

Body/Text/History: Violation of Borders in Assia Djébar's  
*Fantasia*

David Waterman  
*Institut Supérieur d'Enseignement  
Universitaire Professionnel*

*Horror never grows more pro-  
found; it only repeats itself.*

—Mohammed Dib

Assia Djébar's novel, *Fantasia: An Algerian Cavalcade* (1985; originally written in French as *L'amour, la fantasia*), can be read as a political novel which examines, on many levels, the concept of borders, especially borders violated. Although *Fantasia* is largely set in the time of the French occupation and colonization of Algeria, Djébar provides the reader with a much more complex account of border violation and remapping than might be expected from a "war" novel. For centuries, authors have been describing war-torn countries as "conquered," "despoiled," and "raped." In *Fantasia*, Djébar anthropomorphizes Algeria with violent, erotic clichés too, but she goes beyond simile, creating a novel which centers on Algeria under occupation as inextricably linked to the female body, functioning as the site of signification and mediation. The body becomes the semiotic palimpsest upon which the symbolic is written. The female body and occupied Algeria become as one, and because both are determined not only by nature but by culture as well, both are related to history; the body/country becomes a text which carries the historical record. The body is not only a material form, but imaginary as well; Djébar makes a strong connection between the sexuality of the female body and the eroticism of war. The female body/Algeria becomes not just an image, but the central text of borders violated/unveiled, firmly connected to war, writing, history, and sexuality.

Ultimately, Djébar also destroys the boundary between war and peace, suggesting that the two are indistinguishable given the position of the female body within the symbolic system. A related question to consider within this framework is posed by Trinh T. Minh-ha: "Can knowledge circulate without a position of mastery?" (41). This context of body/text/history/sexuality leads us to question our assumptions about where knowledge is produced, how it is transmitted, and the consequences of resistance.

In *Fantasia*, the female body must be seen not only as an individual, but as a collective body too, a body which Anne Donadey suggests "returns to a double past" (107). This double past refers not only to an historical space occupied by an individual/collective body, but a female body as it is positioned during wartime and peace both. History books are full of a double past which distinguishes between the border violations of war and the integrity of peacetime borders, but no such distinction is made for the female body. The veil is the symbol of the body's culturally-determined border, or to define culture more specifically, the veil is imposed by a patriarchal power structure. There is, after all, nothing natural about the veil. The oppressive situation of colonialism and war becomes gendered by its relation, even in times of peace, to the female body. This colonial violence, Julia Emberley argues, leads to "some understanding of the way women's bodies—both literally and figuratively—are often the central site on which and through which social violence is produced and reproduced" (50). The body, of course, has its natural borders, but the veil becomes important precisely because it is unnatural; its imposition by culture relates it to other largely unnatural structures, such as writing and history.<sup>1</sup>

The relationship between body, writing, and history begins early in the young girl's life, and on the first page of Djébar's novel as well. The Arab girl is discovering her awakening sexuality in the form of a love letter written to her by a boy she does not know. It is at this point that the girl must be locked away, because love-letters, according to her father, are "tantamount to setting the stage for rape" (4). Her father's solution, approved by both men and women of the culture, is to "wrap the nubile girl in veils. Make her invisible . . . destroy in her every memory of the world without" (3). The jailer must keep a careful watch, and even so, the words will escape: "Her voice, albeit silenced, will circulate" (3). Words have an incredible double power regarding the border of the veil; words can protect and insulate, and they can penetrate. Regarding a lover's letter, the

narrator says that passion, "expressed in writing . . . cannot touch me" (59). Even she now realizes that writing, as a way of denying her body to her lover, is a "naive sublimation," and that she is, in fact, looking for a way to unveil through writing (59). She describes herself as unveiled, violated by a peeping-tom, an enemy who has stolen her lover's letter (60). While she feels naked because another man has read the letter which describes her body, not all men have eyes to see behind the veil. The conquering French men, for example, are essentially neutralized in this respect; an Arab woman need not necessarily be veiled before a Frenchman (as she would need no veil in the presence of other women), but it is of utmost importance that the Muslim men, who are able to "see" or "know" (because they are not infidels), not see a woman unveiled at any social gathering (169).

To be recognized by a male is a violation of the border/veil, a trespass into forbidden territory. The young girls too feel like trespassers when they discover erotic photographs and postcards in the brother's bookcase (11). There is, unquestionably, a language of the body, using the body to write on and to write with; when the women have been unveiled before the conqueror, they write on/veil themselves in mud in order to erect a new border against the male and the Christian. They would use their own blood if it were necessary (56), using an interior part of their bodies to veil the exterior. To be stripped naked is to be utterly destroyed, like the adolescent bride taken prisoner (98-99). Indeed, it seems to make no difference whether the body is alive or dead when it is stripped. In war generally, and in *Fantasia* specifically, corpses are often stripped not only of their valuable jewels and such, but of their simple clothes as well, and then the bodies are mutilated. These are the ultimate violations of war, first the breach of the cultural border, the veil, and finally the mutilation of the "natural" borders of the body, through rape and/or murder. Any violation of the body in this situation is also a violation of the text, an attempt to destroy something dangerous, trying to prevent an historical record from being transmitted.

"The fourth language, for all females . . . remains that of the body" (180), what Trinh calls "linguistic flesh" (38). When considering the meeting point of the body and language, especially writing, we encounter yet another border, that between the semiotic and the symbolic. Writing becomes an act of naming (a masculine act, with the phallus as transcendental signifier) and of symbolic possession, an act performed both by another and by the self, "as if the

writing marked the beginning and the end of possession" (180). A woman's body cannot be exposed, but "must be muffled up, tightly swathed, swaddled like infants or shrouded like corpses" (180). It is a dangerous situation if a woman's body, like writing, should fall into the wrong hands, especially (but not exclusively) during war-time. It becomes, for Djébar's narrator, an unveiling to write in a foreign language, in this case French, the language of the colonizer. Not only is the body unveiled, but then mutilated; while the textual record is thereby destroyed, the ancestral record remains:

To attempt an autobiography using French words alone is to lend oneself to the vivisector's scalpel, revealing what lies beneath the skin. The flesh flakes off and with it, seemingly, the last shreds of the unwritten language of my childhood. Wounds are reopened, veins weep, one's own blood flows and that of others, which has never dried. . . . Speaking of oneself in a language other than that of the elders is indeed to unveil oneself. . . . Such incidental unveiling is tantamount to stripping oneself naked. (156-57)

Even thus exposed, the unveiled body "reverberates with sounds from the endless landslide of generations of my lineage" (46), a way of re-covering with an "ancestral veil" (209). The body/text of one woman is still able to communicate, connected to history through the dead mothers and sisters who have informed her present being not only through the cries of resistance to border violations, but ironically also in collaboration to veil the young girl. Julia Kristeva speaks of the existence of this semiotic body language in "Stabat Mater," including its inheritability: "Women doubtless reproduce among themselves the strange gamut of forgotten body relationships with their mothers. Complicity in the unspoken, connivance of the inexpressible. . . . We are in it, set free of our identification papers . . ." (180). While we tend to think of a text as something written (the symbolic, subject to the Law of the Father), we see that a semiotic, extra-verbal knowledge can be created and transmitted. French/masculine symbolic writing contrasts with Algerian/feminine semiotic "writing," a means of textual signification and transmission more closely linked to the body.

Part of what connects the body/text to history is the equation of the female body to Algeria, especially Algeria under occupation. The transition from the immediate body and the violation of its

culturally imposed border, the veil, to the violation of Algerian borders, is an easy one to make. *Fantasia* is filled with images which relate the body to the country, and the symbolic act of writing which is so important to the idea of body/text is also important to the textualization of Algeria. Writing itself becomes a weapon of war and colonization, used by the French to legitimate their violent conquest and possession of Algeria.

Immediately after the eruption of battle in 1830, the most important weapon of occupation arrives, though the military is not directly to blame; the first French newspaper in Algeria is established (28). Writing becomes the symbolic way to possess the feminine land/body. Although more subtle than troops or artillery, writing is very much a double-edged sword, with the power to shield or to penetrate. The fact that this newspaper, printed on "Gutenberg's infernal machine," is in the language of the colonizer makes it a trespasser (33). The French newspaper and the war reports, according to the narrator, "legitimized all manner of expropriations: physical and symbolic usurpations!" (45). Writing is used by the seducer and the rapist as a weapon, and by French government officials to sugar-coat episodes of violence which might cause misgivings back home: "And words themselves become a decoration . . . words will become their most effective weapons. . . . The supererogatory protuberances of their publications will form a pyramid to hide the initial violence from view" (45); in other words, only the official version of the "truth" will be published. Foreign-language writing has become like a pyramid, an unnatural part of the landscape, making a text of the country as it does of the body. The land/body, however, is no longer a native text.

The journalist Merle makes this connection between the body and the land early in the novel, as he describes how the Arab warriors refuse to allow one of their fellows, even a dead body, to fall into enemy hands; as the French troops advance, both bodies and the land itself are "at stake" (32). The city of Algiers itself is captured, although the French prefer the term "Open City" (39). Like the women who are captured, especially the episode of the adolescent bride, Algiers is stripped of her gold and jewels and is violated in the process (39). Not only is the gold looted, but the city is robbed of her history as well, "stripped of its past and its pride" (39). A princess, Badra, was born in the year that Algiers fell, and her body is described because it reminds people of the city's past glory and grandeur; she is the adolescent bride who is publicly stripped of her

jewels (84). There are in *Fantasia* many examples of women's bodies seen as part of the landscape, to be looted with impunity by the conqueror (see 88, 93, 97). The women, like the land itself, are in the hands of the French soldiers.

Not only are women's bodies compared to the conquered city, but to the battlefield as well. The officers sending home official reports or personal correspondence "speak of Algeria as a woman whom it is impossible to tame. A tamed Algeria is a pipe dream; every battle drives further and further away the time when the insurgency will burn itself out" (57). The Arabs who are pursued by the French are often elusive, fighting the war guerilla-fashion and then escaping. Whatever hold the conquerors have on the land itself is held in the form of "mutilated women. . . . The only confirmation that the Other, the Invisible Enemy has got away. . . ." (56). The captured women, as the only group with whom the occupiers spend any length of time, speak for Algeria in a "collective voice," in a sense providing the background music for the war (56), which the chroniclers describe as "the ballet of the conquest of our territory" (51), though the dance is French while the music is Arabic. Djébar is not simply using an extended and complicated metaphor in which the female body and war-torn Algeria are interchangeable symbols. She intends them literally to be as one, as the cave-fire episode illustrates.

Danielle Marx-Scouras supports this assertion, speaking of Djébar and other women "war" writers:

Unlike their male counterparts, they do not merely personify the homeland as a woman; they depict the devastation of revolutionary and civil war on their writing bodies, the "body in pain" becomes, so to speak, the textual signifier. (176)

Djébar has fused the public, male domain of war with the private, female body, if in fact the woman's body was ever really private. If the land and the body are indeed one, the most dramatic image of violation and rape must be the fumigation of the cave, penetrating the interior of the land/body. The Ouled Riah tribe, 1,500 people, most of whom were not warriors, have been suffocated as they hid in a cave, suffocated by fires set by the French army (72). The images of rape and massacre are overwhelming; "all of the corpses are naked," writes a Spanish officer, and the looting of the corpses has begun (72). Hundreds of the corpses have been brought out into the sun, and the stench of rotting flesh drives away the army. But though

they are dead, they have not been erased; the land/body becomes words, especially the words of Pélissier in his too-realistic report which causes scandal in Paris: "The corpses exposed in the hot sun have been transmuted into words. Words can travel" (75). Pélissier's report connects the dead with history, blurring the border between "victors and vanquished," and becomes part of the "palimpsest on which I [the narrator] now inscribe the charred passion of my ancestors" (79), as though the multiple and competing texts, telling this story of occupation, have become one. Djébar pursues this blurring of the boundaries between love and rape, master and slave, land and body:

It is as if these parading warriors . . . are mourning their unrequited love for my Algeria. I should first and foremost be moved by the rape or suffering of the anonymous victims, which their writings resurrect; but I am strangely haunted by the agitation of the killers. (57)

If in fact the conqueror has fallen in love with the body/land of Algeria, it is a violent, possessive passion rather than a nurturing, balanced love. The message of the conqueror/lover/rapist is clear; if I cannot possess you, then neither can anyone else. You do not even own yourself.

*Fantasia* abounds with sexual imagery, but it is a violent eroticism, centered on the practice of abduction, torture, and rape. "The grotesque and obscene predominate," Marx-Scouras points out, and the image of violent sexuality is driven by the lust for power: "The oppression of women in Algeria . . . is clearly analogous with the situation of war. Sexuality, like war, is used to conquer and possess, subordinate and control" (175, 178). As we will later see, sexuality becomes a weapon even in peacetime, but for the moment sexuality will be treated like writing, as a subtle but effective weapon of warfare with unclear boundaries. The erotic imagery of the mutilated land/body is perverse, and "the descriptions make it clear that someone is obviously taking pleasure from war" (Marx-Scouras 175). This perverse arousal from mutilated bodies takes to the extreme the erotogenic zones of the body, in other words, the meeting of the interior/exterior borders of the body. Some recent critics argue that the body is not simply a natural being, but a body determined by culture in relation to the symbolic, literally inscribed by the dominant power.<sup>2</sup>

Charles Shepherdson, discussing the work of Luce Irigaray, argues that the symbol,

which, in so far as it gives rise to the constitution of objects, will play an organizing role in giving *limits* to the body, in allowing the subject to distinguish, in other words, between what is inside and what is outside. This is what gives the concept of erotogenic zones—those orifices by means of which the body establishes its exchange with exteriority. . . . (51)

Shepherdson goes on to say that, because the body is not only organic but also a “sexualized field,” it must be considered an “imaginary body” (62), though the violations of its borders are certainly real. This is at least a part of the cause of the conqueror’s sexual perversity in *Fantasia*, namely that the land/body for which he lusts is largely imaginary.

This lust for an unknown body is prefigured early in the novel, when the 13-year-old girl, who is veiled, hears that a man “must have fallen in love with your silhouette and your eyes!” (10). The young girl is not pleased with his advances, intending to resist, and the “suitor,” for his part, is lusting after an outline, an imaginary body which he knows nothing about. He desires to transgress the border of the veil, and he may ultimately use violence to do so. Not only is the unknown body a body which is hidden from view by the veil, but also unknown in another sense, unknown (but not necessarily unpossessed) by other men because the girl is a virgin—the fascination with torn flesh is pervasive. A little later in the novel, we are again reminded of the destructive nature of sexuality in these conditions of occupation, as the narrator asks, “But why, above the corpses that will rot on successive battlefields, does this first Algerian campaign reverberate with the sounds of an obscene copulation?” (19). All of the images of sexuality in *Fantasia* are obscene because mutual consent is never present; the invasion is “an enterprise of rapine” (45), always met with resistance, carried out with violence and resulting in death.

The large-scale rape of Algeria is multiple, not only man against woman but infidel against Muslim, which makes the violation even more dishonorable. The women would rather that they and their children die than be dishonored by the infidels, and they beg their sons and husbands to kill them before they go off to battle, in case the Christians win and come to possess the women as the spoils of

victory (42). Masculine possession of the women is something which does not change much from the context of peace to that of war, and indeed the women's ideal of self-sacrifice may be imposed on them, with that detail overlooked by the recorder. A dangerously jealous lover expects loyalty till death. We hear that lovers hold one another's hearts, but Djebbar presents that cliché in a deadly, literal way:

these two Algerian women—the one in whom rigor mortis was already setting in, still holding in her bloody hands the heart of a dead Frenchman; the second, in a fit of desperate courage, splitting open the brain of her child, like a pomegranate in spring, before dying with her mind at peace. . . . (18)

This "obscene copulation" not only produces no children, but kills children already born and results in the death of the "lovers." Warfare and rapine become a deadly blood sport for the conqueror, "the illusion of a manly sport: to be at one with insurgent Africa, and how better than in the intoxication of rape . . ." (55). Even images of non-violent sexuality become murderous. The two dancers, Fatma and Meriem, had received two French officers, "simply for a night of love" (166), but later, during an attack, the lieutenant returns to the house to find that the two women had been murdered by other soldiers intent on stealing their jewels. The image is one of rape, the soldier's "bayonet dripping with blood": "Two bodies of two young dancers lying half naked up to the waist, their thighs visible through the torn fabric of their clothes, without head-dress or diadem, without earrings or anklets . . ." (166). Too strong a resistance often ends in death, which, depending on the character, is preferable to submission.

The 13-year-old girl who has been raped by the soldiers is said to have "submitted to France" even though she has certainly not been submissive. The word "rape" is not used as one of the older women asks the girl if she has suffered any damage (202). The fact that this young shepherd girl lived through her ordeal perhaps becomes evidence against her in the minds of many of the other Algerians, making her a collaborator. Given that she really has no choice between death and "submission," the girl "chooses" to live, and will bear the apparent shame of that decision for the rest of her life. Inger Agger calls the girl's feelings of guilt "*complicity*: that paradoxical, shameful feeling of being an accessory which can arise in

the person whose boundaries have been violated" (1). Chérifa too lives through her ordeal of arrest, imprisonment, and torture, but her fierce resistance is highlighted; she refuses to submit, thereby earning, she tells De Gaulle's representative, "the respect of my compatriots and my own self-respect." Since she has been fighting against the forces who attempt to violate the borders of her land/body, she is no criminal, and boasts of her clear conscience (140).

The narrator is fighting, as the oppressors cannot understand, against a "language imposed by rape . . . introduced . . . by conquest and accompanied by bloodshed" (216). She cannot yield to a sexuality that has been imposed; voice can answer to voice, "and body can approach body" only "With friend or lover from my own birthplace" (129). History, we are often told, is driven by conflict, the violation of borders and the resistance to that violation; the history books are then generally written by the winners in the conflict, though this makes a hybrid of *Fantasia*, set in Algeria but written in French. I have been discussing the meeting and partial dissolution of various borders: between the body and the land, between warfare and sexuality and how they connect to the body, and how the body/land itself becomes a text. Djébar makes clear that we should include at least one more element into the fuzzy-border equation, namely that of history. If rotting corpses can become words that travel, those words, whether written or spoken, become history. This body/text relationship to history is illustrated by Julia Kristeva's definition of *semiotic* (or pre-symbolic), tracing the etymology to its Greek root: "[semiotic] = Distinctive mark, trace, index, precursory sign, proof, engraved or written sign, imprint, trace, figuration" (93). Shari Benstock, using Kristeva's definition, suggests that "the semiotic mediates 'species memory' and is mediated by . . . social and historical context" (28). Once again we find the female body at the center, now as a textual record of history which can survive the death of the individual, or the semiotic as defined by Kristeva: "only the subtle gamut of sound, touch and visual traces, older than language and newly worked out, are preserved as an ultimate shield against death" (177).

For many different writers, Elizabeth Grosz points out, "the body is conceived as a fundamentally historical and political object; indeed, for many it is the central object over and through which relations of power and resistance are played out" (81). Assia Djébar is certainly a writer in this group, linking body/land/text/sexuality to history. Although Charles Shepherdson has Luce Irigaray in mind

when discussing the historical nature of sexuality, one could easily include Djébar's writing as a subject appropriate to his remarks: "[the symbolic] is a concept used . . . to insist upon the susceptibility of human sexuality to history. . . . The concept of the symbolic, then, stresses the essentially historical nature of sexuality . . ." (60). Djébar's image of sexuality is historical because of its relation to writing, or the symbolic, but it is also historical because it is bound to a past of warfare and colonization; the body in *Fantasia* is a mutilated body, violated by a rapist, murdered by a soldier. The history to which this body/text is bound is stained with blood, and it is often women's blood, what Trinh calls "corporeal fluidity" (38).

History is buried and forgotten, unless it is written down. Bodies and cities must be translated into a text as a form of rebirth; without a record, "everything lies dormant: the bodies of the women . . . cities weighed down by the burden of their past; and so too the epigraphs left by long-forgotten witnesses" (100). Much of this written history, including *Fantasia*, is recorded in French, the language of the "vilest of men from the dominant society" (128). Because it is the language of the colonizer, it reawakens memories of invasion and violation; to use a foreign language is a form of unveiling:

tantamount to stripping oneself naked . . . this stripping naked takes us back oddly enough to the plundering of the preceding century. . . . The battle-cries of our ancestors, unhorsed in long-forgotten combats, re-echo across the years; accompanied by the dirges of the mourning-women who watched them die. (156-57)

When we speak of writing, we generally mean a written account of history, but we cannot forget that the body too is a text, capable of conveying the historical record down through the generations. Djébar's narrator tells us, "stripped, bare, unveiled . . . my body reverberates with sounds from the endless landslide of generations of my lineage" (46). There exist ghosts and memories to be reborn from the textual record of the body.

The body/text, and its relation to history, seems to have magical conjuring powers: "exhuming buried cries, those of yesterday and as well as those of a hundred years ago" (63); raising ghosts behind the officers (51); and "above all to resurrect so many vanished sisters" (204), calling to mind Cixous's idea of *écriture féminine*. The best example of the body passing history on to the next generation is the narrator's grandmother, who has gone into a trance, dancing

to the drum-beat: "all the voices of the past, imprisoned in her present existence, were now set free and leapt far away from her" (145). Teresa de Lauretis, rereading Lévi-Strauss's essay "The Effectiveness of Symbols," suggests that this sort of trance-inducing ritual is an

*exemplum* of the use of woman's 'body' as a generative textual site of mediation . . . [resulting in] a splitting of the female subject's identification into the two mythical positions of hero (the human subject) and boundary (spatially fixed object or personified obstacle—her body). (qtd. in Emberley 52)

But even this direct transmission, like any textual record, is incomplete, giving only "a glimpse of the source of all our sorrows: like half-obliterated signs which we spend the rest of our lives trying to decipher" (*Fantasia* 145). The past, of course, consists of both wartime and peace, though often "peace" is an occupied, submissive peace.

During wartime, the women of Algeria suffered casualties, as the men did, and also suffered, as the men did not, the violation of rape. They were warriors and mothers, combatants and nurses, but after the war they were not sung as heroes; after the war, the occupiers were no longer the immediate enemy, and women were expected to step back, silently, into the oppressive life they had always known, cloistered and covered with a veil. For women, the boundary between war and peace becomes distorted, as Marx-Scouras points out: "Djebar erases this distinction between the abnormal reality of war and the so-called reasonable one of peacetime, in order to demonstrate that they are one and the same" (179). Women will still be casualties: a girl's own father or brother will kill her on the basis of a rumor or an ill-concealed adolescent love letter (12); women will be publicly shamed because a husband has written his wife's name on a postcard, where anyone could read it (37); women will still be veiled if they wish to "circulate" in the city (203). And the woman's torn flesh will still produce a cry, even in peacetime, "A cry which might ring out at every wedding, without the *Fantasia*, even in the absence of caparisoned horses and riders in flaming crimson. The sharp cry of relief and sudden liberation then abruptly checked" (106). "Bruised, half-alive, or dead," Trinh points out, "is often the fate of what comes within the masculine grip" (38); she makes no distinction between French men or Algerian men, at war or in peacetime.

Finally, the severed hand becomes the emblem of writing and the woman's body, of mutilation and history: "Fromentin picks up out of the dust the severed hand of an anonymous Algerian woman. . . . Later, I seize on this living hand, hand of mutilation and of memory . . ." (226). One might assume that this woman's hand was cut off by an occupying soldier during the siege of Laghouat, as he was stealing her jewelry. But if the borders between war and peace are indistinct where the woman is concerned, that assumption is questionable; this act of violence can happen at any time, not just from a declared enemy in wartime. Women who violate the boundaries of the system always face punishment, as the narrator says at the end of *Fantasia*: "I wait, foreseeing the inevitable moment when the mare's hoof will strike down any woman who dares to stand up freely, will trample all life that comes out into the sunlight to dance!" (227). The cycle continues through history, reproducing violence and violation of borders on the land/body, passed along from generation to generation, and retold through the living text of the body. To answer Trinh's question about whether knowledge can circulate outside of a position of mastery, we find that the answer is a guarded yes, because the consequences of confronting and resisting a dominant power are often life-threatening. There are, however, always gaps and imperfections in the borders which protect mastery—fissures in the symbolic system: "the speaking being finds a refuge when his/her symbolic shell cracks and a crest emerges where speech causes biology to show through: I am thinking of the time of illness, of sexual-intellectual-physical passion, of death . . ." (Kristeva, "Stabat Mater" 185). *Fantasia* is just such an ambivalent work, allowing another voice to articulate body/text/history from outside the position of power, allowing (though not without risk) knowledge-without-mastery to show through the cracks.

### Notes

1. The distinction between "natural" and "unnatural" (that is, cultural) itself is problematic, falling as it does into an either/or logical fallacy. Such binary opposition, between nature/culture, male/female, etc., is often a means for the dominant power to maintain social control by defining a single, fixed position that a subject should occupy within a culture. Gender, for example, is not so much a natural fact as it is a cultural construction; the human body is literally inscribed by society, marked in ways which define a subject as "masculine" or "feminine."

2. Susan Bordo, Judith Butler, and Elizabeth Grosz are especially recommended for their excellent discussions of the human body determined by culture. See the following: Bordo, "Docile Bodies," Butler, *Bodies that Matter* and *Gender Trouble*, and Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*.

### Works Cited

- Agger, Inger. *The Blue Room*. Trans. Mary Bille. London: Zed Books, 1994.
- Benstock, Shari. *Textualizing the Feminine: On the Limits of Genre*. Norman, OK: U of Oklahoma P, 1991.
- Bordo, Susan. "Docile Bodies, Rebellious Bodies: Foucauldian Perspectives on Female Psychopathology." *Writing the Politics of Difference*. Ed. Hugh Silverman. Selected Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy 14. Albany: State U of New York P, 1991. 203-15.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.
- . *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Djebar, Assia. *Fantasia: An Algerian Cavalcade*. Trans. Dorothy S. Blair. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1985.
- Donadey, Anne. "Assia Djebar's Poetics of Subversion." *L'Esprit Créateur* 33.2 (1993): 107-17.
- Emberley, Julia V. *Thresholds of Difference: Feminist Critique, Native Women's Writings, Postcolonial Theory*. Buffalo, NY: U of Toronto P, 1993.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. "The Body of Signification." *Abjection, Melancholia and Love: The Work of Julia Kristeva*. Ed. John Fletcher and Andrew Benjamin. New York: Routledge, 1990. 80-104.
- . *Volatile Bodies: Towards a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Revolution in Poetic Language." *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York: Columbia UP, 1986. 89-136.
- . "Stabat Mater." *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York: Columbia UP, 1986. 160-86.
- Marx-Scouras, Danielle. "Muffled Screams/Stifled Voices." *Yale French Studies* 82 (1993): 172-82.

Shepherdson, Charles. "Biology and History: Some Psychoanalytic Aspects of the Writing of Luce Irigaray." *Textual Practice* 6.1 (1992): 47-86.

Trinh, T. Minh-ha. *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1989.