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Recent works by new and by established women writers in English Canada attribute special significance to a striking recurrent motif: the tongue. For Daphne Marlatt in Touch to My Tongue, Lola Lemire Tostevin in Colour of Her Speech and Margaret Atwood in Murder in the Dark, the tongue motif is central to one or both of at least two constructs of meaning. On the one hand, the tongue is linked to language and speech and sets the stage for a poetic exploration of language from a feminist perspective. Marlatt, Tostevin and Atwood all engage in a "musing with mothertongue," which reveals language to be one among various other male-oriented systems of expression or organization which they question. On the other hand, the tongue, organ of gustatory pleasure, is instrumental in the expression of sexual pleasure from a woman’s perspective. In both instances, the writing is serious in its commitment to articulating a female and feminist perspective. There is no tongue in cheek in these urgent explorations of women’s views of life’s experiences.

The link between tongue and language and speech is especially well developed in Lola Lemire Tostevin’s Colour of Her Speech. Tostevin’s francophone origins allow her to conduct her particular exploration of language by playing on the French word langue, meaning both language and tongue. Francophone and feminist concerns arise simultaneously around the recurrent question of bilingualism. In Tostevin’s work, bilingualism has both the traditional meaning of speaking two languages — French and English — and the new meaning feminists have ascribed the term when referring to how women, when they learn to speak, essentially learn a second language — patriarchal language, that is, language as it has evolved to express man’s vision and experience of “reality.”

"French is no longer my mother tongue" she says

"neither is English" he says

"well what is" "fucking" he says

so when people inquired as to her first language she replied "fuckinese"

"about poetry keep it nameless" he says

"an author is inconsequential to a good piece of art"

tongueless fucking in the dark

taking the light

The reduction of self-expression — both as speaker and writer and as a woman and/or a non anglophone — is tantamount to the removal of one’s tongue, as Tostevin suggests in a subsequent poem:

[to remove the whole of the tongue the mouth is widely opened

with a gag the organ transfixed with silk

the glossus divided

with a pair of scissors écraseurs or crushers

the base cut through by a series of short snips

as it becomes easier to pull the tongue

well out of the mouth

each vessel is dealt with as soon as divided

the remaining undivided portion of the organ seized with forceps and lifted from the cavity

in cases where only one side of the tongue needs to be eliminated the operation is modified by splitting the tongue down the centre the affected half removed through the neck through a semilunar incision along the lower jaw extending backward to the hyoid bone the tongue can then be reached through the floor of the mouth and removed with the crushers

the main objection to this operation is that the larynx and all the muscles in the area are divided preventing normal breathing

Tostevin’s chillingly clinical description of a tongue amputation is paralleled by Atwood’s “Simmering” in Murder in the Dark. In this text, a reversal of men’s and women’s roles — men into the kitchen and women out to the workplace — does not, as might be hoped, lead to liberation from debilitating gender roles, but rather to the frightening amputation of women’s tongues:

...I was pointed out to the women, who by this time did not go into the kitchens at all on pain of being thought unfeminine, that chef after all means chief and that Mixmasters were common but no one had ever heard of a Mixmistress. Psychology articles began to appear in the magazines on the origin of women’s kitchen envy and how it could be cured. Amputation of the tongue was recommended, and, as you know, became a
widespread practice in the more advanced nations. If Nature had meant women to cook, it was said, God would have made carving knives round and with holes in them.

Tostevin’s and Atwood’s visions of the removal of a woman’s or women’s tongues signals the urgency of considering a number of questions of importance to feminists. A primary concern is that of “difference,” a concept emanating from the theoretical writings of French feminists like Julia Kristeva, whom both Tostevin and Marlatt cite. The term communicates the notion of the “feminine”/woman as different from the masculine/man, viewed as the norm, rather than as Opposite or Other, that is, abnormal. For Tostevin, the notion of difference arises in the two areas of concern to her — francophone and female identity — as the following two poems suggest: once
the mouth
stood empty

it was easy
to introduce
your difference

which part
of the body
speaks (or the sensation of
which beat
which breath yields the form by
which

it all comes about
we said: the body
is a poem
of coordinated parts
we said: one
is so dependent
upon the other so united
we can speak now
of penetration
we said: language

is opposed
to all that

listen to us eye
to eye too
close to catch

you said: let’s see
how deep down your throat I can thrust

it stopped
there

it takes
a different tongue
to penetrate
a different depth

The mouth is seen here, and in Marlatt’s and Atwood’s work elsewhere, as a point of vulnerability. But it is also the site of resistance. The mouth houses the tongue whose link to speech and language gives it the potential to function as an instrument of resistance — voiced refusal. Like other contemporary feminist writers, Tostevin, Marlatt and Atwood see language as a viable means of changing a reality whose patriarchal structures they contest. Such a change can be initiated by a process of undoing the language of patriarchy, by unlearning social conditioning, by unspeaking:

Touch to My Tongue.

To unspeak — undo, unlearn woman’s conditioning as timid user of language or other male-oriented systems of expression and organization of life — is a concern all three writers share. In Tostevin’s poetry, this concern is further represented by the occasional use of the French prefix “de,” a technique Quebec writer Nicole Brossard has used most effectively in her work to communicate the need to destructure patriarchy and introduce women’s perspectives.

An important dimension of the new perspective is woman’s, not man’s, expression of woman’s corporeal existence. Woman’s body figures prominently in this and other feminist writing where it is linked to language. In a reciprocal relationship, language serves to name aspects of female corporeal reality that have not, or rarely, been named, while the body is, for various women writers, the possible source of a woman’s language — what Tostevin terms “femspeak” in Colour of Her Speech:

femspeak
jargon
guttural voiceless
sound
slang
language

originating with nomads
thieves
whores
gypsies

in Quebec we say
argot
argoter to cut
a dead branch
the semantic cut
cunt
woman’s cant
rant
rent
breach deep
and wide

femspeak
woman’s span

Saying the unsaid or writing the unwritten about women’s experiences of their bodies, naming, in a woman’s language that is linked to the body, (corpo)reality as women experience it, constitutes a challenge to patriarchy. This is a challenge in which the tongue is instrumental, and not solely by way of its link to language and speech. It assumes an extended role which Daphne Marlatt has played out in her Touch to My Tongue.

In Touch to My Tongue, the tongue motif serves in the expression of woman’s sexual pleasure and desire:

...my tongue burrows in, whose wild flesh opens wet, tongue seeks its nest, amative and nurturing (here i am you) lips work towards undoing...

The tongue is again involved in undoing — again the undoing of patriarchy. The mere expression of woman’s sexual pleasure issues a challenge to a tradition wherein male pleasure has primacy. But the undoing is even greater when the sexual pleasure is that of two women in love:

a kiwi at four a.m. among the sheets
green slice of cool going down easy on the tongue extended with desire for you and you in me it isn’t us we suck those other lips tongue flesh wet wall that gives and gives...

there is fern and frost, a gathering of small birds melting song in the underbrush, close, your hair as it falls gold over your shoulder over your naked, dearly known skin — its smell, its answering touch to my tongue.

In many instances, the extended role of the tongue is simply superimposed on its role as link to speech and language:

...letting the yearning play it out, playing it over, every haystack, every pass-
The link between language and body and tongue is made explicit in Marlatt's "musing with mothertongue," which concludes *Touch to My Tongue*. Marlatt places language at the "beginning" and describes it as "a living body which we enter at birth:" "that body of language we speak, our mothertongue, it bears us as we are born in it, into cognition." Like Tostevin, Marlatt envisions a new, woman's language, one that "returns us to the body, a woman's body and the largely unverbalized, presemantic, postlexical field it knows." The tongue is a key motif in the vision of a new language with which to express "reality" in women's terms. For Marlatt, the new perspective definitely includes "a link with the body's physicality... language and tongue... a part of speech and a part of the body... the mouth with which we also eat and make love." It includes "the mutuality her body shares... the turning herself inside out in love when she is both sucking mouth and hot gush on her lover's tongue."

In Atwood's *Murder in the Dark*, the new perspective is the vision provided by the "third eye"—significantly "the eye of the body." While everybody has one, "there are some who resent the third eye:" "They would have it removed, if they could. They feel it as a parasite, squatting in the centre of the forehead, feeding on the brain. To them, the third eye shows only the worst scenery... But someone has to see these things. They exist. Try not to resist the third eye: it knows what it's doing. Leave it alone and it will show you that this truth is not the only truth.

Where Atwood's exploration of woman's experience of language, body, difference and reality leads to the third eye, in Tostevin's *Colour of Her Speech*, "grafted tongue/is seeing eye/now." It "wags and guides / its own keen sense / to speak the lookout / for the other half." The motion set into effect by the seeing tongue and the speaking eye/I leads to "between / the way I speak / the way I spoke."

Tostevin, Marlatt and Atwood are among other women writing in English Canada and Québec today who are engaged in creating new meaning (fulness) by using the familiar in new ways or presenting it from a new—feminist—angle. The tongue motif is a particularly rich one in this regard as it extends women's linguistic and sexual expression through writing.
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