

2021

Elgin's "Native Tongue": A "Me too" Universe?

Amir Barati
amirbaratia@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/tete_a_tete

 Part of the [American Literature Commons](#), [American Popular Culture Commons](#), [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [French and Francophone Language and Literature Commons](#), [Modern Languages Commons](#), [Philosophy of Language Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barati, Amir (2021) "Elgin's "Native Tongue": A "Me too" Universe?," *Tête-à-Tête*: Vol. 1 , Article 14.
Available at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/tete_a_tete/vol1/iss1/14

Elgin's *Native Tongue*: A "Me Too" Universe?

by Amir Barati

Since its first publication in 1984, Suzette Haden Elgin's novel *Native Tongue* has often been disregarded as a major contribution to the world of science fiction. Many reasons might have conjoined for the novel to remain obscure, ranging from the novel's abstruse language style, its disjunctive narrative, or its lack of rich characterization. However, critics are arguing that the absence of linguistic and stylistic nuance resulting in the creation of such tough language in the novel, "arises from generational and situational anger that is important and significant" to the novel's era (Dorsey 37). This view assumes Elgin's style to be representative of her radical ideas, which leaves no room for the aesthetic elements to flourish. Whatever literary and stylistic reasons might have pertained to this dismissal, the novel should be celebrated as an invaluable quest for radical feminist language as a defining element of power to transform the status of women in modern society.

Two qualities make *Native Tongue* stand out as an exceptional experience in the world of science fiction. First, the novel has provided a unique and radical critique of the condition of women in modern society. Elgin, using her sharp critical lens, witnesses the social realities of her time, many of which still hold true to the 21st century, and translates those violent social practices and structures into a radical language. Through this radical translation of what seem to be ordinary realities of her society, Elgin aims to uncover the violence behind such realities. She offers her radical translation that, in the first place seems like a very unimaginable hyperbole, but when better

thought out, informs the reader and uncovers essential realities behind the hyperbolic social practices inscribed within the linguistic patterns. Through her seeming overstatements, Elgin provides a fascinating critique of the ideologies inscribed into patriarchal language and evokes an extremely valuable linguistic and political awareness. The second point for which Elgin's project should be well-received is that she does not remain at the level of criticism and introduces an imaginative feminist path to tackle the patriarchal pillars. Elgin's project calls for a radical feminine transgressive revolt through language, as a means of power, to bring about socio-political change.

Native Tongue is the first book of a trilogy in which Elgin contemplates the ways language transformations can contribute to the formation of alternative social experiences. In her novel, language is at the core of the conflict between men and women. The novel, published at the dawn of second-wave feminism, is replete with radical criticisms questioning the pillars of patriarchal society and the status of women within it. Elgin questions the status quo of women of her time, considers language (English in the novel) as the source of the problem, and calls for genuine alternations to the language of her time. Her linguistic project, called "Láadan" in the novel, turns out quite successful whereas, in reality, her novel was not well-received among critics.

The novel, published in 1984, begins with an imagined futuristic imposition of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States issued again in 1996, based on which women have been stripped of any civil rights. Based on this amendment, women have the right to serve in offices only with the permission of a male member of their family. It is also noted that because women's inherent natural limitations are a clear danger and deemed destructive to the national welfare of the United States, the female gender is considered legal minors in the society (Elgin 7). The novel narrates the desperate status of women in a society where women's labor and their

procreation ability are the only values imaginable for them. In such social structure, women who are old and infertile must be banished from society and be taken to a remote women-only space called Barren House. In Barren House, women are forced to translate all day, and those who get very old have to teach young girls different languages that they know.

In this society, Nazareth Chornyak, a talented female linguist and the heroine of the story, learns that women in the house are working on a project to create a language to help them break away from male domination. The catch makes Nazareth, who is a perfect interstellar translator, focus on this project. Their initial project is called *Langlish* which is a feminized version of English. *Langlish* is a cover to conceal the women's secret project called Láadan; a purely female-centered language. The reason behind the concealment is that if men are very sensitive about the existence of such covert projects, they will shut down any means of feminine resistance instantly. The project has its own problems; nevertheless, it succeeds in affecting the minds of the girls who have been under this feminist education from birth.

Elgin introduces Láadan as a ground-breaking feminine intervention in the patriarchal structures of power. Láadan is designed to counter the androcentric nature of the English language and American society. Structural transformation in languages seem to be an impossible task due to the complexities and gradual construction of them throughout history. Yet, imagining Láadan as a gynocentric language, if not successfully transformative in the actual world the author lived in, can lay bare the ideological androcentrism of our language in the most vivid sense of the word. It may also provide a roadmap for a processual meaningful amendment project to confront the very male-centered nature of it. The introduction of this non-violent radical transgression that deconstructs linguistic forms to reach a synthesis deserves a much better attention.

This article will attempt to point at ways the novel revolts against the patriarchal society via the introduction of a gynocentric linguistic intervention. This article will also examine the liability of such intervention via linguistic theories on the body as the largest metaphorical gestalt in human language and the way changes in the schematic aspect of language can alter the status of women within the society. I will argue how, apart from the far more developed gender politics of the 21st century, this novel as a product of the 1980s challenges the patriarchal nature of English as a language of modern democracy. More importantly, the novel brings about an invaluable instance of how it is possible for women to revolt against the patriarchal society through manipulations at the schematic level of language and most specifically, the bodily metaphoric quality of the English to better serve women. This transformation of the schematic structures¹ of the metaphoric nature of the English language is a substantial achievement that has recently gained significance through movements like the Me Too Movement, Reproductive Rights Movement, and many more body-political and gender-informed liberal politics. All these movements are efforts to fight the silencing aspects of gender-specific traumas like sexual harassment for women and find a language powerful enough to fight the social structures that victimizes women. Elgin's project, like the Me Too movement, is devoted to ending the silences involved in women's pains and finding words to conceptualize them as a call for recognition. Elgin's significance lies in the way she proposes manipulations to the schematic structures of the English lexicon, and through this radical linguistic altercation, she offers a new strategy to fight the pillars of patriarchy in her society.

Foreshadowing Femininity in English:

¹ This conception was initially introduced by Mark Johnson in his book *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reason* (1987).

Multiple feminist scholars have historically pointed out the linguistic qualities that have made English a patriarchal structure. As Spender writes: “males have encoded sexism into the language to consolidate their claims of male supremacy” (144). Examples of such encodings include the way the woman is invisible and subordinated in English and should always be conditioned as an addition to the masculine core in English lexicon (he and (s)he, actor and actress, manager and manageress, God and Goddess). Masculinity represents power and supremacy in English (words like manpower, God ascribed as He, etc.). Masculinity carries positive conceptions while a lot of feminine constructs represents sexualized and negative connotations (like spinster versus bachelor, or the sexualized connotations in slangs and public language). Women are considered the “other” in the androcentric language; man as the agent and woman as the subject, like the relation between the masculine powerful agency of God deciding the fate of the feminine subject called the earth or nature as the objective source of creation. All these qualities and many more structural qualities contribute to the dominance of the social construct called masculinity in English.

Elgin’s project has been taken to be highly influenced by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which maintains that “our worldview is determined by the structures of the particular language that we happen to speak” (Cameron 150). Critics of this worldview have taken issue with Elgin believing that such theories are the products of an obsession with a discursive constructivist view. After the emergence of some scientific techniques of studying the brain function, like brain scans and other neurological findings, it has also been accepted that meaning and conception are not entirely related to the linguistic structures and that using the power of imagination, the human mind is capable of breaking away from the force of linguistic and sociopolitical requirements. This finding that the human brain is not a slave to language has led to a total rejection of ideas like that

of Elgin on the basis that they are dated and not to be taken seriously. Many more recent feminist scholars have objected to Elgin's separatist radical politics noting that this kind of linguistic intervention is not only a futile and illegitimate universalization, but also totalizing. They have objected that such a project of changing the language for the benefit of women is an impossible task and aims at privileging women over men.

Many such objections to Elgin's project seem to consider this kind of linguistic intervention as transgressive discursive moves devoid of any substantial materialist foundation. This is why I am claiming that understanding Elgin's project as a purely linguistic modification is misunderstanding her project. Elgin's project works much more at the level of production and conception. Women have historically been kept absent in meaning production processes in society. There is a large gap in most social discourses and clusters of meaning or image schemas which are most foundational not at the level of representation and expression, but at the deep level of understanding the world around us.

Human being understands the world through establishing a symbolic mental connection with their surrounding, and this meaning-making process has always been seen as a unified process of creating concepts irrespective of the gendered qualities of this process. This myth of gender-neutrality has historically led to a dictatorial form of normativity where everything has been structured around a central body, and that body has been the male body. The male body has been conceptualized in language leading to the inscription and internalization of this quality in language as well. Man's body has been constructed within the language to be the sight of power, authority, agency, reason, humanity, heroism, culture, and any other positive qualities. Whereas anybody different from this normative male body has been considered the sight of weakness, folly, treason, ill-natured, needing to be forced into submission and domesticity. Examples of such image

schemas and clusters of meaning can be historically traced in mythology, literature, philosophy, religion, and law.

Elgin's radical move to introduce a new language is, in fact, a proclamation of war against the long history of misrepresentation and ill-conception of women not specifically in language, but in the ways the world is understood through mental circuits, images, schemas, myths, and linguistic conceptions. For Elgin, language is the tool to introduce a new tactic in this battle against the male-centered history of conception. If language was Elgin's sole concern, she would have dedicated all her time to constructing a language, but the mode of expression she has chosen - the fictional sci-fi narrative - shows that she is looking for new deconstructivist mythmaking. This symbolic transgression is an attempt to break away from the masculine symbolic by creating feminine Discourses².

Lynne Tirrell is one of the rare scholars to account for this positionality. She offers a sophisticated discussion in favor of strategies like those of Elgin and discusses that we need for women to take the semantic authority to redefine and recreate women. Tirrell calls on all women to "engage in the distinctively human activity of defining, describing, and re-creating ourselves while simultaneously defining, describing, and re-creating our social and material world" (2). Tirrell views the job of redefinition and recreation not as a discursive play, but as a material intervention in the ways our brain circuits connect, reconnect, conceptualize and understand the material world around us. This is why Tirrell values the feminist deconstructivist endeavor: "For an agent in an oppressive context, the project of self-articulation cannot be divorced from defining and deconstructing that context." (Tirrell 5)

² In this paper, Discourse with capital D is a reference to James Paul Gee's understanding of Discourses in his *Literacy, Discourse and Linguistics: Introduction* (1989) where he defines Discourses as ways of being in the world.

Moreover, Tirrell highlights the communal aspect of culture and assumes that only collective movements of community building based on feminist ideals have the power to create general image schemes and mental constructs that can transform the status quo of women. Recalling Simone de Beauvoir's conception of women in society, Tirrell writes: "Beauvoir's recommendation that we find or create a community in which we can be constituted as whole free human beings can be taken as a call for certain sorts of communities that Marilyn Friedman has called 'communities of choice' in contrast to our found 'communities of place'..." (7). The same Beauvoirian conception is present in Elgin's project. For Elgin, creating a community of women's own, whether it be a discourse community or the radical imagination of creating a feminist utopia, are all different faces of the same deep understanding of the problem of women in our contemporary world. As Bray discusses, in Elgin's text, "women seek validation and empowerment as human beings through the creation of their own native tongue" as well as a native discourse community (52).

Elgin is not in pursuit of touching upon the later paths of theories like gender performativity. Elgin's theory is mostly concerned with what Derridean theory calls "foreshadowing" the woman in society through linguistic manipulations (Lawlor). Luce Irigaray is probably the most renowned feminist to theoretically agree with Elgin when it comes to this radical notion of destructing the masculine language. As Hendricks and Oliver write, "for Irigaray, the formulation of a women-specific language is not something to be 'invented' helter-skelter, but is rather intended to be both strategic and transformational overtime at the levels of the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and of representation" (369). A close look at the book also shows that Elgin's mode of expression, writing science-fictional novel, clearly shows that she is entertaining this medium to radically help feminists imagine the precise ways how linguistic and social constructs can be

feminized through new feminist Discourses. She uses her radical pose through her poetic license to intervene into the andro-centric construct and make her voice heard.

On the other hand, the contemporary theory is filled with ideas that consider language as framing human thought. Slavoj Žižek in his *Ticklish Subject* argues that “the most elementary form of the Spirit's externalization, of course, is language, as Hegel emphasizes, again and again, our inner experience can shed the traces of external senses and acquire the form of a pure thought only by again becoming externalized in a meaningless sign - we think only in words, in language” (87). Based on a Žižekian reading of Friedrich Hegel, one can only think in metaphorical image schemes defined in language, and when the language has specific male-centered properties that privilege man's body and dismisses women's bodily and affective qualities, the outcome is that the language we speak will never represent such female qualities. Therefore, this male-centered language constitutes and regulates what the subjects think, and only through a modification of this entire image schematic structure will a real change for women be possible. The inner experience is manipulated by its means of externalization.

Thus, Elgin assumes that the only way to transform the situation of women in society is to transform the language. Knowing the impossibility of the creation of a feminine language by a person who has lived in the androcentric society, Elgin gestures towards a feminine language while she is very well aware of the fact that her project is not going to succeed. Elgin's project is only there to destabilize the hierarchical nature of our language and imagine this radical experience. This experience is very valuable since it can be considered a call for more radical moves towards placing femininity in the language conceptions. Elgin's revolution is peacefully revolting against the masculine authority. The reason is not only that the women are dreadful about their fates

following their revolution, but this novel as an aesthetic example portrays a future in which femininity is prevailing over the world.

Hyperbolic Representations of Masculine Mythology:

Many readers find *Native Tongue* problematic in that this novel is too extreme in its representation of the status of women and the power of men. Elgin has chosen the element of hyperbole as a magnifier to create effect and criticize effectively. Extreme and radical representation and even sometimes exaggeration is the strategy Elgin has chosen to draw attention towards the immensity of women's subjugation throughout history. The book points out that there exists "no such thing as reality" when the reality is only constructed through our masculine mythmaking processes (Elgin 140). When there is no such thing as reality and meaning cannot be created for us without great reliance on our mental symbolic operation, therefore, the patriarchal society can present its own reality through its clusters of metaphoric significations. Utilizing a radical gesture towards the realities of the patriarchal society, Elgin attempts to represent the uncovered layer of the very symbolic reality.

In Elgin's radical fictional world, women are considered to have almost no social rights and this is said to be due to their natural limitations (7). In such a world, men control the language used in the houses (11). Women are considered second-class citizens and are primitive in their intellectual powers (151). They are treated as "sophisticated children suffering from delusions of grandeur" (110). In this society, women are granted choices, but those choices are forced on them (148). Women are not able to even choose their husbands and it is the men who have the right to

choose. All the regards for women are in a way ceremonial in order to keep them silent and refrain from their nags (10).

In this world, women are valued for their material benefits. Women take credit for their fertility rates (Elgin 11). The aim of providing them some labor is not to empower them in society, but to keep them busy (86). That is why they are mostly offered very low positions in society. In this world, women should be beneficial; otherwise, they are of no use. Nazareth's father thinks highly of her since she is beneficial to the patriarchal society (147). In one instance, when Nazareth gets sick, her father says that it is not important that she is sick, but he is concerned that she might not be able to attend the Labor Treaty Negotiations that are being held the other day.

These women are only there to bring money and prestige to the household (Squier and Wedder 316). They must work and bear the brunt of having many responsibilities. "Women always had to be up and down all night long; if there weren't sick children, there were sick animals or sick people If there were none of those, there would be a child with a bad dream, or a storm that meant someone had to get up" (Elgin 210). Despite all the benefits that they bring to the household, women are abused verbally too (Elgin 175). When women get old and cannot bear children anymore or are infertile, they will be banished from society and sent to the Barren House. In this house, they will be condemned to forced labor (206-7). Men consider the very forced labor as something trivial (219). In one instance of the novel, Nazareth is extremely tired of their situation in the Barren House and is described as "Nazareth felt that now, more sharply than she had ever had to feel it before Every woman was a prisoner for life; it was not some burden that she bore uniquely" (159).

Such radical representation of the miserable situation of women might irk many readers and convince them to call the book full of misandrist statements. However, taking a quick look at

the history, one can easily trace vivid examples of the very misogynistic practices that are represented in the book. There are still underdeveloped societies that have preserved the same brutal practices subverting the role of women. Apart from the developed societies, these radical representations seem to work as an ideological criticism on women's condition in modern societies too. While there exist utmost respect for women in the west, one can easily trace the fact that women who have gained the most key roles in positions of power are devoid of their feminine agency and are supposed to act and play within the same masculine Discourses to make sure they will be accepted and fit in.

More than anything else, Elgin is objecting against the lack of feminine Discourses, metaphoric structures on women's bodies and affects in the society rather than the female subject active presence in the patriarchal systems of power. Elgin is radical in her *tongue* since she is calling for a revolt against too much masculinity in meaning-making structures of human understanding that has overwhelmed the social reality and disregards the nuances of women's conceptual experience. She is radical since man cannot get rid of the ideological aspect of perception and language, and therefore, the feminine ideologies or myths are replaced by the masculine ones in a radical move to portray the ramifications of the secret masculine ideologies encrypted in human languages.

Elgin's Utopia: Native or Sacred?

Some feminist critics have aligned *Native Tongue* to a feminist Utopia. Cavancanti in her article "Utopias of/f Language in Contemporary Feminist Literary Dystopias" believes that the creation of Láadan imagines a form of liberation from the androcentric language and can be

considered as a feminist Utopia. Cavancanti considers the creation of Láadan as a “Utopian response to the imposed (male) norm, evidenced by the women characters' dissatisfaction with their status in relation to language” (153). Cavancanti is right in that Láadan provides a radical paradigmatic shift not only at a linguistic level but also at the deeper perceptual level of freeing women from an immense masculine and suppressive structure of understanding the world and stepping into a Utopian space for American women of the late 20th century to find their lost selves in the society. Based on this view, if the social space is dominated by men in a way that any intrusion of women is faced with the violent reaction from men, women should try to find a space to create their utopia within this social dystopia, and that utopia is Láadan. But, how?

The novel begins from the problem in the androcentric language. It follows the feminist discussions on language that English language and rhetoric have been predominantly constructed based on masculine mental schemas and imagery. Feminist critics of this realm discuss that to put it in simple words, in this male-oriented metaphoric structure of English a word like *mankind* is generalizing masculinity to all the existence of humans and is privileging man to woman (Bruce 50). These critics discuss that this language that has at the core of it a masculine core does not leave any space for the feminine metaphorical schemas (or female body schemas) to gain recognition. Following the same line of thought, Elgin makes many examples of the sort contributing to the inferior status of women in language, discusses that the term *gynecology* as the most obvious word when it comes to women has been defined by men. Based on the novel, a *Gynecologist* can be defined as the healthcare man who aims at “maintaining [women] in that state of wellness that allows men to pursue their lives as they were intended to pursue them” (Elgin

225). To Elgin, there is Foucauldian³ biopolitics at work here when the terms most relevant to women are all produced by the masculine mentality to assure the smooth operation of the masculine world.

In another instance in the novel, Nazareth expresses her reciprocal love for Jordan Shannonry; an apparently more affectionate man who seems to be more sympathetic and less objectifying women. Right after Jordan gives Nazareth a rose, he informs Thomas, Nazareth's father, of her sensation for him and puts her in huge trouble with her father and her husband Thomas. When Thomas has a quarrel with Nazareth and blames her for what she has done, Nazareth goes out of the room and hugs a tree and thinks that there exist no words for her to describe her pain. As the narrator writes: "And there were no words, not in any language, that she could use to explain to them what it was that had been done to her, that would make them stop and say that it was an awful thing that had been done to her" (Elgin 201-202). After this incident, and not having any linguistic capability to express her feeling towards her forced marriage and the betrayal of her lover and his father's oppressive manner, Nazareth decides that she will not trust any men anymore, not even her own son (202).

On the contrary of the patriarchal nature of the English that is oppressing women, Láadan has some specifications which make it unique and utopian for women. The language is much simpler when it comes to layers of meaning while the sentence structures are pretty similar to English. Similar to English, Láadan has verbs, subjects and objects, and sentence structures. However, what makes this language much more interesting is the creation of concepts that are essential to the feminine world, and are non-existent in English. These terms and concepts can

³ Michel Foucault in his *History of Sexuality: Volume I* (1990) assumed that governments use the biological and health discourses to regulate populations and the system of power functions through the same biopolitical structure of regulation.

enable women to express their bodies and create their own metaphorical structures out of the same conceptions; structures that can much better describe the feminine mental and bodily sensations.

Based on Láadan Study List, there are more than 12 different words for various forms of love in this language, each of which is derivatives of *A* which means a ‘love’ for intimate objects. For instance, *Áayáa* means a “mysterious love”, *Áazh* means a “love for one once sexually desired”, *Am* means a “love for one related by blood”, and *Aye* is defined as “love which is an unwelcome burden” (Bruce 56). Taking a careful look at the list of words in Láadan, one can realize that Elgin’s phenomenological look has made her study different possible dimensions of meaning that each English concept might have in the feminine world, and has done her best to create a new concept for that dimension based on the feminine experiences. Through this, the words and metaphors will communicate the feminine meanings much more precisely without relying too heavily on the contextual or rhetorical structures of the sentences in which they are located.

Apart from the above-mentioned terms that are mostly concerned with human sensations and personal feelings, some words are dedicated to the female bodily experiences from the world that are completely out of reach in our androcentric language. Words that are concerned with women’s menopause, menstruation, pregnancy, and so on are all detailed with a precision that is unimaginable to the ordinary linguists and lexicographers in English. For most male-centric lexicographers those distinctions would seem trivial. Karen Bruce studying Láadan’s language notes that “any woman who has had a pregnancy scare knows what it is to menstruate joyfully, just as any woman who has miscarried a wanted child or has physical problems associated with her period knows what it means to menstruate” (57). This aspect of Láadan can be called the most significant achievement of it for the English language as we know it today.

Apart from the linguistic aspect of the novel, *Native Tongue* depicts a utopian community in which women have much more freedom to pursue their projects. Only in this house, outcast women find time and space to create their own community and find a shared voice among each other, and finally spread that word. Only in the Barren House “the little girls heard the stories at their mother’s knees, when their mothers had time to tell them, and from the women of the Barren Houses otherwise” (158). This miserable house becomes a blessing center for the women to imagine their communal utopias together. Only in this house does “a middle-aged and barren woman” take the risks to disobey the cardinal’s rules and pay for the laser treatment of breast cancer (*Elgin* 14).

This house is the site where the community of women ventures to imagine a way out of the suppression of women that is rampant in their society. The community is very much reminiscent of the old myth of Amazonian women, which is very much favored by feminist critics too. Based on the old myth, Amazonian women had formed a community of women to counter the masculine domination of their society, something which incited the flames of wars with the Greeks who did not tolerate their force (*Encyclopædia Britannica*). *Elgin*’s native society also promises the same radical society against the patriarchal rule whose tools are not swords and spears, but language components and thought. Both societies were working against the oppression of men.

Many critics have argued that the way *Native Tongue* has foreshadowed feminine experience in a bid to deconstruct the androcentric language and create a gynocentric world cannot lead to better world equality is the main component of it. In this respect, Cavalcanti argues that critics like Donna Haraway consider that “the feminist dream of a common language, like all dreams for a perfectly true language, of perfectly faithful naming of experience, is a totalizing and imperialist one” (Cavalcanti 163). Following Haraway’s words, Cavalcanti has argued that the

actual creation of a gynocentric world can be considered as a dystopia for men and a utopia for women. Here, we should provide a redefinition of the female utopias.

Utopias are basically manipulating lies. They are nowhere lands that are solely imagined as a promised land. They are not there to be reached, but they can create hope and movement by derailing the status quo. By presenting an ideal image, utopias mislead people to move towards their ideals. But, this derailment is itself promising in the formation of negativity towards the status quo. In order to affect the structures of power, Elgin has chosen to portray the other side of the story, the far extreme pole of the binary to foreshadow the effects of it. Without imagining a radical society in which women have developed their community and their language, which for Elgin is at least a component of thought if not thought itself. Elgin's voice might not have the power and eloquence to be heard but, radical thought is always heard with caution and excitement. Elgin seems to like this energy in her deconstruction of the masculine society.

Conclusion on Elgin's Contribution to Me Too Movement:

Elgin attempts to foregrounding the human factor in the creation and progression of language. She believes in the fact that language has the potential to reorder our material world and transform it into a better one. Elgin can imagine no place for the purely masculine world as we know it in the future. She takes a radical gesture in order to lay bare the violence of the masculine world and uncover the ideological layers behind it. She depicts a feminine utopian to construct a reality where the order of hierarchy is reversed, imagining this radical intervention can help humans to see the devastations that the androcentric world can bring about for women. This revelation can enable people of this world to imagine a more just world.

Therefore, Elgin calls for a feminine language as a response to the phallogocentric nature of English. When the author views that English does not have the substantial capability to transform its androcentric nature, she ventures to imagine a truly feminine language. This intervention is valuable for the awareness that Elgin propagates for the construction of feminist discourse. The fact that in the process of the development of concepts within discourses, women should be actively forcing their perceptions and revise the former conceptions. The beauty of Elgin's work lies in the space she creates where she beautifully proposes radical changes in the words and concepts. And as Karen Bruce writes:

even if Láadan does not appear to have succeeded as a language in its own right, its unique encodings reveal significant lacunae in our own languages, which should encourage us to find ways of voicing the perceptions of marginalized and silenced groups so that, as Madeleine Gagnon has suggested, they do not feel as if they are foreigners to themselves in their own languages (180). (67)

A close look at most contemporary social justice movements perfectly shows that none of them have been successful unless they have been able to create their own discourse and narrative on the status quo and a large portion of the feminist movement today is constructing the language structures and clusters of phrases that can signify their way of seeing the world. Me Too movement is a genuine example of how two words conjoin to signify such a large scope of signification. Me Too, as another name for Láadan, highlights a history of men sexually harassing and abusing women, a history of silences and ages of internal conflict and trauma, shame, estrangement, social bondage, scarlet letters, lack of any support, and many more. Cases of Me Too and the Jurisdictional responses to the victim's narratives show how this language is nonexistent and new to English and how the production of such Discourses where words are washed away from their

older significations and are deployed to represent the affective, bodily, and emotional experiences of women in the society is the way forward that our social justice movements can discern from Elgin's legacy.

Works Cited:

- Bray, Mary Kay. "The Naming of Things: Men and Women, Language and Reality in Suzette Haden Elgin's Native Tongue." *Extrapolation* (Kent State University Press), vol. 27, no. 1, Spring 1986, pp. 49-61. EBSCOhost, proxy.library.umkc.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lfh&AN=15815269&site=ehost-live&scope=site.
- Bruce, K. 2008. "A Woman-Made Language: Suzette Haden Elgin's Laadan and the Native Tongue Trilogy As Thought Experiment in Feminist Linguistics". *Extrapolation*. 49, no. 1: 44-69.
- Cameron, Deborah. "Feminist Linguistic Theories", in Stevi Jackson and Jackie Jones (eds.), *Contemporary Feminist Theories*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998, pp. 147–161.
- Cavalcanti, Ildney. "Utopias of/f Language in Contemporary Feminist Literary Dystopias." *Utopian Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2000, pp. 152–180., www.jstor.org/stable/20718180.
- Clover, Carol J., 1940. *Men, Women, and Chain Saws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J, 1992.
- Encyclopædia Britannica. "Amazon." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., Accessed 9 May 2017, www.britannica.com/topic/Amazon-Greek-mythology.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Random House, 1990.

TÊTE-À-TÊTE, Vol. 1, January 2022

Gee, James Paul. "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction." *The Journal of Education*, vol. 171, no. 1, Trustees of Boston University, 1989, pp. 5–176,

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/42743865>.

Haden-Elgin, Suzette. *Native Tongue*. North Melbourne, Vic: Spinifex, 2001.

Hendricks, Christina and Kelly Oliver. *Language and Liberation: Feminism, Philosophy, and Language*. State University of New York Press, 1999. SUNY Series in Contemporary

Continental Philosophy. EBSCOhost,

proxy.library.umkc.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xna&AN=5606&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Lawlor, Leonard, "Jacques Derrida", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL =

[<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/derrida/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/derrida/).

Munford, Rebecca. "Irigaray, Luce." *The Encyclopedia of Literary and Cultural Theory*, edited by Michael Ryan, Wiley, 1st edition, 2011. *Credo Reference*,

http://proxy.library.umkc.edu/login?qurl=http%3A%2F%2Fsearch.credoreference.com%2Fcontent%2Fentry%2Fwileylitcul%2Firigaray_luce%2F0%3FinstitutionId%3D4375.

Accessed 08 May 2017.

Shell, M. "Language Wars." *CR: The New Centennial Review*, vol. 1 no. 2, 2001, pp. 1-17.

Project MUSE, [doi:10.1353/ncr.2003.0059](https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2003.0059).

www.muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.umkc.edu/article/50577.

Spender, Dale, *Man Made Language*, second edition, New York: Routledge, 1985.

TÊTE-À-TÊTE, Vol. 1, January 2022

Squier, Susan, and Jullie Vedder. Foreword. *Native Tongue*, by Suzette Haden-Elgin, North Melbourne, Vic: Spinifex, 2001.

Tirrell, Lynne. "Definition and Power: Toward Authority without Privilege." *Hypatia*, vol. 8, no. 4, [Hypatia, Inc., Wiley], 1993, pp. 1–34, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3810367>.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*. London: Verso, 2008.