

**Dijana Zrnica**<sup>1</sup>  
University of Banja Luka  
Faculty of Law  
Republic of Srpska,  
Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Scientific Review**  
UDC: 177.6:159.964.2  
DOI: 10.7251/SOCEN2323061Z  
COBISS.RS-ID 138686721  
Accepted: 23/04/2023

## PHILOSOPHY OF SEXUALITY AND L'ÉCRITURE FÉMININE

### Abstract

*In her work, the author problematizes, but also tries to shed light on, the phenomenon of female sexuality and the place and role of women in the symbolic space, by entering into a dialogue with representatives of l'écriture féminine ("women's writing"), as a French branch of feminist philosophical-literary theory from the beginning of the 70s. those years of the 20th century. The first findings resulting from this polemical discussion reveal that the subject of interest of the theory of "women's writing" is the inscription of the female body and female diversity in structural language and text, by means of deconstruction as a post-structuralist method. It will be shown that the search for a "hidden signifier" in language, which tends to express the unspeakable, implies a critical review of philosophical, psychoanalytic, and literary-theoretical positions on the development of female sexual identity, as well as on the role of women in the symbolic order. Thus, Foucault's texts question the archeology of sexuality in the narrative, under the strong influence of psychoanalysis. French psychoanalysts, led by Freud, through the phenomenon of hysteria, which Foucault reinterprets as a phenomenon of self-misunderstanding, open the way to consider the misunderstanding of one's own desire and one's own sexuality, while literary theorists in parallel introduce the discursive production of knowledge about sexuality, emphasizing the ubiquitous misunderstanding and exclusion of female sexuality. from the standard male language code. In the end, the author concludes that in the androcentric language, women are defined as "other", and that they must enter into a dialogue with their otherness in order to reaffirm such an understanding of themselves and their sexuality.*

**Keywords:** *l'écriture féminine; philosophy; literature; poststructuralism; psychoanalysis; deconstruction; sexuality*

---

1 Correspondence: Dijana Zrnica, PhD – Assistant Professor; e-mail: dijana.zrnica@pf.unibl.org

## Introduction

While in the 1970s and 1980s American feminist critics affirmed gynocriticism<sup>2</sup>, as a multimodal study of women's literature, feminism in France primarily affirmed l'écriture féminine ("women's writing") as one of the most influential directions of French feminist criticism. The theory of l'écriture féminine was significantly inspired by the fundamental changes in French philosophical and literary theoretical thought arising from the wave of popularity of écriture (fr. writing), as one of the most important terms of the poststructuralist discourse. The term "poststructuralism" itself is applied retrospectively to denote a complex of phenomena in contemporary humanities whose roots go back to the 1960s, and whose consequences continue even today. The common feature of these phenomena is a critical attitude towards structuralism. Although many names are associated with poststructuralism, we should point out the French initiators of this theoretical orientation, such as philosopher Jacques Derrida, feminist philosopher Hélène Cixous, literary theorist and critic Roland Barthes, psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, philosopher and historian of ideas Michel Foucault and feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray. However, on the French philosophical-literary scene, at the same time, there is a moderate l'écriture féminine current embodied in the French philosopher and literary theorist Julia Kristeva, whose doubts about the necessity of creating a "women's writing" I myself, in the end, will agree with.

### „White tint“ of Hélène Cixous

Feminist philosopher and psychoanalyst, Hélène Cixous, is among the first French intellectuals from the 1970s to question the role of language in the creation of sexual identity. Encouraged by Jacques Derrida's revolutionary philosophical-linguistic discussions on the binary nature of language structure, as well as strongly influenced by psychoanalysis - primarily, Freud's ideas about sexual identity and gender roles, as well as Lacan's revisionist reading of Freud based on the principles of structural linguistics, Cixous is driven by the wave of French (post-structuralist) feminist theory based on "women's writing".

According to Cixous, specific female literary creativity is a special type of discourse, which is, first of all, unrestrained, free and resists any attempt at theoretical definition and systematization. That "delicate divergence" of a text written by a woman asks the feminist critic to approach the process of determining

---

2 Spacks, P. M. *The Female Imagination*. New York, Avon books, 1976. p. 3

deviations, the historical experience of women's exclusion from literary creation, with equal delicacy and caution. In the polemical essay *The Laugh of the Medusa* (*Le Rire de la Méduse*, 1975), Cixous calls such creation "women's writing" (*l'écriture féminine*) or "writing oneself" (*l'écriture de soi*) as a powerful weapon against the Logos founded by men. The need to oppose the male mode of writing with a unique female mode arose from the knowledge that "it is impossible to define the female practice of writing, because it cannot be transferred into a theory, closed, coded; it will always exceed the discourse that regulates the phallogocentric system; [...] it is seasoned by subjects who have stopped with automatism, peripheral creatures that no authority will ever subjugate"<sup>3</sup>. Conceptually, French feminist criticism, Cixous believed, must find a way to incorporate the female body and female diversity into language and text, without appearing revisionist in relation to existing critical practice. A friend and follower of Derrida, she introduced the method of deconstruction into feminist theory, and with that she engaged in a bit of criticism of the logocentrism of Western philosophical discourse and the hierarchical binary opposition, in which women always represent the other. Deconstruction was introduced into French philosophical and feminist critical thought by Derrida in the book *De la Grammatologie*<sup>4</sup>, inspired by the analysis of the phallogocentric philosophical tradition that represented the basis of Western culture. Its meaning has evolved and changed over time, but what Derrida had in mind was a specific reading procedure aimed, among other things, at revealing cracks in the metaphysical conceptual systems that formed the basis of structuralist thought. Starting from the question of the origin of *écriture*, as well as of language itself, he epistemologically engaged in the deconstruction of structuralist discourse, including De Saussure's dualistic conception of the sign as a link between the acoustic image (signifier) and the concept (signified)<sup>5</sup>. Structuralists viewed the language system as something closed that strictly determines the creation of statements. Today, it is considered that the "Derridian" demolition of the foundations of Western metaphysics and the deconstructive reading of structuralist texts represent the intellectual basis for the poststructuralist movement<sup>6</sup>.

3 Cixous, H. *The Laugh of the Medusa*. U R.R. Warhol i D.P. Herndl (ur.). *Feminisms: an Anthology of literary theory and criticism* (str. 347-363). New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. 1993. p. 353

4 Derrida, J. *De la Grammatologie*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. 1967

5 De Saussure, F. *Course in General Linguistics*. trans. by Wade Baskin. ed. by Perry Meisel and Haun Saussy. New York: Columbia University Press. 2011

6 Derrida, J. *Linguistics and Grammatology*. U J. Derrida. *Of Grammatology* (str. 27-74). Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (prevod sa franc.). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. 1997

Trying to find a way out of the inherited patriarchal, logocentric and phallogocentric structure of writing, thinking and the belief that masculinity is the natural source of power, Hélène Cixous affirms a new way of writing which she calls *l'écriture féminine*. This concept of “women’s writing” was not only complementary to Derrida’s concept of “difference”, i.e. the binary nature of language, with which Derrida sought to overcome the dominant logocentric order in writing and thinking and create space for the free play of thoughts (concepts) and language, i.e. the game “signifier”, but the author also saw in it the possibility to express her feminine essence in the writing of women, not submitting to traditionally male forms of expression. Derrida, namely, developed a new vision of language and literature, in which the idea of structure would be replaced by the idea of a “language game”, fusion would give way to distinction, the system of individuality and similarity to difference and diversity, and the need for order to the need for provisionality<sup>7</sup>. It was necessary to create a female script that would work within the male discourse, but in such a way as to constantly deconstruct it; to write what cannot be written<sup>8</sup>. Language is the starting point; consciousness must be mastered first, and then speech in order to create a female discourse.

The author connects the mysterious sources of female creativity, i.e. the muted sphere of female expression, first of all, with the sphere of physicality, as a symbolic determinant of femininity, which also entails the sphere of the unconscious, as a refuge for all that is unsaid, suppressed by cultural and social conventions. Calling on a woman “to write herself”, because “your body must be heard”<sup>9</sup>, Cixous affirms the conceptual fundament of *l'écriture féminine*, which is reflected in the intimate connection of a woman with her body and which denies the attitude that *écriture* is exclusively an activity of the spirit and as such reserved only for men. Women, she believes, are forcibly separated from writing, just as they are forcibly separated from their bodies. They must return to their body, as the source of femininity and sexuality, but also as an instrument of speech, because a woman speaks with her body, not with her voice. A woman’s psyche is formed by her biology, language and gender.

---

7 Derrida, J. Linguistics and Grammatology. U J. Derrida. *Of Grammatology* (str. 27-74). Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (prevod sa franc.). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. 1997, p. 57

8 Jacobus, M. Is There a Woman in this Text? *Reading Woman: Essays in Feminist Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1986. p. 83-109

9 Cixous, H. The Laugh of the Medusa. U R.R. Warhol i D.P. Herndl (ur.). *Feminisms: an Anthology of literary theory and criticism* (str. 347-363). New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. 1993. p. 385

Acting reductionistically according to Freud's late theories of female writing, in which Freud connects female writing with the "castration complex". The author adheres to Lacan's emphasis on "castration" as a total metaphor for women's literary and linguistic deprivations. In the same text, Cixous hints that "white ink" or mother's milk is necessarily felt in women's writing practice. With that well-known metaphor, she vividly connected the psyche of a woman with the pre-Oedipal phase of child development, which Jacques Lacan called the "imaginary" state, in which the child identifies himself in an intimate relationship with another<sup>10</sup>. The mother, who is a woman, becomes and remains for children of both sexes the Other, or object. Boys and girls develop their gender identity in relation to their mother differently. A boy must learn his sexual identity negatively, as one that is not female. The girl builds a positive gender identity and it rests on the sameness, continuity and identification with the mother. In fact, she never separates from her mother. There, in the "imaginary", the woman moves more freely than in the space that Lacan called "symbolic", With its appearance, the child begins to feel that there is an "outside world" and some higher order that Lacan defined as "the law of the father". The child builds its subjectivity precisely in this phase of separation from the mother and identification with the father. For the boy, this means accepting the masculine principle as a privileged signification, which plays the role of a signifier in language, and is crucial for the construction of gender identity and subjectivity. This construction takes place in language, as a symbolic system, made of rules and structure, which the child adopts in order to become, as a speaking being, part of the patriarchal society<sup>11</sup>. The girl's approach to the Symbolic, i.e. language and its laws, is always negative and/or mediated by an intersubjective relation to the masculine principle, because it is characterized by identification with a deficiency<sup>12</sup>. When it comes to the problem of negativity in psychoanalytic theory and unfair criticism of women's writing in the spirit of Freud's claims that unfulfilled dreams and longings in women are mostly of a romantic character, which significantly shapes the plot in women's texts<sup>13</sup>, Cixous tries to solve it with a gynocentric reading inspired by Lacan's revision-

10 Borch-Jacobsen, M. The Oedipus Problem in Freud and Lacan. *Critical Enquiry*, 20, 1994. 267-282.

11 Lacan, J. *On the Names-Of-the-Father*. trans.by Bruce Fink. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2013. p. 16.

12 Kaplan, C. Fictions of Feminism: Figuring the Maternal. *Feminist Studies*. 20(1): 153 – 167. September 1994. p. 157.

13 Freud, S. Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* trans. by James Strachey, Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson, vol.IX. London: the Hogarth Press. 1908.

ist attitude towards Freud's expectations, revealing the repressed egoistic and ambitious fantasies inherent in male narrative texts. In that Lacanian triadic distinction (subject, object, order), the author saw the possibility of distinguishing "women's writing", which she not only accepted in theory but also in her own discourse, which is characterized by a poetic, metaphorical, allusive style, full of coins and word games, because of which she is "the most translated among French intellectuals, and at the same time untranslatable"<sup>14</sup>.

### The language of Luce Irigaray

Hélène Cixous' idea that *l'écriture féminine* means the affirmation of that woman's "difference" that is manifested in her body was accepted and developed by the French feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray, whose work significantly influenced the later feminist re-examination of psychoanalysis in the light of defining and constantly redefining the principles of female sexuality. The task of psychoanalysis, points out Irigaray, is to determine the moment in a girl's development when she becomes aware of her sexual identity, which is not necessarily biologically determined. Freud himself warned that psychoanalysis should be kept separate from biology<sup>15</sup>. With her books *Speculum of the other woman* (*Speculum de l'autre femme*, 1974) and *The sex which is not one* (*Ce Sexe qui n'en est pas un*, 1977), she approaches a radical re-examination, actually a deconstruction of Freud's and Lacan's teachings. In an imaginary dialogue with Freud on the subject of femininity, Irigaray comments on the disputed points in Freud's statements on the definition and development of female sexuality. Starting from Freud's statement on the importance and meaning of the Oedipus complex and the existence of three psychosexual stages of development and formation of sexual identity, the author points out the omissions and shortcomings of the conclusions, which Freud arrives at. Namely, when explaining the process of female sexual development, Freud initially equates it with the development of male sexuality, whereby boys and girls go through the same psychosexual stages<sup>16</sup>. Freud's attempt to explain this phenomenon with alternative assumptions that vary from the fact that the girl developed hostility towards her mother the moment she was deprived of her mother's milk, through the birth of a new child and the neglect of the existing

14 Derrida, J., Cixous, H., Armel, A., & Thompson, A. From the Word to Life: A Dialogue between Jacques Derrida and Hélène Cixous. *New Literary History*, 37(1), 1–13. 2006. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20057924>

15 Gallop, J. Moving Backwards or Forwards. *Between Feminism and Psychoanalysis*. ed. by Teresa Brennan. London and New York: Routledge. 27 – 39. 2002. p. 35

16 Irigaray, L. *Ce sexe qui n'en est pas un*. Paris: Collection Critique. 1977.

one, to observing the mother's body as a source of various desires, could not be accepted, which Irigaray explains by the fact that the same speculative explanations can be attributed to boys, who nevertheless do not change the object of desire (the mother). Irigaray reminds us that the first object of desire is the same for both sexes, namely the mother, and it appears in the pre-Oedipal phase through the act of breastfeeding<sup>17</sup>. In this early stage of the development of sexuality, the child does not notice the biological differences on which the concept of later gender/sex interpretations rests. Even in the stage of pre-genital sadistic-anal organization, male-female polarization is still not evident, but Freud observes that based on the present antithesis of active i.e. the possession of male genitalia/passive i.e. the state of castration, one can speak of the existence of masculinity, but not of femininity. Irigaray criticizes Freud's theory as extremely androcentric.

Believing that not only patriarchal prejudices about women but also the androcentric structure of Western thinking are hidden in psychoanalysis under the mantle of science, Irigaray proves that the metaphysical discourse does not recognize gender diversity and that in it women do not have an identity as women. Rejecting traditional psychoanalytic attitudes, which define male sexuality as the norm, "presence", and female sexuality as "absence", the lack of a penis, she opposed the androcentric opinion with her assertion that a woman's body, unlike a man's body, has more than one erogenous place, which is why her sexuality is characterized by variety, versatility and abundance.

In the book *The sex which is no one* Luce Irigaray writes: "A woman has sexual organs more or less everywhere. She finds pleasure in almost every place ... The geography of her pleasure is more diverse, multiple in differences, more complex, more subtle than even imagined - unimaginable in an imaginary too focused on sameness."<sup>18</sup> Since the feminine keeps the secret, she is required to, as Irigaray says, "maintain and strengthen the desire of the man without knowing the given desire and without understanding why it is important to her." A woman's enjoyment of sexuality is not one-way, it is never "just one". And that is transferred to her language, to her syntax. Forced to use the language of a man, a woman can never express her whole self. The most she can achieve in those conditions is to get closer to herself. And to get closer to herself for her means to get closer to her gender, "to her mother, our mother in us and among us". Warning that in the historical process of subordination, women have been turned into men's property, the author called on women to

---

17 Irigaray, L. *Ce sexe qui n'en est pas un*. Paris: Collection Critique. 1977.

18 Ibidem, p. 23



oppose the subjugation that denies them both the right to complete sexuality and the right to their own language. Femininity, Irigaray points out, is only one of the identities that participates in the construction of a woman's subjectivity as a human being. Such a gender-based identity is continuously built in a given socio-cultural space, with a carefully structured linguistic manifestation. Socio-culturally projected female sexuality is inserted into a strictly structured language, but it resists equating with male sexuality, because the element of male sexuality appears in language as generic, while female sexuality appears as a radical other - negativity<sup>19</sup>.

Irigaray finds the basis for her feminist thoughts primarily in the philosophy of the body of Michel Foucault as well as in the critique of psychoanalysis by Freud and Lacan. Namely, Foucault devoted the greater part of his thought life to thinking about sexuality and the relationship between knowledge and power. In the first part of the monograph *History of Sexuality* entitled "The Will to Knowledge", Foucault talks about the repression of sexuality, the hysterization of the female body, and the socialization of reproductive behavior, which inevitably leads to the desire. Silenced, sexual desire moves to the level of discourse. In representation, bodies are described in biological terms, which are devoid of any desire or emotion<sup>20</sup>. In a time where there are strict rules of sexual morality, there is no place for sexual expression. Speaking about the origin of knowledge, Foucault starts from two basic factors of power that lie at the root of every creation and acquisition of knowledge, namely patriarchal authority and the manipulation of language. Consulting Foucault, Irigaray wonders if it is even possible to create a language that will talk about the body, while being deprived of Plato's patriarchal hegemony<sup>21</sup>. Using Plato's metaphor about the cave and the source of ignorance, Irigaray warns against the androcentrism of language that is tailored to the will of men and that represents women as a copy of the "one", "eternal", "man". She questions again and again how a woman could be excluded from the process of language creation and why her identity is based on the negation of male sexuality.

On the trail of constructed knowledge about the "feminine principle", Irigaray enters into a sharp polemic with Freud, especially underlining those places that reveal crude stereotypes such as Freud's claim that when you meet a human

---

19 Lacan, J.. *The Psychoses – The Seminar of Jacques Lacan*. Book III, 1955-1956. ed. by Jacques Alain Miller. trans. with notes by Russell Grigg. London: Routledge, 1993. p. 261.

20 Cole, David R. The Reproduction of Philosophical Bodies in Education with Language. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. 42(8). 816-829. 2010. p. 819

21 *Ibidem*, p. 817



being you can immediately see whether they are a man or a woman<sup>22</sup>. Making a safe distinction between human beings on the basis of gender, without the possibility of error, is a consequence of cultural conditioning, not given, Irigaray insists. Science, Irigaray further points out, does not support such arbitrariness in attitudes about sexuality. Sexual organs are only modalities that serve the same reproductive-productive purpose. Scientific objectivity, points out Irigaray, declares it through a microscope, observing the difference between germ cells, and not through simplistic observation<sup>23</sup>. Despite the fact that Freud pointed out the differences between the sexes based on perception, Irigaray highlighted the more dominant socially based gender difference that Judith Butler talked about extensively in such a way that the socially conditioned differences between men and women are so emphasized that they are essential also influenced the establishment of gender distinctions. In other words, for Butler as well as for Irigaray, gender is “an ideal construct that materialized over time”<sup>24</sup>. Through repeated performative actions, gender identity is built as a linguistic construct, which is subject to constant changes. How to speak, how to write, wonders Irigaray, and make the necessary change in the victimological position of female subjectivity in a phallogocentric language. Only by writing herself, another letter, women's writing, performing another spatiality, another narrative, another time, can a woman realize herself and return to her difference<sup>25</sup>.

### On the borders of the obscene by Julia Kristeva

A completely different understanding of “female sexuality” and “women's writing” was presented by Julia Kristeva, who shook the philosophical and intellectual thought of Paris in the seventies with her theories of language and culture. Kristeva saw *l'écriture féminine* as the realization of a more or less conscious aspiration of each speaking subject to introduce an oppositional and subversive element into traditional forms of discourse, which is not generic but ideologically motivated, so we can find it equally in women and men. In her most famous work, in her doctoral dissertation *The Revolution of Poetic Language* (*La Révolution du Langage Poétique*, 1974), Kristeva considered the relationship between the construction of subjectivity and the adoption of language as a system of signs in the development of human personality. The

22 Irigaray, L. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. trans. by Gillian C. Gill. New York: Cornell University Press. 1985. p. 13-25

23 *Ibidem*

24 Butler, J. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of „Sex“*. New York: Routledge. 1993. p. 2

25 Irigaray, 2000, 15

subject enters language, recognizing itself in it as a ready-made structure networked in relational dynamics that gravitate around the primary Signifier. The structuring of the subject is performed in the correlation of the body that is recognized and called out in language and the language that pronounces it and positions it in the field of subjectivity<sup>26</sup>. This is why the subject is always the speaking subject, regardless of its position in relation to the Signifier<sup>27</sup>. In the process of language acquisition, the author points out, the subject goes through two equally important operations: symbolic, which implies the mastery of sign systems, and semiotic, which is reflected in the spontaneous, often unconscious use of language signifiers. That symbolic aspect of language represents the social order - rational, objective and subordinate to grammatical and syntactical rules.

However, the sphere of semiotics associated with subversive forces, as a source of inexhaustible creative energy, constantly influences language and is in a conflicting relationship with the symbolic order. Through the action of these forces in the semiotic process, “women’s writing” is realized. As the position of female subjectivity in language and writing is manifested through a field of gaps and discomfort, the only way to better position it is for the body to write in language and for the body to write with language, but instead of tacitly agreeing to the laws of language, language should become the scene of active action. It is shamefully located on the very edge of subjectivity, “it lies there, quite close, but it cannot be assimilated. It haunts, worries and fascinates the desire while it does not allow itself to be seduced”<sup>28</sup>. It is a shamefully rejected object, what I am (“from nature”); in turn, I adopted a symbolic identity, that which I am not, which was constructed by the Signifier. The subject is, therefore, only an illusion in the textual body of language. In *The Time of Women* (*Le Temps des Femmes*, 1979), Kristeva expressed doubts about the concept of “women’s language”, and especially “women’s writing”, generally accepted by the new generation of feminists in the seventies. Pointing to the revolutionary importance of “efforts, which appear in contemporary art, to break the code, to break the language, to find a special discourse that is closer to the body and emotions, to those who are despised and repressed by the social contract”, she expressed doubt and the need to fence it off like this: “I am not talking here about “women’s language”, whose

---

26 Stojanović, D. Ženskost u polju zazora: prilog analizi ženske pozicije u androcentričnim okvirima jezika i pisma. *Temida*, 3(17), 2014. p. 2

27 Irigaray, L. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. trans. by Gillian C. Gill. New York: Cornell University Press. 1985.

28 Kristeva, J. *La Révolution du Langage Poétique*. Paris: Editions de Seuil. 1974, p. 1.

(at least syntactic) existence is very problematic and whose apparent lexical specificity is perhaps more a product of social marginality than gender-symbolic diversity. I am not talking about the aesthetic quality of the work either, which are produced by women, which are - with a few exceptions (but isn't this always the case with both sexes?) - endless repetitions of more or less euphoric or depressed romanticism and the constant explosion of an ego that lacks narcissistic satisfaction."<sup>29</sup> In order for a woman to position herself in language, she, as a speaking being, does not have to create a new "female" language/script, but to determine herself in a linguistic form that lies on the border between semiotic and symbolic - poetic language. Poetry, namely, introduces the obnoxious (what a woman is) into language while at the same time keeping it in such a form that it cannot harm language as such. It reforms the boundaries of language, achieves the effect of the message, while preserving its structure<sup>30</sup>. Although many feminist theorists and literary critics recognized Kristeva's ideas as useful and provocative, her attitude towards feminism is still ambiguous and even sometimes anti-feminist. In *The Time of Women*, Kristeva explains that there are three phases of feminism. The first phase, which strives for universal gender equality, is not acceptable for Kristeva. The author also rejects what she recognizes as the second phase of feminism, in which a unique female language is sought, which Kristeva considers impossible. She disagrees with feminists who argue that language and culture are fundamentally patriarchal and must somehow be abandoned. On the contrary, Kristeva insists that culture and language are the domain of speaking beings and that women are, above all, speaking beings. She strongly supports what she identifies as the third phase of feminism, which seeks to reinvent identity and difference and their relationship through art, as a field of possible catharsis that allows the subject to reconstruct and redefine<sup>31</sup>.

## Conclusion

In the 1970s, theorists of French feminist psychoanalytic and poststructuralist platforms introduced the concept of women's writing in order to define always potentially intervening and restructuring practices in language that include the speech of the female body in writing, and the writing of the female body in writing. Women's writing underlines the necessity of think-

29 Kristeva, J. *Women's Time*. *Signs*, 7 (1), 13-35. 1981, p. 25,

30 Stojanović, D. *Ženskost u polju zazora: prilog analizi ženske pozicije u androcentričnim okvirima jezika i pisma*. *Temida*, 3(17), 2014., p. 6.

31 Kristeva, 1987, p. 17.

ing about the relationship between physicality and textuality in language. The body is materialized in language, and language becomes a representative of the body. However, a woman, whose physicality is represented by an androcentrically structured language, does not have the possibility of deriving meaning in the full sense, if she were to limit herself only to the domain of language, as symbolic. Feminine is that which is elusive, unrecognized, that which escapes language, which is somehow always outside language, on the other side of the Symbolic, subjectivity, and therefore threatening to the integrity of the subject. How then to speak, how to write, and how to move the female subject position from the place of victim of androcentrism? In the process of critical observation and understanding of the paradoxical position of the female subject in the androcentric language space, the representatives of the women's writing came to the realization that in speech itself, in the displacement of language structures, lies the possibility of language restructuring, i.e. the realization of the female subject through poetic sublimation. "When we are forced to fusion, to find a gap. Where language unites us on a fictitious level, to return to our difference. When others assimilate us, to preserve our autonomy"<sup>32</sup>.

Although an important theoretical formulation in French feminist criticism, the concept of "women's writing" remains a utopian possibility rather than a real literary practice. Their interest in the textuality of the avant-garde, literary production from the end of the 20th century makes "women's writing" a blueprint for the future.

## References

- Borch-Jacobsen, M. The Oedipus Problem in Freud and Lacan. *Critical Enquiry*, 20, 1994.
- Butler, J. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of „Sex“*. New York: Routledge. 1993.
- Cixaus, H. The Laugh of the Medusa. U R.R. Warhol i D.P. Herndl (ur.). *Feminisms: an Anthology of literary theory and criticism* (str. 347-363). New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. 1993.
- Cole, David R. The Reproduction of Philosophical Bodies in Education with Language. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. 42(8). 816-829. 2010.

---

<sup>32</sup> L. Irigaray, *To be Two*. trans. by Monique M. Rhodes & Marco F. Cocito-Monoc. New York: Routledge. 2001. p. 15.

- Derrida, J. *De la Grammatologie*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. 1967
- Derrida, J. Linguistics and Grammatology. U J. Derrida. *Of Grammatology* (str. 27-74). Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (prevod sa franc.). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. 1997.
- Derrida, J., Cixous, H., Armel, A., & Thompson, A. From the Word to Life: A Dialogue between Jacques Derrida and Hélène Cixous. *New Literary History*, 37(1), 1–13. 2006. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20057924>
- De Saussure, F. *Course in General Linguistics*. trans. by Wade Baskin. ed. by Perry Meisel and Haun Saussy. New York: Columbia University Press. 2011.
- Freud, S. Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* trans. by James Strachey, Anna Freud, Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson, vol. IX. London: the Hogarth Press. 1908.
- Gallop, J. Moving Backwards or Forwards. *Between Feminism and Psychoanalysis*. ed. by Teresa Brennan. London and New York: Routledge. 27 – 39. 2002.
- Irigaray, L. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. trans. by Gillian C. Gill. New York: Cornell University Press. 1985.
- Irigaray, L. *Ce sexe qui n'en est pas un*. Paris: Collection Critique. 1977.
- Irigaray, L. *To be Two*. trans. by Monique M. Rhodes & Marco F. Coci-to-Monoc. New York: Routledge. 2001.
- Jacobus, M. Is There a Woman in this Text? *Reading Woman: Essays in Feminist Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1986.
- Kaplan, C. Fictions of Feminism: Figuring the Maternal. *Feminist Studies*. 20(1): 153 – 167. September 1994.
- Kristeva, J. *La Révolution du Langage Poétique*. Paris: Editions de Seuil. 1974
- Kristeva, J. Women's Time. *Signs*, 7 (1), 13-35. 1981
- Kristeva, J. *Powers of Horror – An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1982.
- Lacan, J. *On the Names-Of-the-Father*. trans. by Bruce Fink. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2013.
- Lacan, J. *The Psychoses – The Seminar of Jacques Lacan*. Book III, 1955-1956. ed. by Jacques Alain Miller. trans. with notes by Russell Grigg. London: Routledge, 1993

- Showalter, E. *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women Literature and Theory*. New York: Pantheon. 1985.
- Spacks, P. M. *The Female Imagination*. New York, Avon books. 1976.
- Stojanović, D. Ženskost u polju zazora: prilog analizi ženske pozicije u falogocentričnim okvirima jezika i pisma. *Temida*, 3(17), 2014, p. 69-86.