudian uncanny occurs when repressed childhood memories emerge to haunt daily existence, keeping the past alive in the present. The uncanny is imbued with insecurities, indecisions, and ambivalences; it captures the awkward moment of homelessness and the inability to surmount an irreconcilable past. This is where the persona is caught, and as Bhabha explains "it is precisely in these banalities that the unhomely stirs." The daughter has to exorcise those demons by conquering the uncanny to learn that all her mother's instructions are prima facie.

The following lines forge the persona's hybrid identity: "I am the sun and the moon" while still keeping the cooking metaphor "forever hungry / for her eyes." The persona appears like an ambiguous and equivocal trickster that maintains duality and strives to overcome contradictions; the trickster is also the multivocal truth teller. Kara Provost argues that "Lorde repeatedly returns to the power of the trickster's heterogeneous identity and ability to communicate, connect, and survive despite (and because of) difference." The trickster is a liminal figure with unique linguistic skills that maintains differences and is related to change; through her dual hybridity the persona can be regarded as a trickster-like figure that will break many conventions.
hybridity of light and darkness epitomizes the African American hybrid identity of black and white. Being firmly rooted in a prior array of racist postulations, hybridity is part and parcel of the black experience in America exemplified in Du Bois' double consciousness. The identity of African Americans bears witness to racial ambiguity and the subsequent binary dichotomies, which makes its people hybrids. The attempt to make peace between those warring selves is always at play; to form a junction out of this schism into one better self, without being spurned or contended with in discrimination. The persona articulates this hybrid identity as her means of empowerment where she forces her presence into an absence that the mother is enforcing upon her through an ethos of erasure.

Hybridity becomes a moment of audaciousness for the persona. Hers is a premise of difference and the irregular rhythms of the poem stress that. The mood is one of frustration and the tone is rather angry. Cherie Turpin argues that to Lorde "the path to transforming silence into speaking must include cacophony." The alliteration of the rigid consonants /k/, /g/, /d/, and /b/ denotes this cacophony in a restraining ambience; it breaks down harmony and reflects the persona's anger and a psyche agitated by the uncanny. The cacophony goes beyond Lorde's musicality, since the identity of the persona is fragmented and lacks peace.

Having established her hybrid and intersectionalist identity, the persona declares in the second stanza "I bear two women upon my back." The duality grows into a kind of legacy from her mother. But differences are not erased as her hybridity "does not mediate or resolve the friction between different terms of identity [...] On the contrary it reproduces [...] representations of differences and discriminations." The two women she carries bring about more differences and displacements that the persona is suffering from. The hiding of the perfect daughter is juxtaposed with the dark mother who is "rich and
hidden / in the ivory hungers." The persona breaks the Jungian archetype of darkness, the pictorial symbol of evil, by favoring it over light. Lorde believes that the "woman's place of power within each of us is neither white nor surface; it is dark, it is ancient, and it is deep." In order to reach out to this power, Lorde has to break many taboos; she uses non-conventional syntax as means of breaking the master's house. In addition to her use of enjambment and run-on lines, there are no closures in the stanza; the syntactic ambiguity emerges as she obscures semantic and syntactic boundaries generating myriad interpretations. The dark mother might stand for Yemanjá, Africa or the erotic. According to Lorde the erotic is: "a resource within each of us that lies in a deeply female and spiritual plane, firmly rooted in the power of our unexpressed and unrecognized feeling." The erotic opens sealed doors from inside and allows women to break the silence and rediscover themselves. The dark mother can hence embody the erotic since she is the mnemonic of strength for the persona. The erotic also endows more as Roderick Ferguson explains it in Lorde's work as a resource "for establishing a will to connect, especially in those areas where certain connections were prohibited." Stepping outside the periphery, the persona needs to reach out and connect, which will not be possible without the aid of the dark mother.

The white mother, however is "pale as a witch / yet steady and familiar / brings me bread and terror / in my sleep." The simile draws negative attributes arising from the typos of witchcraft and bestows upon this mother supernatural qualities. The white mother is an equally ambiguous figure who can iconize America or second wave feminism. The structures of power entrenched between the persona and this mother puts the former in the periphery and the latter in the center. The pale mother occupies the positionality of authority where "her breasts are huge exciting anchors / in the midnight storm." Unlike black Yemanjá who was mocked by her husband for having small breasts, the pale mother's breasts are too big. However, this does not render the defeat of
the persona as Bhabha argues that the presence of authority is "fixed and empty." It is a static, not a dynamic entity. The founding underpinning upon which this authority is built is about to be ruptured by the hybrid subject of the persona.

Through hybridity, the persona hears herself speaking from a different stance. She sees herself in a state of probing instead of being probed into and this is where the power inversion occurs as she becomes recalcitrant. The tone changes into one of strength as the persona confronts the uncanny. Being held a hostage by her past, the persona states "All this has been / before / in my mother's bed / time has no sense." The uncanny embraces space and time; both shackles are about to be broken by the persona. She embarks on seeking means of empowerment, but she is cognizant of her situation "I have no brothers / and my sisters are cruel." In a world marred by multi-faceted interrelating stratifications of gender and race, the persona, caught in their intersection, turns to the black mother to recuperate. The iterative structure that follows is related to the uncanny "Mother I need / mother I need / mother I need your blackness now." The last stanzas are short with run-on syntax to mirror a mood of exigency. The persona proudly celebrates difference. According to Andreas Ackermann, hybridity is "threatening and creative." The dialogic synthesis of hybridity enables her to consider her identity in a non-essentialist context. She decides not to confine to an identity expected from her mother, her white sisters or her black brothers by being different.

The final strophe creates the 'Third Space' as she declares being the sun and moon and forever hungry
the sharpened edge
where day and night shall meet
and not be
one.
The persona is captured in the intersection of white and black worlds and is rejected by both. Her hybrid identity refuses to favor one constituent; hence day and night shall never be one. Refusing assimilation and integration, differences must be retained and reified to conquer the uncanny and achieve power reverse. The binary oppositions of the celestial bodies embedded in the persona's identity make hybridity the epitomic paradigm for disarticulating authority. Bhabha argues that the "paranoid threat from the hybrid is finally uncontainable because it breaks down the symmetry and the duality of self/other, inside/outside. In the productivity of power, the boundaries of authority - its reality effects - are always besieged by 'the other scene' of fixations and phantoms."61 The illusions of the oppressors come tumbling down after confronting hybrid subjects. "The House of Yemanjá" eventually proves to be what Keith Leonard calls the "fractured wholeness of the house of difference."62 Hierarchies are disturbed and the Third Space is constructed for hybrids to reside in and renegotiate structures of power. It is not a dialectical fusion, but a third in-between location in which binary opposites meet and reconcile.

Having established the Third Space on the individual level, Lorde moves on to other oppressed voices; voices that are all signifiers of alterity. CarstenSchinko argues that in the Third Space "meaning is fuzzy, structures are temporalized, […] and perceptions of identity (self and other) oscillate;" this liminality is thus "reconfigured as a form of agency."63 "A Litany for Survival" moves from the 'I' to the 'we' pronoun and captures oppressed voices residing in an in-between locale and striving to craft their identities. It brings about the margins of oppression in an intersectionalist locus of fear. Being caught in third spaces is crucial as Bhabha explains that such "in-between spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood […] that initiate new signs of identity."64 Inhabiting the third space interrupts the status quo of authority; it opens up a space for the subaltern to utter the unutterable; enabling the oppressed and the oppressor to see themselves in new lights.
The intersectionalist liminal space in "A Litany for Survival" allows its voices to negotiate their identities, the binaries they are caught in, and hence articulate their differences against a demoting and stultifying Other. As Bhabha warns "[t]he representation of difference must not be hastily read as a reflection of pre-given ethnic or cultural traits set in the fixed tablet of tradition. The social articulation of difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, on-going negotiation that seeks to authorize cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation." The voices of the litany are not simply stating their difference; they are confronting the dialectical sublation of their existence and challenging the ideological apparatus of their oppressor to survive. Lorde argues that "to survive in the mouth of this dragon we call america, we have had to learn this first and most vital lesson – that we were never meant to survive." The voices of the litany have learnt that lesson by heart.

The poem takes the form of a litany, their moment of performativity is a supplication with several petitions where a collective sense is initially created in free verse and perceptive lineation "For those of us who live at the shoreline / standing upon the constant edges of decision / crucial and alone." Brenda Carr notes that the "Western liturgical form of the litany or antiphonal prayer is resonant with the African call and response structure." The poem uses call-and-response sermonic pattern which, through the repetition at the beginning and the end of the first two stanzas, mirrors the operative compulsions of its voices as they forge their identities. Racism, sexism, classicism and heterosexism are an exclusionist nexus; the voices of the litany pray in seclusion and exist between binaries. Lorde clarifies that "those of us who are poor, who are lesbians, who are Black, who are older – know that survival is not an academic skill. It is learning how to stand alone." Their loneliness defines their existence, and it also points to a hierarchy in which they are placed at the bottom.
The following lines draw the dualisms of "coming and going," "inward and outward," and "before and after" and depict their vision of a future where the dreams of their oppressors "will not reflect / the death of ours." Lorde establishes their positionality vis-à-vis authority; they are the marginalized residents of the Third Space. Bhabha argues that the "intervention of the Third Space of enunciation, which makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process, destroys this mirror of representation … [it] challenges our sense of the historical identity of culture as a homogenizing, unifying force." The Third Space de-regulates unities and disturbs common exposés of signification through its equivocation. The Third Space thus becomes the vantage point for Lorde from which she is able to disrupt power zones, demolish alleged superiority, question homogeneity and break the shackles of binaries. Margaret Morris argues that Lorde "repositions marginal categories." They leave the periphery to occupy the Third Space which can cause displacement and introduce fragmentation opposed to unity; it shakes the grounds upon which fixity is established and founds discursive locales of enunciation. Lorde gives well-crafted and non-ending closures where there is one period in the whole poem, creating room for ambiguity. LexiRudnitsky believes that such ambiguity "often has a pointed objective: that of complicating the subject position, undermining monolithic categories of identity, and demonstrating that difference can be a source of creativity." The situatedness of those voices already wraps them in ambiguity and Lorde's syntax intensifies that. Lorde believes that "the transformation of silence into language and action is an act of self-revelation […] that always seems fraught with danger." In order to get over what she calls "the tyrannies of silence," she has to manipulate the language of the Master that she describes as a language "that has been made to work against us." The warp and weft of her poetic idiom is intriguing; being seemingly simple, yet overflowing with syntactic ambiguity through continuous lines divided to form fractured syntactic units. Her manipulation of sentence structure by
keeping the lines short reveals a mood of urgency thematized in the poem, since these voices are hardly allowed to talk much.

The next stanza delves into the reasons of occupying this in-betweenness: "For those of us / who were imprinted with fear / like a faint line in the center of our foreheads." The voices live in an abyss of fear and the simile points to its inseparability from their existence. Fear starts with their "mother's milk;" they are made to believe that fear is their "weapon" against an invincible oppressor. Nonetheless, they eventually realize that the weapon has inscribed defeat upon them; in their struggle for survival this fear proved to be an "illusion of some safety to be found / the heavy-footed hoped to silence us." Lorde relates fear to silence arguing that "[i]n the cause of silence, each of us draws the face of her own fear – the fear of contempt, of censure, or some judgment, or recognition, of challenge, of annihilation." The epistemic and ideological frameworks of the fear-silence axis establish sites of hegemony resulting from the trajectories of racism, classicism, and sexism which render these fearful silent voices invisible to their oppressors. The conclusive lines, however, mark the apocalypse of its voices: "For all of us / this instant and this triumph / We were never meant to survive." Reaching this stance, the voices decide to risk nemesis; they embark on establishing their contestation and constituting their agency in a moment of epiphany.

Lorde understands that fear has become the cornerstone of the marginalized stating that "we have been socialized to respect fear more than our own needs for language and definition and while we wait in silence, for the final luxury of fearlessness, the weight of that silence will choke us." Silence is not the remedy and it will not bring fearlessness. The third stanza explores fear on all its levels; fear of darkness "when the sun rises we are afraid / it might not remain," fear of hunger "when our stomachs are empty we are afraid / we may never eat again," and fear of love "when we are loved we are afraid / love will vanish / when we are
alone we are afraid / love will never return." Their entire lives are shaped by fear, insecurity, and hesitations. It is a multi-layered oppression perpetrated on those voices to keep power structures intact and enforce inferiority upon them coupled with silence. But ironically they realize that silence fails to enable them to survive for "when we are silent / we are still afraid."79

The final three-line stanza introduces the ultimate injunction: "So it is better to speak / remembering / we were never meant to survive."80 The voices decide to remain in the Third Space and survive despite the topology of oppression; speaking up becomes their strategy of resistance. Arthur Frank believes that in her work, "Lorde creates herself as a figure of resistance."81 She is definitely one of the voices in the litany. In order to survive, the voices of the litany need to establish their sense of self a propos the Third Space. This space creates a fissure in their oppressors' authoritative positionality offering a dimension to sever fixity and reforge identities. Carr argues that "Lorde's invocation of her 'voice/presence' [is] a provisional assertion of strategic authority […] Such an authority de-authorizes those with capitol A/Authority and opens up a cultural space for others speaking."82 Lorde inscribes her agenda by breaking the fear-silence dichotomy and celebrating her difference; a difference capable of disrupting power structures and claiming the agency of its bearers. Speaking up while residing in the Third Space is her counter attack to circumvent imposed silence and her means of survival. Hybridity paves the way for the Third Space which holds a promise of resistance for its dwellers. Residing in what has been assigned by hegemonic powers as a compounded locus of imperfection, resistance emerges from the ambivalence offered by this liminal space which denies purity, and hence denies the absolute authority of the ones in power. Third Space dwellers refuse to satisfy authority, and this open process of signification will not come to a halt. The liminal space moves with its voices from self-effacement to self-assertion.
Third-wave feminism established itself as a movement of pluralist thought that emerged not to de-center, but rather to complete the unfinished quest of its predecessor and rather myopic second-wave feminism. Nevertheless, third wavers lack formalized structure and their movement still has a long way to go. The theoretical grounding of a feminist school requires more than loosely-connected autobiographical essays by diverse women. Intersectionality, being the signpost of the third wave, can benefit much from other minority-oriented discourses. Hybridity in postcolonialism has much in common with intersectionality, and it can widen its scope through its ability to reset power relations and disrupt hegemonic discourses. Third wavers equally need to revisit third-world feminist writers like Lorde in whose *ars poetica* and essays multiple intersectionalist and hybrid selves are orchestrated into one voice aspiring for solipsism. Lorde explores the conceptual boundaries of differences and points to the fallacy of the ersatz homogeneity of a monologic discourse willing to accept only what is white, patriarchal, middle class, and heterosexual, and trying to wreak havoc on any differences likely to appear. Her intersectionalist hybridity unveils the relics of a white, male, heterosexual other; producing a voice that hears itself speaking from a distance and trounces the uncanny nature of differences. Her work embraces a notion of difference in meanings, languages and identities. It provides profoundly inherent varied shapes of associations, tensions, allusions, and conciliations that are apt to appear in the utterance coming from many margins. There are no erasures or elisions of differences; in Lorde's work it is a matter of coexistence among differences which enables her to realize diversity. Her intersectionalist hybridity becomes a coalition that embraces differences while retaining them; a coalition third-wave feminism is still trying to achieve.
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Findlen, Listen Up, xv.

Findlen published an extended edition of this volume in 2001 in which articles by Lisa Miya-Jervis, Alison Crews, and Daisy Hernandez are added discussing further topics concerning third-wave intersectionality, women's careers, and pop culture.
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Hybridity is not totally alien to third-wave terminology since it has been used by Heywood and Drake referring to third wavers as "beasts of such hybrid kind;" nonetheless, they do not locate it in any specific discourse (3).

Following the etymology of hybridity, the foundationalist use of the term was embraced by Mikhail Bakhtin in *The Dialogic Imagination*. Bakhtin conceptualizes the term to refer to a single utterance that implies two or more connotations, ideologies, strategies, vocabularies, languages, styles, etc… A cultural theorist and a linguist, Bakhtin draws much upon the multiplicity of voices paraded in linguistic situations. He moves among the terrains of diversity and differences to trace the unity that results in spite of such polarity. This unity, albeit nigling and altering, possesses authority in human speech and behavior, since it makes room for listening to one’s voice from the others’ perception.
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10 Lorde acquiesces to many African mythological figures in *The Black Unicorn* such as: Elegba, Eshu, Maw, Mawlisa, Seboulisa, Yemanjá, Dahomean gods, and others.


42 The notion of bringing fertility through the river resonates the Egyptian myth of Isis and Osiris, in which Osiris, god and king of Egypt, is killed by Set his brother, but Isis the wife decides to roam the country to restore the body of her murdered husband and she successfully conceives a son with him. Isis is also the goddess of fertility, and it was believed in Ancient Egypt that the Nile flooded every year because of the tears she shed on Osiris.


45 Bhabha, *The Location*, 15.


48 The full trickster figure created by Lorde appears in her mythobiography *Zami: A New Spelling of My Name* (1982) in which she manipulates all the characteristics of the trickster in African culture to deliver Zami and tell her story as a black lesbian.
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