



**Difficulties of Constructing the Feminine Subject Resulting
from Limitations of Language - Based on Poetic Texts of Ingeborg
Bachmann and Lia Sturua¹**

Salome Pataridze

*PHD Student, Invited Teacher at Ilia State University
salome.pataridze@iliauni.edu.ge*

APA Citation:

Pataridze, S. (2019). Difficulties of Constructing the Feminine Subject Resulting from Limitations of Language - Based on Poetic Texts of Ingeborg Bachmann and Lia Sturua. *Journal of Narrative and Language Studies*, 7(12), 30-39.

Abstract

In the discourse of feminist literary studies, women's writing is often viewed as an independent, strong branch developing alongside the men's mainstream literature. Feminist literature has been gradually characterized as breaking traditions and that is why women's texts/literature is often mentioned as a subculture. Women's texts highlight the unity of theme and metaphor often containing subtexts and they attempt to change their meanings with female experience. A woman has been perceived as the other/ an object in relation to the male since ancient times, so it was difficult for her to express her desires in the dominant discourse. In feminist studies, they often discuss the restriction of women with characters, language, myths and history ascribed to them by the patriarchal world and the lack of autonomy in defining "femininity", contributing to the difficulty to identity formation. That is why French feminism often speaks of "oppression" of feminine language. This article analyzes some lyrical works of Austrian Ingeborg Bachmann and Georgian Lia Sturua in the context of post-structuralism and highlights characteristics of feminine language, those deficits and impediments women face in the process of constructing the subject as a whole.

Keywords: construction, ambivalence, language, femininity, patriarchal order

Introduction

Logocentrism emerged in the antiquity, however, it reached its apotheosis in the age of Enlightenment. Aristotle in *The Organon*, using the reasoning-concerned term "logic" for the first time, states that one can understand/gain insight into reality by means of formal logic. This was the idea behind the western philosophical assumption that the structure of reality and the structure of reasoning are identical, known in post-structuralism as "logocentric illusion." This illusion reached its peak in the age of Enlightenment with the project on an autonomous subject: *cogito ergo sum* ("I think, therefore I am"). With this dictum, Descartes defines existence with

¹ This work was supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation (SRNSF) (PHDF-18-2163, *Specific Features of Feminine Narrative in German and Georgian Poetry of the Second Half of the 20th Century*).

the act of thinking making “one a master in one’s house” (Weber, 1994, p.13), meaning that the subject has control over their thoughts, utterances and actions.

Theoretical Framework

According to the logocentric illusion, language describes reality immediately, the connection between reality and language is mimetic and language is an illustration of the given reality. In contrast to the above, Ferdinand de Saussure stresses the autonomous character of language. To him language is an arbitrary sign (there is no motivation behind why a concept is expressed with a specific group of sounds), comprising of the signifier (sound) and the signified (concept to which the sound is attached). The signifier and the signified are inseparably interconnected, the signifier performing the function of “servants” of the signified. The signifier is formed to enable the transportation of meaning. This view of Saussure is considered as a leftover of logocentrism by post-structuralism and it makes this view more radical by declaring that signifiers are autonomous.

If structuralists examine the processes of differences informing the creation of dichotomies (man/ woman, nature/culture, mind/ madness, language/body ...), where one is always oppressed by the other, and, accordingly, cultures and notions are created, as Martin Sahl states, the Freudian concept of unconscious and Saussure’s theory on which post-structuralists base their views, either ignore or see the repression as natural. Post-structuralists used deconstruction developed by Derrida as a tool to critically analyze concept, meaning and reality. However, according to post-structuralists, the subject is not free in the order of language and signs (it does not form this order). In the universal order, *texte general* (Derrida), features (characteristics) are formed which come out of control of the discourse. This may be representation, difference or joke. Derrida describes binary oppositions not as the confrontation between two concepts, but as the hierarchy and subordination. In binary opposition soul/body does not combine two different elements, but it points to the same, but not the identical. As a result, writing is visible, sensible memory (mnéme). The written then turns into painful and inebriant invisible part of soul, memories and truth. Although poison damages and intoxicates the body, it then helps the soul – it sets it free from the body and awakens essence/Eidos (Derrida, 1981, p.126-127). As Derrida mentions: „The Pharmakon is the movement the locus and the play: (the production of) difference. It is the difference of difference. It holds in reserve, in its undecided shadow and vigil, the opposites and different that the process of discrimination will come to carve out (Derrida, 1981, p.127).

For Jacques Derrida, writing dominates speech. Writing is the oldest form of expression. It cannot speak, therefore it is subject to interpretation and meanings can be put forward by means of contextual accommodation/alternation. A text is not the same in different contexts. Language, as written, can always be reconstructed. Derrida argues that a language sign acquires its meaning through “differing” from other signs. The meaning of the sign is never given initially, we may determine the meaning of the sign with the following attempt, however, the sign may be used in different contexts with different meanings. That is why Derrida speaks of a never-ending play which does not have an organized center (qtd. in Köppe&Winko, 2008, p.115). Accordingly, deconstructive theory on the meaning of signs is anti-essential as it questions the view of whether concepts may be precisely defined. According to deconstructive model, it is even debatable, whether the world can be described “naturally” by means of linguistic signs.

Sigmund Freud changed the understanding of a united subject by means of highlighting dark aspirations. Lacan reconstructs Freudian views in the linguistic aspect. For Lacan, the language is a tool of thinking to express one’s experiences. Even more, thinking and experience

are demonstrated in the language. This statement destroys the view on the unity of the subject and the subject is defined as split/decentralized (qtd.in Weber, 1994, p.14-15).

Human-beings are born as helpless creatures and because of this they remain symbiotically united to the mother. To express this connection (unity), Lacan uses the concept of “imaginary”. The Imaginary stage consists of the whole prespeech and pre-oedipal stages of the infant and is characterized by direct satisfaction of desires. In this stage of quasi paradise, the infant does not know the border between his/her body and that of the mother, the difference between me and you (the outside world). In this period, the only thing the infant has is the mother’s body. With the Mirror stage begins the process of self-recognition, referred by Lacan as identification: “The mirror stage can be understood as one’s identification” (Man kann das Spiegelstadium als seine Identifikation verstehen..) (Letters 1,4). The shift to the symbolic order takes place, not of one’s own free will, but it is forced and connected to the father. Instead of a forbidden passion (to the mother), the father offers language to the child. The father gives birth to the subject by means of language. This equals to the public birth, whereas in the case of the mother, the birth is physical. It is evident that Lacan does not mean a “real father”, but he refers to the symbolic father associated with “no”. Incest prohibition is a primary taboo of society. According to Lacan “the unconscious is structured similar to language” (qtd.in Weber, 1994, p.17).

The conscious and unconscious are formed as the result of primary oppression (the shift to the symbolic order). If the unconscious is structured the same way as language, then it can be read like a text. For Lacan, metaphor and metonymy are main keys to linguistic and unconscious texts, as they bring meanings in the text to the fore.

Lacan goes further with a provocative phrase: “La femme n’existe pas” (the woman does not exist). He cannot see the woman’s place in the symbolic order; the woman is understood in the pre-linguistic and pre-social understanding, where she is identified with the mother (qtd. in Weber, 1994, p. 20). Feminine is motherly, sacrificed to the masculine culture. Lacan assigns *jouissance* to the feminine, as being bounded only theoretically, it practically exists in the unconscious and from there enters the symbolic discourse, enchants the male and awakens the memory of the imaginary *jouissance* in him.

While working with the patients suffering from schizophrenia, Luce Irigaray noticed that men do not lose their ability to speak, while women become numb and staging their pain in physical symptoms. Based on this observation, Irigaray concludes that women cannot express their desires in the dominant discourse and the feminist author discusses the linguistic “oppression” of femininity. Luce Irigaray’s dissertation thesis *Speculum de l’autre femme* (Speculum of the Other Woman) (1974) is significant for feminism. In this work she not only revises the history of Western philosophy but also tries to write beyond the “Phallus” discourse (Lindhoff, 2000, p.119). As regards Freud’s theory, the woman is defined with “castration” and is therefore presented as a defective man, giving the grounds to Luce Irigaray to state: actually, there exists only one gender - masculine (qtd. in Lindhoff, 2000, p.119). In the all-encompassing patriarchal order, the woman has no place to establish her own identity, as a result, all she is left to do is to reconstruct her place by “processing” male characteristics.

Irigaray deliberately breaks syntax, aiming not to destruct language, but to transform it, to “double vision”, resulting in a definite, clear meaning accompanied with the obscure. According to Irigaray, the woman is estranged from her unconscious, imagination and sexuality and has no access to them. The woman has been given a task to create masculine sexuality, imagination and unconsciousness in the society (Irigaray 1980, p.81). Discourses of western

theory describe elementary images of body, sex, birth and death, as well as traces of the repressed “imaginary” in the symbolic order and provide a hierarchical value system: solid-liquid, one-many, similar-different. In this system, the subordinated is always related to the woman. Irigaray seeks to detect and deconstruct the images of the solid world. Her strategy is to turn the hierarchy into giving women the value of their own, and the ultimate goal is to overcome the hierarchy and grant the subject status to the woman.

Hélène Cixous discusses women’s fate in the patriarchal world. She thinks that the only way out for the woman is to come out of the man’s shadow and break the silence which was sentenced to them by the patriarchal order; through writing and finding the language of imagination the woman shall find their self. Instead of death melody, that accompanies the symbolic order, Hélène Cixous discusses singing the song of life/mother’s song through feminine writing and the maternal order shall replace the paternal (symbolic) order. Women shall listen to the feminine language in the preoedipal imagination and give cultural and revolutionary power: „A feminine text cannot fail to be more than subversive. It is volcanic; as it is written, it brings about an upheaval of the old property crust, carrier of masculine investments (Cixous, 1975, p.888).

For the theoretician, feminine writing (*écriture féminine*) is singing of feminine-motherly song as being a woman means being a body „ A woman is never far from “mother” (Cixous, 1975, p.881). Writing with the body means giving birth to a text like a child with pain and full, never-ending love. The primary expression of love is a lullaby, which is written with “mother’s milk” (Cixous, 1975, p.884) and keeps the feminine connection to the song, it is the echo of the feminine voice.

The woman reveals herself in the text and finds her identity in the very text “your self-seeking text” (Cixous, 1975, p.889) and turns into “a new woman” breaking the silence, the endless cosmic libido enjoys her bodily presence.

Mainly, men try to attach meanings to letters and sounds, while women describe rhythm in texts, first they activate the textual unconscious – rhythm, the melody of language, musicalness of letters and sounds. Feminine texts are created for sounds and are “texts for ears” not “texts for eyes” (masculine texts). Cixous evaluates masculine texts as “the mausoleum of words”, while feminine texts are “texts of love”. Feminine texts are metaphoric and metonymic. They play with words, sounds, changing meanings and taking recipients to the place they were born: unconscious fantasy and feeling. With this, the author is not a single owner of a text but the “all-knowing author”, neither the text is plagiarism. (qtd. in Weber, 1994, p.31).

In her theories, Julia Kristeva uses Lacan’s concept of the split subject and discusses the possibility of simultaneous existence of two components in the language: the semiotic and symbolic, out of which, for her, semiotic is linked to the feminine, while the symbolic to the masculine. According to Kristeva, before children shift to the symbolic order, they have experience of voice, sound, color, rhythm and body. However, these elements are structured and, after the transition to the symbolic order, these elements become inter-connected with grammar, syntax and social rules and expressions acquire meanings (qtd. in Bürgmann, 1989, p.408-409). For Kristeva, those structures are significant which either add or deprive specific essence to texts.

With her interview with Rossum-Guyon, Kristeva questions the existence of texts that can only be written by women: “Wenn es wahr ist, dass das Unbewusste die Negation und die Zeit ignoriert.. dann würde ich sagen, dass die schreibweise das Geschlecht ignoriert“ (“If it is true that the unconscious ignores the negation and the time ... then I would say that the writing techniques ignore the gender”) (qtd. in Bürgmann, 1989, p.409). According to Kristeva, the

masculine and feminine unconscious does not have different structures and believes that the artwork is the result of interconnection of semiotic and symbolic libidinous polar points. It is difficult for women to find identity in the symbolic order as for this, women either join or act against the patriarchal world, as radicals (Kristeva, 1986, p.156).

The analysis of Lyric Texts

The poem “Erklär mir, Liebe!” (“Explain to Me, Love!”) by Austrian, German-language poet Ingeborg Bachmann describes inner transformation of lyric I, its shift from the routine, symbolic world to the world full of emotions and feelings. Opening lines of the poem show emotional animal world isolated from the symbolic world. The animal world can be natural, as animals do not use language to share emotions, the smell is enough for them:

The beetle smells the most desirable from far
If only I had its sense, I would feel it too (Bachmann, 2010, p.141)²

In contrast to the idyllic animal world, the "split" lyrical subject appears with its hysteric tones – it either laughs, or cries. Hysteria has been considered to be a typical female disease³. Disorganized speech is one of the main symptoms of hysteria, when a woman cannot form her identity due to a language deficiency. Bachmann uses the refrain “Erklär mir, Liebe” (“Explain to Me, Love!”) throughout the poem to underline that the protagonist is lost in the language and estranged.

Water knows how to speak,
The wave took the wave by the hand (Bachmann, 2010, p.141)⁴

The limit of language as the main challenge to the creator is also discussed by Ingeborg Bachmann in her lectures delivered in Frankfurt. Language for Bachmann is not a clear phenomenon, because the limit of language questions everything - by language the author implies the world that enters our perception only through language. In her radio essay “Sagbares und Unsagbares - Die Philosophie Ludwig Wittgensteins” (“The Sayable and Unsayable—The Philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein”) Bachman makes the philosopher say the sentence: And “the limit of my world” signifies “the limit of my language.” For our reach extends only as far the reach of our language” (Bachmann, 2010, p. 9).

In the poem “Erklär mir, Liebe!” (“Explain to Me, Love!”), the lyric I seeks to overcome the limits of language. This is indicated by stand-alone lines of the poem expressing some kind of protest of the lyric I: 1. “So unsuspecting, the snail steps out of its house!”⁵ 2. „Even a stone knows how to soften the other!!“⁶ In order for language to turn into utopia and beauty, the lyric I does not try to change the language system, but seeks to modify forms of its usage:

Should I spend this short, horrid time
With thoughts only, and alone
Know no love and give none? ⁷ (Bachmann, 2010, p.143)

² Der Käfer reicht die Herrlichste von weit
Hätt ich nur seinen Sinn, ich fühlte auch

³ Sigmund Freud's observation on his patient Dora.

⁴ Wasser weiß zu reden,

Die Welle nimmt die Welle an der Hand

⁵ So arglos tritt die Schencke aus dem haus

⁶ Ein Stein weiß eninen andern zu erweichen!

⁷ Sollt ich die kurze schauerliche Zeit

Nur mit Gedanken Umgang haben und allein nichts Liebes kennen

In these lines the author uses rhetoric figure and through the interrogative sentence she offers a stylistic trick to demonstrate that the answer to the question can be found without finding the truth, one truth may point to the other. It does not require any explanation, as by giving the example of salamander, she concludes that one may overcome a limit, this is proved by the existence of a limit itself. In the closing lines of the poem, an implicit dialogue appears which is indicated by the lyric I's answer to love:

Do not explain anything to me. I see the salamander
Go through every fire ⁸(Bachmann, 2010, p.143).

The Lyric I grieves over the polysemy of concepts and paradox of language in Bachmann's poem "Entfremdung" ("Estrangement"). In the very opening lines of the poem, the confusion of Lyric I is expressed by the anaphoric repetition: Bäume –Bäume (trees-trees) (Bachmann 2010: 233), pointing to the impossibility of monosemy of concepts and powerlessness of language.

The Lyric I cannot see "trees in the trees" but it is forced to call them the "trees". Femininity has the only way out of the patriarchal/symbolic order - masquerade, hysteria, mimesis, which deconstructs the patriarchal discourse. However, these forms cannot help women find their place, as mimesis, hysteria and masquerade chain them to the concept they wish to break. The pain resulting from this enchainment is expressed by the so called "frame-phrase" of the poem: „What should be done?“ (Bachmann, 2010, p.233)

The Lyric I uses the binary opposition to express its state: full-hungry (232). The hierarchy is broken in the binary oppositions, as "hunger" is a natural state for the lyric I and it turns to the night to kill the hunger. The night is associated with the unconscious/origin and with the question - „ So, shall I open up, approach everything again?“ (233) – it becomes clear that the lyric I has done this many times before. However, by using the anaphoric repetition "way-way" (Weg-Weg) (233) in a standing alone line, the lyric I concludes that there is no way: „I cannot see a way in any way" (233).

In the poem "Wie sol lich mich nennen?" („How should I call myself?"), Ingeborg Bachmann attempts to overcome binary oppositions as through this she may find the self: bound-free (gebunden-frei), hard-fleeing (harter-flüchtendes), beginning-end (Beginnen-Enden), bound- dismissed (gefesselt-entließ):

But there is still a beginning in me singing
Or the end resisting my flee,
I want to escape the arrow of this guilt. ⁹(Bachmann, 2010, p.247)

The concept of feminine "singing" points to the pre-linguistic period, when the woman was identified to the mother, before culture forced her to shift to the symbolic order. The patriarchal world/the conscious does not let her return to the origin, leading to the self-identification problem of the lyric/feminine I. In her book *Of Grammatology* Jacques Derrida delves into arche-violence discussing the anthropological observation of Claude Lévi-Strauss in the context of writing/the written. Writing, in its part, implies violence, as the author has no

Und nichts Liebes tun?

⁸ Erklär mir nichts. Ich seh den Salamander
Durch jedes Feuer gehen.

⁹ Aber in mir singt noch ein Beginnen
-oder ein Enden-und wehrt meiner Flucht,
ich will dem Pfeil dieser Schuld entrinnen.

control over it and it slips out of her hands, unlike the oral “logos” which is formed by the speaker and its meaning may be explained by the sender. While writing creates some distance between its subject (author) and object (text). When the message reaches the recipient, it is not present any more. As soon as the utterance/expression is written, it kills its producer. Derrida uses the word “liquid” to describe writing: “The pharmakon always penetrates like liquid, it is absorbed, drunk, introduced into the inside, which it first marks with the hardness of the type, soon to invade it and inundate it with its medicine, its brew, its drink, its potion, its poison” (Derrida, 1981, p.152). The liquid is a characteristic of the written, for in the non-existence of the author, writing flows from one reader to the other as liquid and, as a result, the identity of the written is vague and equivocal. Naming is the first process of writing.

The individual is given a certain name to separate it from the other. Nevertheless, this separation is impossible as one word may not encompass all characteristics and unique features of a person. The lyric I does not want to look for another language: „I am not looking for another language” however it deliberately plays with the words: „How shall I know myself?“, „I may know myself one day“¹⁰. The word/words for self-expression must be found as a prerequisite for self-knowing however the lyric fails to find them in the symbolic order.

A number of lyric poems of Lia Sturua describe the conflicts arising in the cultural/patriarchal world. In the poem “Call your doctor”, the lyric I expresses the difficulty of constructing the feminine identity. The lyric I declares itself as a guest in this world, as it has nothing autonomous in it:

I have nothing to pay,
With a polished smile he takes off my skin
I remain: a pile of infants
Or a maternity house ¹¹(Sturua, 2016, p.104)

The only function that the woman must acquire is the reproduction. According to Simone de Beauvoir, in the patriarchal world, girls are brought up with binary oppositions, such as: pervert-honest, Eve-Marry, Medea-Judith, and they are taught that they can choose to resemble one of them; however, they were given the standard for norm (Beauvoir, 1968, p.10). It is clear from the poem that the lyric I knows normal characteristics, it needs to do its task and become the projector masculine fears:

How long will they fly,
If I do not harden its cover with blood? ¹²(Sturua, 2016, p.104)

By using the anaphoric expressions „blood-blood“, „when-when-when“(104), the author introduces hysteric tones into the text, showing the lyric I attempting to take control over its life and language:

¹⁰ Wie halt ich mich?-Vielleicht kann ich mich einmal erkennen

¹¹ აღარაფერი მაქვს გასახდელი,

თავაზიანი ღიმილით მხდის კანს

ვრჩები: ჩვილი ბავშვების ზვინი

თუ სამშობიარო სახლი.

¹² რამდენ ხანს იფრიალებდნენ,

სისხლით ყდა რომ არ გავუმაგრო?

This is my blood and I know
When to put it aside
And when: "If the pain will not go away,
Call my doctor!" ¹³(Sturua, 2016, p.104)

With the lines "If the pain will not go away, Call my doctor!" and „overall intoxication”, the author underlines the pre-determined place of women in the patriarchal world: if the woman does not comply with the standards of normal, she is hysterical (requires a doctor’s attention), and her state is evaluated as the intoxication of the whole body. According to Freud and Breuer, hysterical women suffer from reminiscences (reminisce-sich erinnern) (Freud&Breuer, 1991, p.31). Painful memories are replaced with accumulated symptoms, which achieves the experienced unconscious and they appear repeatedly. Strong symptoms arise when experience cause big changes of feelings, and the basis for the change is internal contradictions, conflicts between the self and feelings (Lindhoff, 2003, p.140). The lyric I in the poem of Lia Sturua, suffers from hysteria as well: it is afraid of its feelings/metaphors, metaphors bring the lyric I back to the unconscious and cause inner conflict in it which may be expressed with the act of self-damaging:

The metaphor works on the nail line,
If I touch it, it will mutilate me ¹⁴(Sturua, 2016, p.105)

The fear of self-destruction of the lyric/feminine I is apparent in Sturua’s poem “Love?!” If the female voice gives freedom of expression to the written/words, it will threaten to “mutilate” her again. The language is restricted within “frames” after the shift to the oedipal phase. The lyric I compares words to the fire and the symbolic order tries to put it in frames. Burning words can be put in the frames only temporarily and it endangers the established order every day. The world described in the first part of Lia Sturua’s poem, contains features of symbolic order:

Wars, children,
Emotions conscious and unconscious,
Church in between, or classic literature ¹⁵(Sturua, 2016, p.102)

The world described in these lines is the product of men using the argument of the fact that mythos, religion, history, poetry were not created by women. Evenmore, even dreams are determined by men’s dreams (Beauvoir, 1968, p.155). Accordingly, church, war, children

¹³ ეს ჩემი სისხლია და მე ვიცი,

როდის გამოვიყენო, როდის გვერდზე გავწიო

და როდის: „ტკივილმა თუ არ გამიარა,

მივმართო ექიმს!“

¹⁴ მეტაფორა ლურსმნების ხაზით მუშაობს,

რომ შევეხო, დამასახიჩრებს.

¹⁵ ომები, ბავშვები,

ემოციები ზენა და ქვენა,

შუაში ეკლესია, ან კლასიკური ლიტერატურა

(child bears father's surname and thus culture separates the child from mother) are the main tools for the patriarchal order.

In her poem, Lia Sturua presents two ways of women's self-representation and existence:

1. The woman can fit to the rules of the patriarchal world and subordinate her language to the symbolic language making herself visible in the historic reality.

If you fit
And light even a single matchstick,
Such a novel will fall down on me ¹⁶(Sturua, 2016, p.102)

2. The woman can confront the established linguistic norms and waste no shrewishness characteristic of the gender on faded words". This will enable her to build feminine identity.

In the chapter "Plato's Pharmacy" of the book *La Dissémination (Dissemination)* Jacques Derrida deconstructs the dichotomic hierarchy. The author tries to overcome the hierarchy claiming that one meaning/value includes within itself the element of the other subordinated one. Through the deconstruction of "Plato's Pharmacy", Derrida comes to the conclusion that writing is similar to pharmakon which has a double effect: It may cure the decease and aggravate it. The ambivalent unity of the words "cure" and "poison" takes initial in the ancient ceremony of pharmakon. In ancient Athens, pharmakos-ceremonies took place at critical moments. It referred to the scapegoat, uncontrolled evil which should have been exiled from the city (Derrida, 1981, p.130). This practice occurred in Athens until the fifth century. The sacrifice(scape-goat) chosen for the ceremony was of an ambivalent significance: it was evil, which was to leave the city, because citizens of Athens believed that he had evil in him, on the other hand, he served as a cure for the city.

Similar to the above mentioned, in the poem of Lia Sturua, the lyric I realizes that words may mutilate and destroy it, but unless it revives the words from the unconscious through unleashing them from the "lowest and darkest layer of the sleep" (102), it will face a new danger of disappearance. In the closing lines of the poem, the lyric may address itself with the question: "Can you still?" With this indefinite question the author leaves unanswered the limitedness of femininity and the problem of self-identity.

¹⁶ თუ მოარგე
და ერთი ღერი ასანთიც აუწთე,
ისეთი რომანი დამემხოზა თავზე

Conclusion

The analysis of the lyrical texts by Ingeborg Bachman and Lia Sturua in a post-structuralist context revealed the self-identification problem of femininity enchained to the symbolic order. In the above-analyzed poems, both of the authors discuss linguistic difficulties due to which feelings and inner conflicts cannot be described properly. This leads to the self-alienation and problems of self-identification. The interpretation of the poems made it clear that the femininity can become representative and visible only through overcoming masculine creation and feminine self-destruction, and defeating the feminine identity established by the symbolic order/mythos. Although, in the poems by Ingeborg Bachmann and Lia Sturua, the lyric I cannot construct a new/feminine identity, it makes an attempt to find new ways for finding the new subject, for how not to be a victim of neither the symbolic order, not the self and admit emancipated, autonomous existence along with the hysteria.

References

- Bachmann, I. (2010). *Sämtliche Gedichte*. München, Zürich: Piper
- Beauvoir, S. (1968). *Das andere Geschlecht. Sitte und Sexus der Frau*. Hamburg
- Brüggemann, M. (1989). Weiblichkeit im Spiel der Sprache in: *Schreibende Frauen, Frauen-Literatur-Geschichte vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*.(pp.395-415). Gnüg, Hiltrud & Renate Möhrmann (eds). Suhrkamp Taschenbuch 1603.
- Derida, J. (1981). *Dissemination*. Translated:Barbara Johnson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Derrida, J. (1983). *Grammatologie*. Trans: Hans-Jörg Rheinberger & Hanns Zischler. Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp Verlag
- Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. Oxford
- Lindhoff, L. (2003). *Einführung in die feministische Literaturtheorie*. Stuttgart: Metzler
- Müller-Zettelmann, E. (2000). *Lyrik und Metalyrik. Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte*. Band 171. Heidelberg
- Nünning, A. , Nünning, V. (eds) (2002). *Erzähltextanalyse und Gender Studies*. Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler Stuttgart
- Sexl, M (Hg). (2004). *Einführung in die Literturtheorie*. Wien: Facultas Verlags- und Buchhandels AG. 88-91.
- Sturua, L.(2016). *Wolf's Hour*. Tbilisi: Intelekti publishing.
- Weber, I (ed). (1994). *Weiblichkeit und weibliches Schreiben*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- მე-20 საუკუნის ავსტრიული ლირიკა -Österreichische Lyrik des 20. Jahrhunderts*. (2010). ინგებორგ ბახმანი . თბილისი: გამომცემლობა პოლილოგი -Tbilissi: Polylogi Verlag