

## Women Writing Women: Reading Helene Cixious' "The Laugh of the Medusa"

**P. Prayer Elmo Raj**

Assistant Professor  
PG & Research Department of English  
Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai  
Tamilnadu, India  
Orcid: **0000-0002-4771-2107**

### Abstract

"The Laugh of the Medusa" is a call for *écriture féminine*. Connecting female body to female authorship and writing, Cixous urges women to claim their bodies to narrow down the fissure between body and writing. Advocating a vehement critique on phallogocentrism, Cixous challenges the masculine tradition of reason, rhetoric and writing to advance female body writing. This essay is an interpretive study on how Cixous demonstrates *écriture féminine*.

**Key Words:** body, writing, woman, desire

Write! and your self-seeking text will know itself better than flesh and blood, rising, insurrectionary dough kneading itself, with sonorous, perfumed ingredients, a lively combination of flying colors, leaves, and rivers plunging into the sea we feed. (Cixous, "Laugh" 899)

Medusa, in Greek myth, cursed by goddess Minerva, was transformed into a grotesque figure with snake like hair and her gaze turned all who looked at her to stone. Peresus, son of Zeus, kills Medusa by slaying her head. "Cixous interprets this myth of Medusa's death as men's attempt to silence the voice of women, to cut off women's languages, thus deconstructing Freud's theory of the "castration complex" in men during the Oedipal stage of psychosexual development and the



© This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Lacanian theory of Symbolic Order in the development of language” (Chakraborty 2897-8). The decapitation of Medusa's head, in Freud's “Medusa's head” is a symbol that demonstrates the “castration complex” in males at the Oedipal stage. “To decapitate = to castrate. The terror of Medusa is thus a terror of castration that is linked to the sight of something” (Freud 264). It is at the Oedipal stage the male child recognizes the absence of phallus in the mother and identifies with the father. The identification of male child with the father is an outcome of the fear of being castrated and thereby casts off mother to overcome fear. Chakraborty explains how Lacan adopts and interprets “castration complex”:

Psychoanalyst Lacan, adopting Freud's theory in the domain of language development, states that with the rejection of what he calls the “womb worlds” of the mother, the child enters the patrilineal world systematized by order and concrete rules which Lacan terms the “Symbolic Order”. As a member of the Symbolic Order the male child learns the spoken word that is the language of the world, while rejecting the pre-linguistic language of the mother, whereas the girl child, being anatomically similar to her mother, continues to identify with her and hence with the prelinguistic language of the mother. Thus Lacan believes that girls acquire a different language than boys, a language that, according to Lacan, is primitive, silent like the womb world of the mother. The language of women thus remains undeciphered by men and is thus repressed and silenced by the male ordered discourse. This draws us back again to the myth of the Medusa whose death signifies the triumph of the Symbolic order (i.e the spoken word) and the domination of the female voice, the pre-linguistic, primitive language of the womb world. (Chakraborty 2898)

Cixous, in “The Laugh of the Medusa,” discusses women's writing and “what it will do” (Cixous, “Laugh” 875). Why is it important for a woman to write? From where should women's writing transpire? Who should write women? What if a woman writes? Cixous urges women to write themselves. Women “must write about women and bring women to writing from which they have been driven away as violently as from their bodies—for same reasons, by the same law, with the same fatal goal. Woman must put herself into the text—as into the world and into

history--by her own movement" (Cixous, "Laugh" 875).<sup>1</sup> With her call for women to write, she challenges the "conventional man" and "a universal woman subject" who aims to restore women back to their senses and historic position. An essentialist construction of "universal"<sup>2</sup> woman subject is partial and exclusionary. Such a woman subject will be a "Western, bourgeois, white and heterosexual woman" (Thornham 39).<sup>3</sup>

Cixous argues against devising female sexuality as definite and homogeneous. The "very structures of Western language exclude women and can function only through the silencing of women and the repression of feminine sexual drives" (Rabine 21). Emphasizing on the individual copiousness, Cixous asserts that female sexuality is not consistent, homogeneous and describable into codes. Any "insistence upon coherence and unity of the category of women" forcefully disapproves "the multiplicity of culture, social, and political intersections in which the concrete array of 'women' are constructed" (Butler 14). Instead of creating an oppositional discourse, Cixous fashions a discourse based on the assemblage of female sexuality. Emphasis on heterogeneity subverts,<sup>4</sup> dislocates and opens up the otherwise circumscribed and controlled women's imaginary as inexhaustible: "Women's imaginary is inexhaustible like music, painting, writing: their stream of phantasms is incredible" (Cixous, "Laugh" 876).

---

<sup>1</sup>Höpfl maintains that "It is difficult to convey the problem of feminine writing without seeking to transgress the text and, yet, every transgression will invite correction ... However, since every explanation is a further *incorporation* into the body of the text this project is self-defeating. On the other hand, without explanation, the attempt becomes untenable. A lack of discipline in writing is considered inept, unprofessional. (101)

<sup>2</sup> The "universal category" "contradicts." It is a "positive and finite term" that limits and negates the female sexuality within "exhaustive possibilities." (Thornham 33)

<sup>3</sup> Therefore, in the place of universal woman, feminism offers a "profound scepticism regarding universal (or universalizing) claims about the existence, nature and powers of reason, progress, science, language and the subject/self." (Flax 193)

<sup>4</sup> "By opposing male discourse, women would once again, according to Cixous, end up as the mirror opposite of that which they oppose. She seeks instead to subvert the oppositions by playing with them in such a way that dislocates the whole system" (Rabine 27-8)

In contrast to the rigid and subjugated world devised by patriarchy, the self-descriptive world of a woman is a “world of searching,” the amplification of knowledge based on the schematic exploration and examination of bodily functions and “a passionate and precise interrogation of her herotogeneity” (Cixous, “Laugh” 876). This exploration of heterogeneity, the “plural category,”<sup>5</sup> is a journey into the self with a possibility of dynamic change. It imbibes the necessary conditions for the possibility of subjective transformation that articulates resistance. This practice is abounding, creative, and actual aesthetic venture in which beauty remains unabated. Further, Cixous also acknowledges that woman is erotogenous: “she is the erotogeneity of the heterogeneous” (Cixous, “Laugh” 890). It is a moment of fête and radical difference. The emphasis on difference allows women to challenge, contest and resist dominance. Xie writes: Cixous “erotogeneity of the heterogenous” echoes Kristeva’s conception of the semiotic feminine other, which as the disruptive and irrational in character, writes outside and threatens to subvert the rational imperial order of discourse” (9).

Women have long been prevented from writing by the “great arm of parental-conjugal phallocentrism” that leads them into self-disdain. Parental-conjugal phallocentrism promotes a “logical linearity of phallogenic writing and thought” (Rees 433).<sup>6</sup> Phallogenic is an “alternative means” of excerpting patriarchal domination with insistence on the symbolic domain of phallus. This “privileging of the masculine, which results from what she calls ‘the solidarity of

---

<sup>5</sup> “The plural category of ‘women’, for instance, though conceptually signalling heterogeneity nonetheless semantically marks a collectivity; constructed or not, ‘women’ still occupies the space of a linguistic unity” (Fuss 4)

<sup>6</sup> “Her discussion of “parental-conjugal phallogenicism” clearly delineates this phenomenon as a cultural construct maintained at least in part by patriarchal notions of the family. Further, the histories of writing and of rationality exist in an interdependent relationship with phallogenicism” (Rees 433).

logocentrism and phallogentrism,<sup>7</sup> damages us all, females and males alike, because it curbs the imagination and is therefore oppressive in general” (Bertens 138). Cixous envisions a freedom from the patriarchal social and cultural constraints that would subvert the “hegemony of phallogentrism” (Hekman 42).

Since writing has been designated only for “great men,” women write in secret. Writing in secret remains a secret. Women punished themselves for writing. As in the case of masturbation, they make themselves feel guilty. Guilt and shame were sanctioned on women who write. Like masturbation, “writing is an intense exercise in imaginary visualization” (Bergland 84). However, masturbation and writing are connected and separated “by the fear that writing may metamorphose into the sin of self-abuse and by the similarity of the two activities that makes simultaneity impossible” (Schehr 217). Writing is an act of configuring the self and strengthening it: “To write is to let masturbation go, not to abandon the self, but rather to reinforce the self, as the trace and in the wake of the moving hand: writing means taking time out from ecstasy” (Schehr 217). A “woman must write woman” because a “female-sexed text” not only challenges men to realise where his masculinity and femininity are at but also the absurd capitalist machinery. Writings that register femininity are rare in the history of literature. The phallogentric tradition of writing is confounded with self-reflexive rationalities. Most of the female writings, similar to that of male writings, presents obscure women or replicate the classic representations of women as sensitive and intuitive. Writing, for women, offers a possibility of change, the space where women can start off their subversive and transformational thoughts.

---

<sup>7</sup> Cixous mentions the interconnection between logocentrism and phallogentrism: “The challenging of this solidarity of logocentrism and phallogentrism has today become insistent enough—the bringing to light of the fate which has been imposed upon women, of her burial—to threaten the ability of masculine edifice which passed itself off as eternal-natural; by bringing forth from the world of femininity reflection, hypotheses which are necessarily ruinous for the bastion which still holds the authority” (Cixous and Clement, “Sorties” 65)

Woman must write her self because writing is a moment of liberation. Writing can be seen “itself as something which might be endlessly rediscovered and renewed, as an open, flowing process. In this lies its power, but also its ultimate impossibility” (Boyman 186). Writing is insurgent aiding her to accomplish the imperative ruptures and historical transformations. This occurs at two interrelated levels: a) individually: When a woman writes her self, she returns to the body, which has been impounded and turned into an “uncanny stranger.” This confounded body is a debilitated and dead figure. The body must be heard. For Cixous,

language is itself a body function. Speaking and writing involve the translation of thoughts through a complex network of chemical messages, nerve impulses and muscle movements, and Cixous suggests that this physiological activity, together with the ongoing body functions of breathing, pulse, the momentum of the body drives, stress and hormonal changes, influence our use of language. She believes a writer's attempt to repress these activities is both a falsification of the nature of the writing process, and an attempt to control meaning in compliance with the dictates of masculine law. (Sellers 139)

This will let the boundless resources and ability of the unconscious spring forth. The act of writing

will not only “realize” the decensored relation of woman to her sexuality, to her womanly being, giving her access to her native strength; it will give her back her goods, her pleasures, her organs, her immense bodily territories which have been kept under seal; it will tear her away from the superegoized structure in which she has always occupied the place reserved for the guilty (guilty of everything, guilty at every turn: for having desires, for not having any; for being frigid, for being “too hot”; for not being both at once; for being too motherly and not enough; for having children and for not having any; for nursing and for not nursing ... )-tear her away by means of this research, this job of analysis and illumination, this emancipation of the marvelous text of her self that she must urgently learn to speak (Cixous, “Laugh” 880).

Writing annihilates the false woman barring the organic woman from inscribing her breath. It allows to “inscribe the breath” of women in totality. b) The opportunity to express themselves and break them free from oppression they have always been subjected to. In the process of writing, women will develop a weapon against her oppression. It is imperative for women to start

scoring their achievements in written and oral languages. In every symbolic system and political process, she is at liberty to take the initiative on her own terms. The difficulty of getting up to speak is not uncommon among women. Even if her heart is racing and she is lost for words, it is daring for a woman to speak in public. Her transgression reverberates in male world. Besides silence, which is reserved for symbolic purposes, women will be able to affirm themselves by taking on the challenge of speech and writing, which has been dominated by the phallus. Women should break silence:

Listen to a woman speak at a public gathering (if she hasn't painfully lost her wind). She doesn't "speak," she throws her trembling body forward; she lets go of herself, she flies; all of her passes into her voice, and it's with her body that she vitally supports the "logic" of her speech. Her flesh speaks true. She lays herself bare. In fact, she physically materializes what she's thinking; she signifies it with her body. In a certain way she inscribes what she's saying, because she doesn't deny her drives the intractable and impassioned part they have in speaking. Her speech, even when "theoretical" or political, is never simple or linear or "objectified," generalized: she draws her story into history. (Cixous, "Laugh" 881)

It is difficult for a common man to differentiate between oral speech and the logic of the text because of his "antiquated relation-servile, calculating-to mastery" (Cixous, "Laugh" 881). Cixous observes that the "niggardly lip service," employs a masked body. Women's speech and writing keep their power to move us even after they have absorbed us deeply and imperceptibly. The first music that comes from a woman's voice of love is a song. It is because a woman is unable to build as many defenses against the drives as a man does. A woman writes in white ink in spite of phallic mystification polluting good relationships.

Writing in the feminine is configured by "the Symbolic, the voice of the mother..." (Cixous, "Castration or Decapitation" 54). When a woman goes through life, there is always that force produced by another woman, particularly the other woman. In giving birth to the other, mothers

are both the locus and the source of the other. Mother is a metaphor that contests phallic literary trope. Further, "the moment the maternal emerges as a new dominance, it must be put into question before it congeals as feminine essence, as unchanging in-difference" (Stanton 174). A woman needs to give her best to another woman in order to love herself and return the body that was "born" to her with love. "The relation to the "mother," in terms of intense pleasure and violence, is curtailed no more than the relation to childhood (the child that she was, that she is, that she makes, remakes, undoes, to the point at which she, at the same time, otherizes herself)." (Cixous, "Laugh" 882) Women have always had a mother who made things right, nurtured, and opposed separation: a force that cannot be avoided but will knock the wind out of the codes, and we will start by rethinking how women are viewed. What Cixous implies is the

continuing impact of the rhythms and articulations of the mother's body affects the otherwise omnipotent stratification of the (masculine) symbolic, challenging its constitution and definitions, and hence the subject's relationship to language, the other, himself and the world. More emphatically than Kristeva, Cixous believes the non-repression and inclusion of the maternal body in writing presents a link with the pre-symbolic plenitude between self and m/other, and hence a way round the loss, exile and perpetual alienation of the masculine schema. She sees in the very different motivations of mother-love the model for a radically different relation to the other, and thus the possibility for an other - feminine - economy and language 'contrary to the selfabsorbed, masculine narcissism, making sure of its image of being seen, of seeing itself, of assembling its glories, of pocketing itself again. She believes the inscription of this m/other relation in writing will provide a blue-print for revolutionary change" (Sellers 140)

The dynamic arrival of women suggests the dawn of new history or suggestive of the beginning of a press of becoming, a place where multiple histories converge. Throughout history, there has been a history of women, happening simultaneously in multiple places at the same time, and forever. As a result, women challenge the unifying, regulating history that homogenizes and guides forces, bringing incongruencies into one face-to-face confrontation. As well as being inextricably linked to the history of all women, it also represents the history of the nation and



world as a whole. She doesn't have to be a militant to be involved in liberation; rather, she has to be far-sighted and not limit herself. Liberation will not just bring about a change in power relations, but it will also bring about a radical change in human relations, thought, and practice. As a result of her liberation, her struggle is no longer a struggle about class; it is also a larger movement. In order to be a "woman-in-struggle," she does not have to leave or reject the class struggle rather, she splits it up, spreads it out, pushes it forward, and fills it up with the fundamental struggle. Cixous envisages a new history, one that is not a fantasy, even though it goes beyond men's imaginations. This new history envisions to destroy men's conceptual orthopedics, starting with the "enticement machine."

Defining a feminine practice of writing is impossible because it cannot be theoreticalized, contained, or codified, but that does not mean it does not exist. Nevertheless, phallogocentric discourse will always be outstripped; it will function only in areas that are not subordinate to philosophical-theoretical dominance. Those who are able to break free of the automatisms of their lives and subjugate peripheral figures cannot realize this vision. It is possible to appreciate that writing prospers by comprehending both its nearby and distant conduits. At the onset, one has to be aware of (1) sexual opposition, which has always been aimed at man's benefit to such an extent that writing is a product of his laws, is not simply a cultural or historical phenomenon. With each passing year, more and more fiction will depict women as irreducibly feminine. 2) readers, critics, and writers of both sexes are reluctant to admit or deny outright that there is a difference between feminine and masculine writing:

It will usually be said, thus disposing of sexual difference: either that all writing, to the extent that it materializes, is feminine; or, inversely-but it comes to the same thing-that the act of writing is equivalent to masculine masturbation (and so the woman who writes cuts herself out a paper penis); or that writing is bisexual,

hence neuter, which again does away with differentiation" (Cixous, "Laugh" 883).

Through the act of writing, we work through the in-between, observing the process of the same and the other without which nothing exists, undoing the work of death. It is necessary to wish for both, as well as the ensemble of both, one and another, which never becomes fixed through battles, expulsions, or other forms of death, but rather is perpetually dynamized by endless exchanges of ideas. The boundaries of one individual create the boundaries of the other, a continuous and multiple process whereby different subjects become aware of one another through the boundaries of the other. From one woman to another, there is an endless cycle of encounters and transformations. As a sign of dreaded sectility, and the mark of an operation that caused loss, Cixous emphasizes classical bisexuality as "bisexual, hence neuter." Castration fear and the fantasy of a "total" being (even though it is divided into two halves) erased this distinction as a sign of dreaded sectility. It is "sexual difference [that] develops out of bisexuality which is the original condition of every individual and is subsequently displaced, transformed by culture." (Makward 22). The dynamic opposition between genders are reinscribed consequent of how culture performs upon the human psyche (Aneja 21). The self-effacing, merger-type bisexuality might evoke castration in some minds, but Cixous opposes the other kind of bisexuality on which all subjects not encased in phallogentric representation construct their erotic world. "Bisexuality: that is, each one's location in self of the presence-variously manifest and insistent according to each person, male or female-of both sexes, nonexclusion either of the difference or of one sex, and, from this "self-permission," multiplication of the effects of the inscription of desire, over all parts of my body and the other body"(Cixous, "Laugh" 884).<sup>8</sup> Due

---

<sup>8</sup> Explaining the difference between genders, Cixous writes: "My own position is to insist always on the fact that libidinal femininity is not the *propre* of women and that libidinal masculinity is not the *propre* of men. What is most

to historical and cultural factors, it is women who are benefiting from this vatic bisexuality, stimulating, pursuing, and increasing the number of female bisexuals. Bisexuality as the basis of writing allows “a “nonexclusion of difference,” a traversing of self-other that allows a new (erotic) universe to be-come” (Juncker 427) “Woman is bisexual” in certain ways, whereas for man, it is no secret that he is poised to keep his glorious phallic monosexuality in mind. Many have been victimized as a result of phallic ideology asserting the primacy of the phallus.

It is Lacan's intention to keep alive the inevitable man-with-rock figure, erect in the old Freudian realm, in the sanctuary of the phallus, protected from castration by virtue of its phallus structure, which returns to where linguistics conceptualizes it “anew.” Phallic symbols are powerful and women are aware of this disorder. There is no womanly reason to pledge allegiance to something that is detrimental. The dark continent is neither dark or unexplorable. Women have not explored it because they have been told it is too dark and made believe it is too dark. Women were captivated by two horrifying myths: Medusa and the Abyss. It is a strange phenomenon that makes half the world laugh, yet it persists. The world is experiencing a phallogocentric subversion, and it is militant, regenerating old patterns steeped in castration dogma.

---

important for me, what allows me to continue to live and not to despair, is precisely the conviction that it does not depend on the anatomical sex, not on the role of man and of woman but that it depends on life's chance which is every individual's responsibility.( Cixous, “voice i” 54). “Masculinity and femininity both derive their meanings, and, more importantly, their values, in opposition to each other, but that opposition is produced through a repression of particular qualities on one side and their projection onto the other. Hence the understanding of masculinity as powerful, reasonable, and essentially of the mind is derived from the definition of femininity as vulnerable, emotional, and essentially of the body. She is the negative of what he wants to be. The purpose of examining such oppositions is not only to reveal the symbolic denigration of “the feminine.” It is also to reveal the illusions on which the oppositions themselves, and the hierarchies they establish, are constructed: hierarchies of mind over body, reason over emotion, power over vulnerability.” (Weil 154)

Men have claimed that death and feminine sex as unrepresentable. Femininity is associated with death. Historically, women have not written much about femininity, including its unlimited sexuality, mobility, eroticization, or sudden changes in emotional states of a minute and intense area. This is because most of the literature on feminine experience has not been written by women. The story that Cixous weaves is not about destiny, but about an adventure and a drive, a journey of crossings, trudges, sudden awakenings, and encounters with a zone that was once fearful. However, this journey, for Cixous, is about to become more open. When yokes and censorship are removed from a woman's body, she is able to express a multitude of meanings expressing multiple thresholds of desire.

Cixous views love as fool's game where the affinity between sexes is exhibited and bodies are exchanged blindly or yielded. Women are taught to ignore their bodies, to doubt them, and to turn them away. What Cixous envisions is that women should write their/through bodies:

Women must write through their bodies, they must invent the impregnable language that will wreck partitions, classes, and rhetorics, regulations and codes, they must submerge, cut through, get beyond the ultimate reserve-discourse, including the one that laughs at the very idea of pronouncing the word "silence," the one that, aiming for the impossible, stops short before the word "impossible" and writes it as "the end." (Cixous, "Laugh" 886).

Women are still shining through despite the loss of the famous thread that serves as the umbilical cord for men. Women will go to any length to make phallus, knowing the old lady is always right behind them.

When the repressed subject returns, she comes back explosive, destructive and staggering to challenge her culture and society with a force so powerful, unstoppable and unimaginable in suppression that it is unbearable. Cixous envisages that when the Phallic period comes to a close, either the women would have been annihilated or they would have been braved to the most

violent and passionate incandescence possible. Women's histories are characterized by dreams, bodies, silences, and aphonic in and through history. Despite the fragility attributed to women, they have not sublimated, but have saved their skin and their energy. They have not surrendered to the oppressive manacles of a life without future. In writing the vertiginous enormity of a history that has sprung from the entire history of men and from biblico-capitalist society, the women who have carved that history with a single word of the body are the women, the suppliants of yesterday, who will serve as the lineages of the new women, whose intersubjective relationship will never be the same. Women are an indomitable, poetic body. They are the Signifier's real mistress. Their efficacy will be ostensible every time she stops speaking silently and turn her point against herself rather than writing it opposite herself. Women's body is more conspicuous than that of men. Women's bodies have endured persecution, domestication, and castration, and have reacted accordingly.

Language conceals an invincible adversary, however, this is the language of men and their grammar, and therefore we cannot offer it any place that belongs to women. When woman has functioned within patriarchal discourse,

a signifier that has always referred back to the opposite signifier which annihilates its specific energy and diminishes or stifles its very different sounds, it is time for her to dislocate this "within," to explode it, turn it around, and seize it; to make it hers, containing it, taking it in her own mouth, biting that tongue with her very own teeth to invent for herself a language to get inside of. (Cixous, "Laugh" 887)

Language offers women the much needed flight. Flying is a "woman's gesture," she transforms her language into something that is able to fly. Her flight is liberating, setting free from her shackles. History has taught women how to fly, its dynamics and its many systems and practices. Women have owned everything by flying; have lived in flight, stealing away, finding narrow passages and hidden crossovers when desired. Women take after birds and robbers, and robbers

take after women and birds in the same way. As they fly by, bewildering the order of space, changing up the furniture, unsettling things and values, flouting them up, clearing structures, and overturned propriety, they befuddle the order of space. Stealing refers to the pleasure in disassembling and challenging structures and values. This allows women to realign and fashion their language anew. "Flying and stealing are both metaphors that signify the mobility, the fluidity and the subversive potential of the woman writer. They are also images that show the lyrical quality and the romantic undercurrents of Cixous' writing" (Puri 281). Feminine text is subversive. It has a dynamic volcanic because it writes experiences that revamps the old property crust and dismantle masculine investments. It aims to shatter patriarchal institutions to rupture laws and truth with "laughter." It is impossible to escape the chaosmos of the "personal" expressed by pronouns, nouns, and a faction of referents, since the language serves as a symbol for the world.

With history, women are capable of installing things that men could never imagine. The right to self supersedes the right to person, since if, through laws, lies, blackmail, and marriage, her name has been wrested with her identity. Due to mortal alienation, she has become increasingly aware of the absurdity of the concept of "propriety" and the reductive parsimoniousness of "masculine-conjugal subjective economies," which she resists emphatically. Consequently, she is necessarily positioned as a person who can lose a part of herself without losing her integrity. While she grows and multiplies secretly, silently, deep within, she also knows more about life than any man. She manages the ego and balance the drives. As opposed to men who are obstinate about their titles, their destinations of value and their power positions, women do not worry about decapitation (or castration), adventuring into inconspicuousness without the masculine

impertinence, which she can merge “with without annihilating herself”: women are givers. If women possess a “propriety,” “it is paradoxically their capacity to deappropriate altruistically:

body without an end,” without an appendage, and without their primary "parts." “If she is a whole, it's a whole composed of parts that are wholes, not simple partial objects but a moving, limitlessly changing ensemble, a cosmos tirelessly traversed by Eros, an immense astral space not organized around any one sun that's any more of a star than the others. (Cixous, “Laugh” 889)

Woman is not an undifferentiated magma, but rather one that does dominate it over the body or the desires of her body. However, the ability to create/write is intermingled with desire: “Writing is never very far removed from desire, from sexuality, and the pulsions that locate themselves in writing may be marked by either a feminine or a masculine libidinal economy” (Aneja 17). As masculine sexuality tends to gravitate around the penis, creating a centralized body (in political anatomy) organized by its parts, woman does not contribute to the same regionalization, as it is specific to one area and confined to the head/genitals in couples. A woman's libido is cosmic:

Her libido is cosmic, just as her unconscious is worldwide. Her writing can only keep going, without ever inscribing or discerning contours, daring to make these vertiginous crossings of the other(s) ephemeral and passionate sojourns in him, her, them, whom she inhabits long enough to look at from the point closest to their unconscious from the moment they awaken, to love them at the point closest to their drives; and then further, impregnated through and through with these brief, identificatory embraces, she goes and passes into infinity. (Cixous, “Laugh” 899).

By referring woman's libido as cosmic, “Cixous is so privileging female *jouissance* as, inevitably, to risk fixing it to the centre of her libidinal poetics. Her very privileging of the remainder that is *jouissance* might return it to the accountable realm of centres, limits and ends” (Schad 153). Further, even though woman is an outcast, she is the only one to search from within to discover where the echoes of front-language have never faded. Her language is free of enclosures or death; she refuses to die. In her language, she does not contain, she carries; she

does not hold back, she facilitates. When the id is ambiguously expressed-the wonder of being several-she does not defend herself against unknown women, but rather enjoys the beauty of changing.

Women are motivated by feminine jealousy, not because they have become entangled in the chain of substitutions that reveal what is really being substituted. To maintain some self-importance, they must believe that they are dying of desire, that we are holes fringed with desire for their penis, and that is their immemorial business if they want to persuade themselves that they are dying of desire. A man aligns himself to be fitted with feathers. Women do not desire the penis or even the famous bit of skin that men gravitate to, but the child. The ancients' historical limitations, fate, mechanical substitutions originating from the unconscious of an eternal "jealous woman" do not explain pregnancy; penis envy, narcissism or homosexuality involving mothers are excluded. There is no such thing as a woman or man having a child that makes them fall ineluctably into patterns or recharge their reproductive circuits.

In order to set up the child-mother-father-family system at once, will man still rely on everyone's blindness and passiveness, worried that the child will become a father, and that having a baby will lead to more than one bad deal? Both parties must develop a brand new topic based on defamiliarization in order to get rid of the old relationship and its effects. We should demater-paternalize woman rather than deny her in order to avoid co-opting procreation, a thrilling experience in the body. Also, there is a desire to live from within, and a desire to be a writer as well. In the event that it should happen to strike our fancy, we will not resist the opportunity to indulge ourselves in the unsurpassed pleasures of pregnancy, which have always been exaggerated, conjured away, or cursed in classical texts, but are actually unreal. Pregnancy



taboos have suppressed one thing. Actually, this reveals the power she possesses at the time, since it is well known that when a woman becomes pregnant, not only does her market value double, but she also gains intrinsic value as a woman, acquiring a body and acquiring sex in an undeniable way. No matter what, women seek, a “loving desire” or an “envious” desire, Cixous does not wish to adorn phallus on her body not out of revenge but she prefers to have another person for the other person, complete and whole. To live is to desire everything that exists, everything that exists, and to preserve it. New Women are seized, fingerprinted, disagreed, and brought to the authority trying to create external of theoretical setting. They are positioned for the advantage of a privileged signifier at a specific place in the sequence. The name-of-the-father is interpreted in a new way with a phallic mother.

In this journey, a new love hedges between knowledge and invention without bounds. She appears, “she’s everywhere, she exchanges, she is the desire-that-gives” (Cixous, “Laugh” 892) When a woman is in trance, she comes between herself and you, between the other me, where there is always more than one and more than me. She is exhilarated that we are becoming, and we continue to become. In a moving, open, transitional space, she runs the risk of running her own risks as she cuts through defensive loves, motherages, and devourations. She disrespects an Eros dynamic powered by abhorrence, as it is a malicious cycle beyond struggle-to-the-death in bed, beyond love battles that imaginary to signify interchange, through which she feeds. Those who love are loving, watching, thinking, despising, and unhoarding, but the phallus dominates us with revulsion. It is an heirloom, a remnant, a deceiving subservience. This is surely possible, and what sustains a life-love that is not concerned with trepidation, that stifles weirdness and keeps hunger at bay; a love that celebrates exchange.

Death still discloses in areas of history where woman cannot tread. Due to phallogocentric values, conflict, hierarchical interchange, and the struggle for mastery all lead to death. Even though the period endures into the present, the woman is still in the progression of fashioning her own story. While woman does not know what she is giving, she does not measure what she is giving, and she neither gives a false imprint nor something she doesn't own. Since life, thought, and transformation are possible, she gives more, without any guarantee that she will ever be able to recover even some unanticipated return from what she gives out, as a result of that possibility. In order to generate an economy that is no longer based on economics, she leaves behind all her management ideas wherever she loves. At the end of her conscious reckoning, woman finds not her sum, but her differences.

The subversive nature and impact of women's writing transpires out of the conventionally debased and inherently oppressive femininity formulated by patriarchy. Contesting the phallogocentric control and nurture of the female body, desire and writing, Cixous advocates freedom and innate bisexuality to move away male dominated textuality and writing. She urges the women to discover their "repressed sexualities" and to challenge the standards of phallogocentric discourses by writing their body.

### Works Cited

- Aneja, Anu. "The Medusa's Slip: Hélène Cixous and the underpinnings of écriture féminine." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory*, vol.4, no.1, pp. 17-21.
- Bergland, Renée L. *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects*. UP of New England, 2000.
- Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basics*. Routledge, 2014.
- Boyman, Anne. "Dora or the Case of *L'Écriture Féminine*." *Que Parle*, vol.3, no.1, Spring 1989, pp.180-188.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. Routledge, 2007.
- Chakraborty, Debadrita. "Analyzing *Ecriture Feminine* in "The Laugh of Medusa."" *European Academic Research*, vol.1, no.9, December 2013, pp. 2895-2904.
- Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." *Signs*, translated by Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen, vol. 1, no.4, Summer 1976, pp.875-893.
- . "Castration or Decapitation?" *Signs*, translated by Annette Kuhn, vol.75, Autumn 1981, pp.41-55.
- . "Coming to Writing." *Coming to Writing and Other Essays*, edited by Deborah Jenson, Harvard UP, 1991.
- Cixous, Hélène and Catherine Clément. *The Newly Born Woman*. Translated by Betsy Wing, U of Minnesota P, 1986.
- Conley, Verena A. "Voice i..." Interview with Hélène Cixous." *Boundary*, vol.1, no.12, 1984, pp. 51-67.
- Conley, Verena A. *Helen Cixous, Writing the Feminine*, U of Nebraska P, 1984
- Copjec, Joan. "Sex and the Euthanasia of Reason." *Supposing the Subject*, edited by Joan Copjec, Verso, 1994, pp. 16-44.
- Flax, Jane. "Gender and Social Problem: In and For Feminist Theory." *American Studies*, vol.31, 1986, pp.193-213.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Writings on Art and Literature*. Stanford UP, 1997.
- Fuss, Diana. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference*. Routledge, 1989.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Routledge, 1994.
- Hekman, Susan. *The Feminine Subject*. Polity, 2014.

- Höpfl, J. "The Suffering Mother and the Miserable Son: Organizing Women and Organizing Women's Writing." *Gender, Work & Organization*, vol 7, no.2, 2000, pp.98-105.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind. "Writing the Body: Toward an Understanding of *Écriture Féminine*." *New Feminist Criticism*, edited by Elaine Showalter, Pantheon, 1985, pp. 361-377.
- Juncker, Clara. "Writing (With) Cixous." *College English*, vol.50, no.4, April 1988, pp. 424-436.
- Makward, Christian. "Interview with Hélène Cixous." *Sub-stance*, vol.13, 1976, pp.19-37.
- Nye, Andrew. "French Feminism and Philosophy of Language." *Noûs*, vol.20, no 1, 1986, pp. 45-51.
- Puri, Tara. "Hélène Cixous and the Play of Language." *The Edinburgh Companion to Poststructuralism*, edited by Benoit Dillet, Iain Mackenzie and Robert Porter, Edinburgh UP, 2013, pp.270-290.
- Rabine, Leslie W. "Écriture Féminine as Metaphor." *Cultural Critique*, no. 8, Winter 1987-88, pp. 19-44.
- Rees, Emma L. E. "Phallogentrism." *Encyclopaedia of Feminist Theory*, edited by Elizabeth Kowaleski Wallas, Routledge, 2009, pp.423-33.
- Schad, John. *Victorians in Theory: From Derrida to Browning*. Manchester UP, 1999.
- Schehr, Lawrence R. "Fragments of a Poetics: Bonnetain and Roth." *Solitary Pleasures: The Historical, Literary and Artistic Discourses of Autoeroticism*, edited by Paula Bennett and Vernon A. Rosario II, Routledge, 1995, pp. 215-233.
- Sellers, Susan. *Language and Sexual Difference: Feminist Writing in France*. Routledge, 1991.
- Stanton, Domna. "Difference on Trial: A Critique of the Maternal Metaphor in Cixous, Irigaray, and Kristeva." *The Poetics of Gender*, edited by Nancy K. Miller, Columbia UP, 1986, 157-182.
- Xie, Shaobo. "Rethinking the Identity of Cultural Otherness: The Discourse of Difference as an Unfinished Project." *Voices of the Other: Children's Literature and the Postcolonial Context*, edited by Robert McGillis, Routledge, 2000, pp. 1-16.