

## Blanchot's Theory of Language and Narration in Lydia Davis' Selected Short Stories

DOI: [10.22098/JPC.2022.1732](https://doi.org/10.22098/JPC.2022.1732)

Fatemeh Aziz Mohammadi<sup>1</sup>

1. Associate Professor of English Literature, Arak Branch, Islamic Azad University, Arak, Iran  
Ph.D. in English Literature  
Email: [f-azizmohammadi@iau-arak.ac.ir](mailto:f-azizmohammadi@iau-arak.ac.ir)

### Abstract

The aim of the present study is to show how language and narration function in the selected works by Lydia Davis based on Blanchot's theory. Lydia Davis is an American writer known for her idiosyncratic and extremely short stories often characterized by clear observations of mostly material and daily events. One aspect that Blanchot points out is the spacing among a literary text. This spacing or distance refers to how a literary text resists interpretation and reaching the singular truth by the reader. The more, the reader attempts to understand the text, the further the meaning slips. As a result, a relation between the text and the reader is created. The present essay shows how Davis experiences death or becoming through her writings. The author shows her sacrifice and becoming the other in her short stories; in *Meat, My Husband*, Davis becomes no one and every one at the same time; she becomes the wife, the cook, and the meal but she is not any of them as well. In *Jack in the Country*, Davis reflects the field where no transcendental being is detected. Davis's stories manifest Blanchot's theory of language and narration in which the author is engaged with dying process, yet ironically neither he dies nor she is reborn. The aim of the present research is to show how Davis experiences the dying process and becoming the other.

**Keywords:** Language, Death, Signification, Spacing, Blanchot

## Introduction

Davis is an American author and interpreter of north of 20 books from French, including Gustave Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* (2010), Marcel Proust's *The Way by Swann's* (2003 [2002]) and texts by Maurice Blanchot. Davis additionally composes fiction. She has distributed one novel, *The End of the Story* (2004) and her Collected Stories distributed in 2009. Her creation as a creator has gone with her deciphering all through her vocation. Her work overall shows how the connection among composing and interpretation is mind boggling, as her interpretations and stories share a similar mark. Here and there, she further difficulties the line between the two methods of creation by drawing on one of her interpretations.

Lydia Davis' assortment *Almost No Memory* is lavishly innovative exhibit of lively philosophical examinations, involuted homegrown debates, and tales of the dim fabulous. With cleverly controlled power, she again depicts the scrutinizing self trapped in the perplexing scene. The tales in *Almost No Memory* uncover an empathic, at times breaking comprehension of human relations, as Davis, in an extra yet thunderous exposition all her own, investigates the restrictions of personality, of rationale, and of the known and the understandable.

Maurice Blanchot, the French philosopher, is one of the most important figures of the twentieth century. He has viewed literature in a philosophical way and regarded it as a serious matter. Blanchot does not evaluate different literary writers but he discusses how literature can be demanding to the thoughts. His writing has been so vast that he could influence many great thinkers in the twentieth century in the realm of poststructuralism. His writings are categorized into four groups including political journalism, literary reviews, novel writing and finally a hybrid style that is shown to resist any genre definition, as it is a mixture of both philosophical and literary text manifested in particular style.

Blanchot does not respect writing in feeling of a progressive connection assessed in view of their relative worth. As we have brought up, it would be difficult to track down definite literary analysis in Blanchot, even. Indeed, for Blanchot, writing can't be seen into a circle where the only thing that is important are examination of significant worth and taste, as it manages central philosophical inquiries.

With respect to plan to writing, one might say that the key inquiry isn't regardless of whether scholarly texts have a specific worth, or then again on the off chance that they fit the qualities or not, or their type and grouping; rather, the inquiry is the manner by which they cause the topic of what Blanchot calls the chance of writing. This inquiry, for Blanchot, has to do with the manner in which language and truth can be perceived. The readers typically comprehend the artistic text as moving a kind of truth to the readers. The object of artistic analysis is to get this reality. Notwithstanding, Blanchot accepts the meaning of writing is testing its desired truth to convey. Each artistic text wants to retaliate understanding and finding its importance. Blanchot features the beginning of current scholarly hypothesis, since it was the main development to understand the different element of the advanced novel which turns around upon itself and turns into its own subject. Just right now writing turns into its own test.

## Methods

The methods in this essay is based on Blanchot's theory of literature and language, so that the researcher uses the concepts and theories that have been developed by Blanchot. Blanchot argues that literature challenges itself and the language inserted within it. He emphasizes language as the challenging element of literature and in, *Literature and the Right to Death*, he writes that "this question is addressed to language, behind the person who is writing and the person who is reading, by language which has become literature" (21). In fact, the language of literature is different from the daily one which is used by people. It is not the tool for communication or reference and it must be released from the burden of the communicative purposes. As a result, literature for Blanchot is not the message that language carries but the language itself. Blanchot discusses how language brings about the death over language itself as Moradi states "language has the ability to name a thing outside itself in the world and sets it aside to represent it. Then, the word becomes the thing itself. Language thus kills and brings death to everything that it refers to" (34). Language becomes the tool of destruction for the references that it stands for and as a result meaning shatters. The researcher attempts to trace this aspect of language in the selected works of Davis. Therefore, the researcher finds how language brings about death over the text. In fact, the researcher shows that the aim of the language is not communication but the language itself.

Blanchot refers to the concept of death and how through making the world devoid, being and unity disappear and the world becomes the word. This is the ironic function of language which Blanchot has discussed since through destroying the entity outside of the language, it gives it existence and this relation can be another way around. Therefore, the researcher focuses on this aspect of language in Davis' short stories.

For Blanchot literature has two sides and the first side of literature deals with how death plays its role in bringing about the destruction and the absence of the things. Likewise, "Death is the source of the negativity that separates sign from object and by making language possible makes both humanity and literature possible" (Hill 113). In fact, language gives existence to the humanity by perceiving other phenomena outside himself. This process of perceiving "negates the thing outside separates the sign from the object" (Moradi 35) and the result would be the being of humanity. Therefore, the researcher uses the first side of literature to identify the birth and death of the author through language. Blanchot discusses how the second slope of the literature deals with two events: Writing has won over the significance of words, however what it has found in words thought about separated from their importance is implying that has become thing: and hence it is importance confined from its circumstances, isolated from its minutes, meandering like void power without power, a power nobody can do anything with, a power without power, the basic failure to stop to be, yet which, therefore, seems, by all accounts, to be the appropriate assurance of vague and inane presence. (*Literature and the Right to Death* 55)

This refers to the process of transforming in which the meaning turns into the entity. However, a separation takes place between the meaning and that entity since it is not present. This separation the meaning is no longer able to show what it is supposed to manifest and it weakens. Since the signification process does not take place, there would be no meaning and the language of literature does not represent anything outside the language. Hence, the researcher attempts to show how signification is gone and no meaning survives. Language becomes the tool through which an entity shows absence and presence at the same time. Therefore, the researcher investigates how a phenomenon appears and vanishes at the same time in the selected short stories. In other words, how spacing takes place through negation must be sought by the researcher. How language goes through moving from a thing in order to make it appear must be investigated throughout Davis' stories.

## Results

By Xue Weil and Kate Rose have distributed their paper named as "Metropolitan Nowhere: Loss of Self in Lydia Davis' Stories and Wang Anyi's *Brothers*. All through their paper, they center around how contemporary abstract functions by ladies' creators in China and the U.S. change distinction in two better places. They accept that female characters are attempting to track down importance in their lives as people. They reason that "in the West, powers restricting such opportunities are progressively mutable, and predominantly troublesome in postmodern space to perceive and to name. The books of Lydia Davis and Wang Anyi recommend a postmodern refutation of the Self in the US, especially connected to metropolitan scenes" (47).

Jonathan Evans in his paper named as "At the Borders Between Translation and Parody: Lydia Davis' Story about Marie Curie", has chipped away at the components of intertextuality and interpretation as satire. He accepts that a text problematizes the qualification among interpretation and different types of intertextual composing, particularly spoof. In his article, the pundit endeavors "to show how Davis' story is developed through interpretation and yet isn't an interpretation" (167). Also, he needs to study "how it plays with and disturbs the limits among interpretation and other intertextual types of composing, at last scrutinizing the possibility of portrayal innates in these practices" (168).

Leslie Hill has published his book by the title of *Maurice Blanchot and Fragmentary: Writing a Change of Epoch* in which different concepts and ideas by Maurice Blanchot. In this book, the author has elaborated on Blanchot's concepts regarding writing mostly fragmentary writing which is a significant concept in twentieth century.

In one more book by Ullrich Haase and William Large named as *Maurice Blanchot*. The book starts with a part offering an outline of the life and thoughts of Maurice Blanchot and clarifying why he is significant. The focal part of each book examines the Maurice Blanchot's key thoughts, his unique circumstance, advancement and gathering. The book finishes up with an overview of the Blanchot's s sway, illustrating how his thoughts have

been taken up and created by others. Moreover, there is a nitty gritty last area proposing and depicting books for additional perusing with respect to Maurice Blanchot.

## Discussion

The story of *Meat, My Husband* manifests the relationship between a couple through the matter of food and eating. Throughout this story, the narrator is mostly talking about food preparation, healthy diet, and her husband's reaction to the food. At the first glance, it could be realized what is said is different from what is meant. Food represents everything about the relationship between the narrator and her husband.

Food refers to the space of language in which spacing and distancing takes place. The narrator who is a housewife wants to approach his husband and become united with him. However, she fails and she cannot find the unity with her husband as they are two different people with different sense of taste which signifies how far they are from each other. Although the narrator declares that "I've learned by now that when he's involved in preparing a meal, or anything else for that matter, he's more apt to like it" (*Meat, My Husband* 120), the centrality of meaning and unity is shattered. The author who is the narrator is engaged in a cyclic process that is always changing and becoming a new subject. She is a wife, she is a cook, and she is food for her husband.

The storyteller needs to track down her job in this marriage; nonetheless, what she finds is far unique in relation to what she has expected. She concedes that she has found her significant other's beloved food as of late which has been 'corned food' since his adolescence. She adds that "I was unable to consider any, yet my better half didn't need to think prior to replying" (*Meat, My Husband* 118). This assertion features how vacancy of importance capacities in her marital existence with his better half. All through this portrayal, she calls attention to that she doesn't involve meat in the food that she cooks for her better half and here meat alludes to the meaning of significance which is lost in their life. In addition to the fact that she views herself as the spouse and cook and accepts "I'm the person who prepares the greater part of his dinners now" (*Meat, My Husband* 118), yet additionally she decides to discuss the wellbeing like a specialist and states "Regularly I make him suppers with no meat in them at everything since I don't think meat is really great for us" (*Meat, My Husband* 118). This shows how the storyteller is occupied with a course of becoming without a solitary being and solidarity. The vacancy of importance and significance is called attention to by the shortfall of various fixings. All in all, language can be acknowledged as food and the words are the fixings; when the fixings are disregarded while cooking, the outcome would be a kind of food which isn't food. The storyteller shows how she does cook and disregards the fundamental fixings. She makes reference to: "Consistently there is no fish in them either, because most fish isn't incredible for us either, and there will never be any fish in them, not entirely in light of the fact that I can't remember which sorts of fish may be safeguarded to eat and which are almost certainly" (*Meat, My Husband* 118)

The arrangement of language from postmodern view that the storyteller here epitomizes looks like cooking in which nonattendance makes meaning. The shortfall of importance and solidarity is appeared through the play of the words: "How about you make the food varieties I like?" he asks here and there. "How about you like the food sources I make?" I reply. (Meat, *My Husband* 118). Here the substitution and separation of words which depend on distinction make meaning which isn't steady. As a matter of fact, centrality of importance is lost and distraction of the text remains. The creator endeavors to make reality which is neither reality nor deception. The irresoluteness of importance can be recognized in what the future held his better half 'dietary pattern. There is no centrality of signifying: "At times he loves what I make, and assuming he's feeling great he says as much... But for the most part he tries to avoid what I cook however much what he used to eat in burger joints and surely not however much what he used to make for himself before he met me" (Meat, *My Husband* 119)

Composing is language at its most independent since it is language at its generally spatial. Composing exists significantly outside of the psyche, freely of the brief and straightforward vibrations of the air, as imprints on a surface. These imprints needn't bother with the presence of their creator; rather, the creator is generally missing or even dead all the time. The storyteller makes reference to how she becomes related with the most common way of cooking and she can't be isolated from the cooking system: "I don't believe he's quiet since I'm taking care of him such a lot of less meat, but since he is training himself to acknowledge what I do. He would really rather avoid it yet realizes that I accept I'm doing it to his benefit" (Meat, *My Husband* 119). Here, the death of the author can be realized in this process in which nothing can satisfy her husband. This refers to the dead-end relationship that they have been trapped.

The story of *Jack* revolves around the instability of language in which narration is shattered and the addressor and the addressee suffer from misunderstanding. The name Jack is supposed to be significant and remains as the absolute meaning and truth. Henry and Jack are friends who happen to see each other in the street. Henry inquires Jack about Laura and his weekend with her. However, upon hearing the name Laura, Jack reacts and states "he hasn't addressed Laura in at minimum a month" (Jack 121). The name Jack holds solidarity and being for Henry since he accepts that Jack is the one whom Ellen has referenced. Jack changes into a critical being for both Henry and Ellen as it is said that "she has been coming clean: Laura let her via telephone know that Jack was coming for the end of the week to her home up there in the nation" (Jack 121). Jack becomes the language in this narration and everybody attempts to have the interpretation based on the particular logos. Henry assumes that someone is lying and he wants to realize who that person is. However, the mistake and the blame is on Ellen who has made a mistake regarding the name Jack.

Blanchot mentions that language has the feature to use naming system for calling a thing which is not inside itself in the world and firms it aside to show it. Then, the word turns into the thing itself. Language destroys and makes death to everything that it refers to.

The family name is actually an added name which plays the role of the lack in one's first name by repetition. The added family name signifies a lack in first name for which it is used to complete it. That is why naming is like a process of repetition and it refers to an endless cycle. The result of this naming system and process is that Jack becomes everyone and no none. This is what Blanchot believes regarding the function of language and the person becomes everyone and no one at the same time. Jack is every one and no one at the same time; he is neither born nor does he die and in fact he becomes an omnipresent Jack for every person but he is absent at the same time.

The question starts to rise for Henry and Ellen and even for Jack himself. Jack is the one that Henry knows and also, he is the Jack that Laura knows. However, they are different and the centrality of Jack shatters for Henry and Ellen. Moreover, the borders between the identities are blurred and no independent subjectivity can be detected. The story concludes with playing of different signifiers: “a third Jack has become involved in this story, to the distress of the second Jack, for Laura’s affections have already strayed from the Jack that Ellen knows only slightly and that Henry does not know, and fastened on a Jack in the country unknown to them all” (Jack 119). What is left is actually the spacing within the process of language. In the story the spacing takes place in language which results into breaking of the entity as a wholeness. In other words, language changes into a dynamic system where no stability is found. In this story Jack signifies a site of many possibilities and alternatives and truth becomes just an illusion.

The story of *The Professor* deals with a female professor who has crush on marrying a cowboy. The main idea of the story centers on contradiction and ambiguity since the idea of marriage between a professor and a cowboy is ridiculous. The whole story amplifies Blanchot’s theory of language in literature. The centrality of meaning and stability does not last in the narrative of this story. The idea of neither forgetfulness nor remembrance is prevalent within the text of the narration “a few years ago, I used to tell myself I wanted to marry a cowboy. Why shouldn’t I say this to myself—living alone, excited by the brown landscape” (*The Professor* 126) and also she adds “in fact, I realize I would still like to marry a cowboy, though by now I’m living in the East and married already to someone who is not a cowboy” (*The Professor* 126). The narrator refers to the function of memory and forgetfulness at the same time. It is blurred whether she lives in the present or the past and in Blanchot’s theory, it might be said that she is not living in the presence nor the past.

Connected with Blanchot's concept of language as the space which on one hand neglects to show and finds another ability to allow things to come out vastly then again, it very well may be contended that the storyteller and the rancher are arranged here of language. The unbiased space of language invests an item outside effort and spot and lets what has been overlooked about the item to be thought. The storyteller's choice to wed such a person triggers expectation for the reader. This expectation has established in the capacity of language. In light of Blanchot's thought, language embraces the most common way of changing and passing. All along, in the 'prehistoric past,' the author has no premise, no

substance and never finds being recorded as a hard copy ever again. In this course of biting the dust, a choice should be generally not quite the same as any earlier arrangements for it. The narrator interprets her own decision using the role of language and states: “But what would a cowboy want with a woman like me—an English professor, the daughter of another English professor, not very easygoing?” (*The Professor* 126).

Davis’s story becomes other than itself or is created when it is read with other interpretations. As Blanchot writes, it is the public that is writing which resist interpretation. Blanchot mentions how both the author and text are created in this process as Blanchot writes “he looked out of the window’ to be more than himself” (*Kafka and Literature* 34).

It shows that Blanchot believes the act of writing which is the source of itself and the writer as well. As a result, Davis writes in order that writing creates her and she becomes more than who she is. Her story of *The Professor* is the field in which the writer and the reader are born. Moreover, in this space others can be born and play roles. Likewise in this short story, there are several roles for the narrator; she is the professor; she is the daughter and she is the lover at the same time. The narrator is always involved in the constant process of changing and becoming. The process of creation and rebirth is shown metaphorically through use of briefcase and carrying it around. In fact, it gives her identity and she becomes another one. The narrator observes this epidemic action among other professors: “I could see that the older professors, mostly men but also some women, were no longer aware of the importance of their briefcases, and that the younger women pretended they weren’t aware of it, but the younger men carried their briefcases like trophies” (*The Professor* 127). She mentions how other professors go through changes and become lost in the hall. The narrator looks for escaping and she wants to become some else. In Blanchot’s words, she desires to break this unity of being and experiences death. In fact, the narrator states how she has been under pressure by her own father to become a professor that her father has always wanted.

She is not able to find the wholeness of meaning in this job as her father has suggested and she wants to change completely. She mentions that it was her father who has forced her to carry that briefcase and have some papers with herself. The narrator mentions how she doubts the function of language as she states that “I didn’t read more than a few pages sometimes when I was feeling strong. How could an old professor try to teach a young professor?” (*The Professor* 127). The narrator points out the process of replacement which puts her under the pressure as Moradi believes that “he substitution destabilizes the constitution of the self, since the self undergoes a transformation while he reads himself” (32). Likewise, the narrator’s self and construction are under decentering and she becomes another subject in her life. She desires a cowboy to rub away from the self that she has been given. This idea can be related to the concept of becoming by Deleuze as he declares that there is no stable existence which can go beyond becoming. In other words, becoming is the different forms of being at different points and moments.

Therefore, a being is an instable state rather than a fixed one. This means that a subject can never reach the state of being, but he is always in the process of becoming. As the result, the subject cannot reach the transcendental reality since there are no realities beyond appearance. This is what the narrator knows about the transcended reality and truth. She knows it is just the matter of appearance and essence does not exist like the language of literature. She states: "More important than the clothes a cowboy wore, and the way he wore them, was the fact that a cowboy probably wouldn't know much more than he had to" (*The Professor* 127).

What an individual does and what befalls that individual are inescapable. Becoming causes to make conditions which these circumstances consolidate together and this new condition is significant and OK. On the off chance that this individual communicates, or shows turning out to be evidently, it has had becoming in its mind. Majority is associated with stability which resists change and becoming. On the contrary, minority is associated with changing and becoming. Women are the symbol of changing as they have no ownership and possession. Therefore, they do not remain stable and they experience changing and becoming. Consequently, women are able to bring about changes in both male and female. It means that man does not change. The narrator is in the same process of changing and she wants to bring about the changes in both herself and the mentality of that cowboy as she admits: "I was tired of so much thinking, which was what I did most in those days. I did other things, but I went on thinking while I did them... When I had the idea of marrying a cowboy, I imagined that maybe a cowboy would help me stop thinking so much. (*The Professor* 127)

In the narrator's mind, the changing unity can be traced and seen. Becoming occurs in the mentality then thought and social reality function to change it. As a result, becoming can be considered as a process of making oneself select and be affected by forces and parts of the environment that one would normally exclude" (Due 143). Blanchot considers literature as the process of challenging the being. In his idea, language is the matter of absence and negates the nature of different matters. Likewise, Davis's use of language in the story refers to the act of negation and challenging the self. The narrator's constantly wants to challenge the sense of self and being. The Language of the story function in this making absent and the negation of the thing in nature.

All the words that the narrator uses including thinking, working, feeling, and so on are negated in nature as the narrator herself is confused about what she wants. Throughout what the narrator says, language is changed into the void that is neither something nor nothing; in fact it is considered as neither representation nor manifestation. Whatever the narrator mentions deals with the "category of presence/absence and the definition of being/non-being. It means that being is characterized as the neither/nor condition" (Moradi 34). The narrator expresses her own feelings which shows her state is out of this category of being and non being. In other words, she is involved in the process of spacing: "I thought that when my mind, always so busy, always going around in circles, always having an idea and then an idea about an idea, reached out to his mind, it would meet

something quieter, that there would be more blanks, more open spaces” (127). What the narrator means is that the more she attempts to get closer to what she wants, the further she slips away from the unity of her being.

She is drawn in the space of language where meaning does not exist. She is mixed with both being and non-being. The narrator’s mind is at the same time functioning and floating in the space. What she experiences is the void that Blanchot has mentioned and theorized. Language is used to name things and represent them in the world, so that what the language shows and the thing itself remain the same. The result would be the death since the thing has been taken into language. As the narrator points out to the word cowboy, she brings about death on him because the system of language includes that cowboy “who is here right now, can be detached from [himself], removed from [his] existence and [his] presence and suddenly plunged into a nothingness in which there is no existence or presence; my language essentially signifies the possibility of this destruction. Therefore, it is accurate to say that when I speak: death speaks in me” (*Literature and the Right to Death* 42).

The storyteller continues and notices she envisioned this despite the fact that she realize that a portion of the things she preferred that may be in that cattle rustler's brain, similar to the seats, the seat injuries, the horsehair, and the actual ponies, weren't frequently a piece of the existence of a rancher any longer. The storyteller happens by saying she at times envisioned herself perusing discreetly in clean garments in a pleasant report, yet at different times she envisioned herself "oiling tack or cooking enormous amounts of plain food or assisting in the outbuilding in the early morning while the cattle rustler had the two arms inside a cow to turn a calf so it would introduce appropriately" (*The Professor* 127). This language brings about the death of cowboy by detaching himself from his real identity. He does not remain the same person and he goes through differentiation process in the system of the narrator’s language.

Personality has forever been a significant idea in various settings and fields. "The expression "personality" has a long practice in Western way of thinking and a lot more limited precursors in brain research and social brain science" (Sollberger 1). By and large, character is a predicate, what capacities as an identifier or in different words a marker that recognizes and separates one item from another article. Along these lines, character in this sense centers around the uniqueness of the concerned article. The difference in character can be understood and followed for the storyteller too. her language achieves her demise too.

She makes reference to assuming that she wedded a cattle rustler, she wouldn't need to leave the West. She preferred the west for its challenges. She preferred the trouble of telling when one season was finished and one more had started, and afterward she loved the trouble of tracking down any excellence in the scene. The inconsistency of words and the issue of being and non-being are viewed as the storyteller calls attention to that the boundary of offensiveness and magnificence can't be recognized. The outcome is that the storyteller's personality stays corresponding to the specific situation:

Regardless, I had become acclimated to its own sort of grotesqueness, that large number of expansive parkways set down in the valleys and the new developments put up on the exposed slopes. Then, at that point, I started to track down magnificence in it, and enjoyed the exposed state and the plain brown of the slopes in the dry season, and the manner in which the folds in the slopes where some soggianness would in general wait would top off with grasses and bushes and other blooming plants. (*The Professor* 128)

What she mentions refers to the death of identity which is always in changing. The shattering of unity of identity is in line with becoming in identity. Identity is thus something that is in the process of change and alteration. It changes since the world, the time and identities are placed at the center of change. Since identities are placed in, and depend on different contextual forces, what they hold changes due to culture and society. It means that the concept of identity is contextual. The narrator recalls how she has met a person close to the cowboy who was not an actual cowboy. This would bring about the death of cowboy and also the man that he has met.

The storyteller met a man in one of her classes who appeared to be sensibly near her concept of a rancher, however presently she can't tell precisely why she suspected as much. She wasn't exactly similar to a cowpoke, for sure she figured a rancher may be like, so what she needed probably been something different, and the possibility of a cattle rustler just came up to her for accommodation. The realities weren't right. He didn't fill in as a cattle rustler yet at some sort of occupation where he stuck the bones of chimpanzees together. He played jazz trombone, and when he had an illustration, he wore a dull suit to class and conveyed a dark case. Every one of the elements that are depicted utilizing language alludes until the very end and resurrection cycle of self in Blanchot's hypothesis.

The instability of identity means changing from one matter to another one as an everlasting process. Such an in-between constantly is in progress, between yesterday and tomorrow, between here and there, between before and after constitutes becoming-other (Semetsky 12). In other words, what is in the mind and the self are in changing condition and it holds true for all people. It is not fixed in a specific time and place. As a result, these changes make create a new person with a new point of view to the world and becoming is not related to a specific person. It consists of every person. These changes occur in a moment between moments and in a place between places in a person between people.

The language that the narrator uses creates spacing and decentralization. The professor wants to marry the cowboy and stay where she was born. However, she tells him that she would not marry her since she is leaving for the west. However, later she mentions that "it wasn't quite true that I hadn't expected to see him again, but it was true that I was leaving soon" (131). This contradiction amplifies the issue of death for the cowboy whom she has been dreaming. As the storyteller continue to discuss him, it very well may be understood the cowpoke is dead for her. She says that he brought her back home and kissed her goodbye. As should have been obvious, she wouldn't fret the manner in which

the date ended up. She said that began crying the following day in her vehicle en route to the drive-in bank. She thought she was sobbing for him, his feelings of trepidation, his troubles, the baffling men he believed were after him and his little girl, however she was presumably weeping for herself, out of dissatisfaction, however she didn't know about what she needed. What the narrator thinks shows that she is in love with the idea of a cowboy not the person himself; this means death for that person since she dies constantly as she changes the object of her love.

This changing of identity and self which happens due to death from Blanchot's idea creates emptiness of self. It means that a person may have experienced many real events in his or her life and these events created new his or her individuality. Therefore, this new individuality makes him or her unique.

The end of the story shows the sense of time from Blanchot's point of view. The time becomes like a circle in which the present and the past are meaningless. The finish of the story is its start. The storyteller is at a similar place where she began portraying that can be connected with actually time for Blanchot. The second that the work seems ought to be known as the second at which the work is viewed as inconceivable. This second at which the work becomes conceivable is fluctuating between its presence as the making missing things on the planet and their reemerging. Moradi specifies "this 'pendulum' means the work as the hour of destruction and advancement simultaneously. Its improvement is at the expense of its annihilation. Language as the work invalidates thing in the world and at the same time re-appears as the real thing" (41). This course of development and deconstruction is shown by the storyteller that achieves carelessness: "I can't recall which, and he sounded similarly as satisfied to hear from me, and complimented, as he had sounded when I asked him out on the date. I actually envision wedding a cowpoke, however on rare occasions, and the fantasy has changed a little" (*The Professor* 131).

In the above extract, what can be realized is the matter of moving and spacing towards a point which is neither present nor absent. The whole idea of time is being challenged and negated. She is neither in the West nor in the East; she is everywhere and nowhere. Her confusion of feeling about this cowboy means she does not know the sense of time and in her mind, she still desires marrying a cowboy. Her language looks like the unbiased space which opens onto inconceivability. It is the main chance to lead to being in itself. This difficulty is being and nothingness together. As such, being and nothingness are together, it is on the grounds that nothing should arise as a solitary element which means being or nothing. It shows that being is in suspension or staying alive while kicking the bucket simultaneously, in the field of language.

## Conclusion

The story of *Meat, My Husband* manifests the relationship between a couple through the matter of food and eating. Throughout this story, the narrator is mostly talking about food preparation, healthy diet, and her husband's reaction to the food. At the first glance, it

could be realized what is said is different from what is meant. Food represents everything about the relationship between the narrator and her husband.

Food refers to the space of language in which spacing and distancing takes place. The author who is the narrator is engaged in a cyclic process that is always changing and becoming a new subject. She is a wife, she is a cook, and she is food for her husband. The narrator wants to find her role in this matrimony; however, what she finds is far different from what she has assumed. She admits that she has found her husband's favorite food recently which has been 'corned food' since his childhood. According to common sense, people assume the physical signifier to be inhabited and stimulated by the content of a signified, but Husserl goes further and insists that the signified must be inhabited and stimulated by an act of consciousness. Hence, Husserl's theory of language privileges the role of the Voice. The story of *Jack* revolves around the instability of language in which narration is shattered and the addressor and the addressee suffer from misunderstanding. The name Jack is supposed to be significant and remains as the absolute meaning and truth. Henry and Jack are friends who happen to see each other in the street. Henry inquires Jack about Laura and his weekend with her. The question starts to rise for Henry and Ellen and even for Jack himself. Jack is the one that Henry knows and also he is the Jack that Laura knows. However, they are different and the centrality of Jack shatters for Henry and Ellen. Moreover, the borders between the identities are blurred and no independent subjectivity can be detected.

The story of *The Professor* deals with a female professor who has crush on marrying a cowboy. The main idea of the story centers on contradiction and ambiguity since the idea of marriage between a professor and a cowboy is ridiculous. The whole story amplifies Blanchot's theory of language in literature. The centrality of meaning and stability does not last in the narrative of this story. The neutral space of language puts an object outside time and place and lets what has been ignored about the object to be thought. The narrator's decision to marry such a guy triggers an anticipation for the reader. The process of creation and rebirth is shown metaphorically through use of briefcase and carrying it around. In fact, it gives her identity and she become another one. The narrator observes this epidemic action among other professors.

### Disclosure Statements

This research was prepared by Dr. Fatemeh Aziz Mohammadi, who is a member of the faculty and associate professor of Islamic Azad University of Arak branch. Also, the purpose of this research is to access the content for those interested in this field.

### ORCID

**Fatemeh Azizmohammadi:** <https://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-6705-3743>

### References

(n.d.). Lautréamont et Sade (Minuit).

- (n.d.). by Susan Hanson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993. ---, 'Literature and the Right to Death' in *The Gaze of Orpheus*.
- . *Awaiting Oblivion*, trans. by John Gregg. Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Leslie Hill, *Blanchot: Extreme Contemporary*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Sur Maurice Blanchot*. Montpellier: Fata Morgana, 1975. Quoted in Gary D. Mole, *Levinas, Blanchot, Jabes: Figures of Estrangement* (Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 1997).
- Clark, Timothy. "Contradictory Passion: Inspiration in Blanchot's 'The Space of Literature'", *SubStance*, Vol. 25, No. 1, Issue 79. (1996),
- Donald G. Marshal, "History, Theory, and Influence: Yale Critics as Readers of Maurice Blanchot' in *The Yale Critics: Deconstruction in America*, ed. by Jonathan Arc, Wald Godzich, Wallace Martin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.