

## **I. Issues of Gender Identity in Eugenide's Novel**

This research represents some of the most recent issues on gender and sexuality focusing on the question of what it might mean to undo restrictively, constructed normative conception of sexual and gender identities by thorough analysis of Jeffery Eugenide's play *Middlesex*. The focus of analysis is gender, sex and sexuality. It rejects the idea that 'sex' is only biologically determined entity. Gender is a process which has neither origin nor end so that it is something that we 'do' rather than 'are'. Undoing gender does claim that gender identity is a sequence of acts. In other word, it is not concerned with definition, fixity or stasis, but is transitive, multiple and anti assimilations. Undoing gender on the other hand, affirms the instability and indeterminacy of all gendered and sex identities. Rather than assuming that identities are self evident and fixed as it was previously taken to be its traces the process by which identity is constructed within a society.

The main focus of this research is that the subject is not a pre-existing essential entity and that our identities are constructed, means that it is possible for identities to be reconstructed in ways that challenge and subvert existing power structures. Gender can be endeavored by our efforts. Eugenide's main character Callie becomes Cal when she tells her mother and father (in writing) that she is a boy. She is a boy only because she decides to reject her rearing. She cuts her hair, works like a boy, and names herself with boy's name. In the moment that he declares himself male, he begin the process of constructing a history of his life by challenging the previous concept 'sex' as fixed infinite, pure monolithic single and determinate. He revolt with the doctor who propose to make his body conform to his rearing and cut off the end of his name (Cal from Calliope) and cut his hair to endeavor his gender by

his own efforts. In this research work Cal or Calliope is, sometimes referred with an illusive pronoun ' S/he' to highlight undecidability and fluidity of gender identity.

Gender is always coming from a source that is elsewhere and directed toward something that is beyond us constituted in a society. If that is so then gender undoes the 'I' who is supposed to be or bear, its gender, and that undoing is part of the very meaning and compensability of that "I". Gender is considered as a kind of a doing which is subverted in post modern era. One does not do one's gender alone one is always doing with or for another even if the other is only imaginary.

The viability of individual personhood is fundamentally dependent on the social norms. People always have the desire for recognition, and that, it is only through the experience of recognition that any of us becomes constituted as socially viable beings. The terms, by which, we are recognized as human are socially articulated and changeable and sometimes the very terms that confer humanness on some individual are those that derive certain other individual of the possibility of achieving that status producing a differential between the human and the less than human. The very terms such as masculine and feminine are notoriously changeable, there are social histories for each term, their meaning change radically depending upon geopolitical boundaries and cultural constraints, on who is imagining whom, and for what purpose. Terms of genders designation are thus never settled once and for all but are constantly in the process of being remade. The concept of gender as historical per formative, however, stands in tension for those who are regarded less than human.

So undoing gender sought to counter gender's views that made presumptions about the limits and propriety of gender and restricted the meaning of gender to received notions of masculinity and femininity and it also sought to undermine any and all efforts to wield a discourse of truth to delegitimize minority gendered and sexual

practices. This does not mean that all minority practices are to be condemned or celebrated but it does mean that we ought to be able to think them. The neat division of sex as male/female is challenged by undoing gender. It defines a hermaphrodite as someone who combines features drawn from both sexes. Undoing gender does not only challenge the biological division of sex in the two fold categories rather it dismantles the very category. Undoing gender dismantles the previous concept of gender as pure unified and monolithic. It appeals to mainstream modern societies' values of fair treatment for all people including future generation of inter sexual, homosexual, lesbianism and gay.

Jeffrey Eugenides is one of the most prominent and controversial writer in contemporary literature. He was born in the affluent Detroit suburb, Grosse Pointe, Michigan to Constantine and Wanda Eugenides on March 8, 1960 his first novel, and *The Virgin Suicide* was published in 1993. Eugenides won the Aga Khan prize for fiction when he submitted an excerpt of *The Virgin Suicide* to the Paris review in 1991. He completed the novel in 1993 and after its publication; it joined great critical acclaim and commercial success. Eugenides did not publish another novel for nine years. His second novel, *Middlesex* won him the 2003 Pulitzer Prize for fiction and a nomination for the national book critics circle awards.

Eugenides parents wanted to assimilate in mainstream American society despite their Greek heritage. He was so influenced by the world of his childhood that his first two novels are set there. His Greek parent's assimilation serves as the part of the backdrops for *Middlesex*. *Middlesex*, the long awaited and Pulitzer winning second novel by Jeffrey Eugenides, unfolds like a Greek drama with a sense of inevitability and raises the voices of marginal group who are regarded less than human.

Calliope who changes her name to Cal, when she assumes a male identity she claim that, “s/he has a male brain but was assumed to be female at birth (57).” Cal insists that from the beginning of her life she had the ability to communicate between the gender to see not with the monovision of one sex but in the stereoscope of both. Yet her hermaphroditism causes her great shame. As a result, she admits “when I meet someone I like and who seems to like me, I retreat” (49). This research work attempts to analyze the cause of her mix feelings.

Cal Stephanides, a pseudo hermaphrodite narrates the novel. Cal states that he was born twice as a teenage boy in an emergence room in Petoskey, Michigan in 1974 Cal will discover his identity, but through many chapters, Calliope (his young female sell) remains confused by her feelings and her body Cal believes that he breaks from predestination by deciding to live as a man but one could argue that because he is genetically male (with XY chromosomes albeit with female genitalia), the choice to be a man is not his. Why one suffer from gender identity is interesting for carrying out further research.

Cal begins by telling readers about his dual birth, relates a bit about his present circumstance and then back to the roots of his story in the lives of his grandparents. It is grandmother Desdemona who knows that something bad would come from making her brother and tries to avoid becoming pregnant. “I was wondering ... how do you keep from getting pregnant”(58). Greek myth enters here. Desdemona and her cousin Sourmelina with whom Desdemona and Leffty live become pregnant on the same night after watching on Americanized performance of a Greek tragedy. The double impregnation is doubly ominous as Sourcelina; a lesbian had not had sexual intercourse with her husband, Jimmy Zizmo, for five month pitting him off with various excuses.

The primary reason for Cal to tell so much about his grandparents as part of his own story is to reveal how the rare recessive gene for Cal's form of hermaphroditism was passed to his father, Desdemona and Lefty's child Milton. Milton marries Tessie, the daughter of Sourmelina and Jimmy Zizmo, such intermarrying among else families was common in their home village, but Desdemona comes to learn of the medical reason against it. Then, is gender a medical construct?

Cal has a relatively normal girlhood, but as an adolescent she becomes troubled by her attraction to a female classmate referred to only as the obscure object and by her failure to develop physically or to menstruate. Eugenides here prologs suspense providing a series of episodes hinting to Callie that something is wrong and leaving the reader to wonder just how and when she will discover her genetic identity. Her secret comes out while on a vacation with the obscure object. They engage in quasis sexual exploration, each pretending that it is not really happening. The Object's brother accuses them of being lesbian and Callie runs away, only to be hit by a tractor. The emergency room doctor who treats her discovers her physical abnormality. Milton and Tessie take Callie to a specialist in gender identity who tells them that multiple factors determine gender and in his opinion Callie should receive hormone treatment and surgery to allow living as women. Callie, however, reads his records and sees that genetically she is male. She leaves her parents a note saying that she really is a boy and that the doctor had lied to them, then runs away. She states that she buys a suit, adopts the name Cal, and hitchhikes to California and lives briefly in a camp of other run away. After being beaten there by several homeless men in desperation Cal meets a man on the road. He states that the experience, through horrible, allowed him to become comfortable with his body when the club is raided by

police the underage Cal's taken into custody. He calls home setting the scene for reconciliation several months after the runaway.

After Cal comes home for Milton is traditional Greek funeral, the family gradually adjust cal as a male Desdemona admits that Lefty was her brother and blames herself for Cal's situation Cal tells her that Cal likes his life and that he is okay. The novel ends with Cal at door happy to be home and thinking about what was next. James Wood, in his review of the novel for the *New Republic* comments that:

*Middlesex* is an enormously ambitious book, whose many stories do indeed gather to present a broad swath of Greek- American life. More, Eugenides wishes to his three- generational structure to suggest something about fate, the bequeathments of genetics, and the possibility of revolt once fate has displayed its carts to carry this thematic he has chosen a very peculiar vehicle: His narrator hermaphroditic. (32)

Wood writes the book clearly turns on the idea of destiny and of destiny resisted, both by free will and by helpless action. "First when Desdemona and Lefty have their lives changed and in turn change their lives by coming to America, and then when their granddaughter chooses, at the age of thirteen, to become a boy"(27). Calliope, we are supposed to bad believe is the Synthesis that unites the restless dialectic of Eros and perhaps of history: A character neatly informs us that "Plato said that the original human being was a hermaphrodite. Dud you have that? The original person has two halves, one male, and one female. Then these get separated that's why everybody's always searching for their other half Except for us. We've got both halves already". (33)

Wood's further opinions *Middlesex* is a child of its moment in its occasional recourse to those excitements, patterning, and implausibility that lie on the soft side of magical realism and should be called hysterical realism. Two cousins conceive their children on the same night and at the same moment. These two children later marry each other; a character is named chapter 11 and seems never to have been given any other name the Greek lady who flees Smyrna in 1922 later returns to Smyrna beach, Florida. The novel's hermaphrodite narrator, Calliope Stephanides, which born a girl but later decides, conveniently moves to a house on Middlesex streets, in Grosse Pointe Michigan, in 1960, and conveniently narrates his story from present day Berlin formerly a city of two halves or sexes (which of course he remarks upon) and so on.

James wood, in his review of the novel comments that "Eugenides wishes to use his three generational structures to suggest something about fate, the bequeathments of genetics, and the possibility of revolt once fate has displayed its card. Wood concludes "the book clearly turns on the idea of destiny, and of destiny resisted, both by free will and by helpless action". Keith Gessen in his review "nation (10/14/2002) highlights that the narrator is intersexes he says:

The hermaphrodite, even a pseudo hermaphrodite, symbolizes a return by pretty off the omniscient narrator, capable of inhabiting all ages and sexes in what is probably the book central, Calliope and her best friend (known only as "the obscure object") find themselves drinking in a Cabin in the woods with the objects older brother, Jerome and his sinister friend, Rex Reese soon Jerome is a top an indifferent calliope, Rex similarly astride a willing Object occasionally parrying Jerome's advances Calliope directs her attention across the room. (27)

With consummate skill (Rex) had undone the object's brassiere with one hand because he was more experienced than me. He let him deal with the shirt buttons' but it was my hands that took hold of her bra and, as if snooping up a window shade, let into the room the pale light of the object's breast. I saw them, touched them, and since it wasn't me who did this but Rex Reese. I didn't have to feel guilty, didn't have to ask myself if I was having unnatural desires. Keith says it's a lovely scene and the novelistic use of an intersexes narrator is making powerfully clear.

Another prominent critic Max Watman in his fiction "Suffers the Children" explores *Middlesex* as a family history. He states:

Eugenides has written a three generation family history. Sing, now O muse, of the recessive mutation of my chromosome should give you a sense of its scope. He moves from modern day Berlin to the origins of the Black Muslim movement in Detroit, to immigration. Griffitt in "Sibling of the Genus Erroneous" reviews *Middlesex* is a sprawling boisterous epic, a book that veers with astonishing speed from wit to pathos, from comedy to tragedy. It is a hermaphrodite in the second sense, "anything comprised of a combination of diverse or contradictory elements. (213)

Cal takes about the doctor who would remove all evidence of his maleness so that he could continue to live as girl. The doctor sees Cal's indeterminate sex as a problem to be solved Jen Gilbert too emphasized on the sex aspect of the novel. In "literature as sex education" she explores the status of the novel in thinking about sex education she further states:

In a later passage Cal remarks upon the terrible impatience with anything that falls outside the box. Having spent his life being raised as



a girl because no adult who cared for him could bear to look any closer, or accept the possibility that he was somewhere in between, Cal makes the blindness a problem of adulthood. (239)

The solution is not to help Cal think about his dilemma, to learn what it is like to live between the sexes, or to interrogate the punishing logic of normality. Instead, the doctor works to bring Cal back into the realm of the intelligible. For Cal sexual identity is one of the strategies people have for giving a boost to normality

But Samule reviews the text claiming differently while comparing this novel with “In a Time of Terror” he says:

Jeffrey Eugenides 2002 *Middlesex*, a critically acclaimed historical novel has been praised as an expansive, epic portrait of the American twentieth century from its immigrant roots to the present. It takes its readers from a Turkish village in the 1920. To the race riots of the late 1960s following a Greek and then Greek American family across time and the world, spinning an interestingly twisted yarn in the voice of the family is latest product whose gender identity complicated by a genetically inherited hermaphroditism, is at the center of his story.(371)

Thus, from the above mentioned literature review, it can be deciphered that through the *Middlesex* has been analyzed and interpreted through different perspectives. Undoing gender identity of Cal has not been dealt, with. Without the analysis from the perspective of undoing gender of Cal it seems the meaning of the text remains incomplete. The critics have not yet answered satisfactorily the question like: why the protagonist adopts the male identity although she/he is born as a girl by birth? Why

can Cal Stephanides not fit himself in one identity category? Is sex a purely biological, a pre discursive entity upon which gender is forcibly imposed?

The major focus of this research work is to answer the problem why the protagonist's adopt the male identity although she/he is born as a girl physically. The research work attempts to deconstruct male/female categories which is constructed by the society and raises the voice from the perspective of marginal group such as hermaphrodite. Gender is performatively constructed. It is formed through the certain practices of 'doing'. When the practices are 'done' otherwise 'gender' changes its present status and results in 'undoing gender'.

## **II. Undoing Gender**

‘Gender’ is a set of social process which produces and organizes the structure and expression of desire. Gender is a social construction in which certain identities and behaviors are attached to the biological and anatomical raw material of human sex: male-female. One is not born male/female but it is constructed so gender is the effect of social and cultural process. ‘Sex’ refers to the biological different but gender refers to the parallel and socially unequal division into femininity and masculinity. ‘Role’ plays the significant role to determine the gender. What kind of ‘role’ a person performs in the society determines the certain gender.

Gender draws attention to the socially constructed aspect of differences between women and men. But the term gender has since become extended to refer not only to individual identity and personality but also set the symbolic level to cultural ideal and stereotype of masculinity and femininity. Not only biological differences or division between men and women determines the gender but a culturally dominant idea also somehow determines his/her gender. It shows that there are huge cross-cultural variations in ideas about gender and in the roles of men and women. There are studies of the ways in which baby boys and girls are conceptualized his/her gender by the process of socialization. Child rearing, education, environment, culture, employment practices and family ideology help the child to internalize his/her gender. Gender is not inborn or natural but it is constructed in certain framework of the society.

There are two major concepts of gender. The first is that it is based upon a false dichotomy between the biological and the social. Child’s mind is ‘tabula rasa’ upon which socialization plays great role to produce social consciousness of his/her gender. The second kind of concept about gender is related to the way in which the

concept of gender focuses on differences between women and men at the expense of power and domination. Women and men are treated as pre-constituted groups in the society and the biology of procreation is often used in the explanation of it.

All societies have gender system, and that system produces social connection on gender from biological and anatomical raw materials of human procreation. Gender is open to imitation. Child imitates the socially constructed norms and internalizes his/her gender. Repetitions of acts determine who or what one is.

Gender is a kind of action that can potentially proliferate beyond the binary limits imposed by the binary of sex. Gender is constructed so it can be acquired by our effort. Undoing gender dismantles that binary of male/female identity categories which is constructed by society. The question, however, of what qualifies as 'gender' is itself already a question that attests to pervasively normative operation of power. Previous concept of gender as pure, unified and monolithic is dismantled now. All the boundaries of male/female, homosexual and heterosexual are dismantled in modern society which is helpful for marginal group to exist in society comfortably. It helps the marginal groups to live livable life. Social construction of legal, real, reliable, possible is question now. Impossible, illegible, unrealizable, unreal and illegitimate is considered positively in modern time.

Butler says in his *Undoing Gender*, gender is sometimes used as a way of securing heterosexuality under the condition of normative heterosexuality. Gender emerges as the congealed form of sexualization of inequality between men and women. Briefly, one is a woman according to this framework to the extent that one functions as one within the dominant heterosexual frame and to call the frame into question is perhaps to place in gender. Butler says:

We can see precisely some people suffer in one's place in gender or of not knowing what will be if one sleeps with someone of the ostensibly 'same gender'. Gay or homosexual people, for instance may be discriminated against in position of employment because they fail to appear in accordance with accepted gendered norms. And the sexual harassment of gay people may well take place not in the service of sharing up gender hierarchy, but in promoting gender normatively.

(14)

To have a gender means to have entered already into heterosexual relationship of subordination. Previous concept of gender as unified, pure gender as performative are all dismantled now. Those group who are marginalized, or who are exclusive in previous categories are included now to help them to establish their identities.

According to Butler a normative conception of gender can undo one's personhood undermining the capacity to preserve in a livable life. Other times, the experience of a normative restriction becoming undone can undo a prior conception of which one is only to inaugurate a relatively newer one that has greater livability as its aim.

If gender is a kind of doing, an incessant activity performed, in part, without one knows and without one willing, it is not for automatic or mechanical. Butler further writes:

Gender is a practice of improvisation within a scene of constraint. Moreover, one does not 'do' one's gender alone. One is always 'doing' with or for another even if the other is only imaginary. But the terms that make up one's own gender are from the start, outside oneself, beyond oneself in a sociality that has no single author. (1)

What does gender want? To speak in this way may seem strange, but it becomes less, so when we realize that the social norms that constitute our existence carry desires that do not originate with our individual personhood. This matter is made more complex by the fact that the viability of our individual personhood is fundamentally dependent on these social norms.

Butler states the Hegelian tradition links desire with recognition, claiming that desire is always a desire for recognition and that it is only through the experience of recognition that any of us become constituted as socially viable beings. That view has its allure and its truth, but it also misses a couple of important points. The terms by which we are recognized as human are socially articulated and changeable. And sometimes the very terms that confer 'humanness' on some individuals are those that deprive certain other individual of the possibility of achieving that status producing a differential between the human and the less than human. The human is understood differentially depending on its race, the legibility of that race, its morphology, the recognizability of that morphology, its sex, the perceptual verifiability of that of that sex, its ethnicity, the categorical understanding of that ethnicity. Certain human are recognized as less human and that of qualified recognition does not lead to a viable life. Certain humans are not recognized as human at all. And that leads to yet another order of unlivable life. Butler states:

If parts of what desire wants are to gain recognition, then gender, insofar as it is animated by desire, will want recognition as well. But if the schemes of recognition that are available to us are those that 'undo' the person by withholding recognition, then recognition becomes a site of power by which human is differentially produced. (2)

This means that to the extent that desire implicated in social norms, it is bound up with the question of power and with the problem of who qualifies as the recognizably human who does not. If 'I' am certain gender, will 'I' still be regarded as part of the human? Will the human expand to include me in its reach? If 'I' desire in certain ways will 'I' be able to live? Will there be a place for 'my' life, and will it be recognizable to the others upon whom 'I' depend for social existence? If 'I' have no desire to be recognized within a certain set of norms, then it follows that 'my' sense of survival depends upon escaping the clutch of those norms by which recognition is conferred. It may well be that 'my' sense of social belonging is impaired by the distance 'I' take, but surely that estrangement is preferable to gaining a sense of intelligibility by virtue of norms that will only do me in from another direction. Indeed, the capacity to develop a critical relation to those norms presupposes a distance from them, an ability to suspend or defer the need for them, even as there is a desire for norms that might, let one live. If 'I' am someone who cannot be without doing them the conditions of 'my' doing are, in part the conditions of 'my' existence. If 'my' doing is dependent on what is done to me or, rather the ways in which 'I' am done by norms, then the possibility of 'my' persistence as an depends upon 'my' being able to do something with what is done with me. If 'I' have any agency it is opened up by the fact that 'I' am constituted by a social world 'I' never chose.

As a result, the that 'I' am finds itself that at once constituted by norms and dependent on them but also endeavors to live in ways that maintain a critical and transformative relation to them Butler's further opines:

This is not easy, because the become to a certain extent unknowable, threatened with unviability with becoming undone altogether, when it

no longer incorporates the norm in such a way that makes this fully recognizable. There is a certain departure from the human that takes place in order to start the process of remaking the human. 'I' may feel that without some recognizability 'I' cannot live. But 'I' may also feel that the terms by which 'I' am recognized make life unlivable. (3)

This is the junctures from which critique emerges where critique is understood as an interrogation of the terms by which life is constrained in order to open up the possibility of different modes of living in order word not to celebrate difference as such but to establish more inclusive conditions for sheltering and maintaining life that resist models of assimilation.

Consider the intersex opposition to the widespread practice of performing coercive surgery on infants and children with sexually indeterminate or hermaphroditic anatomy in the name of normalizing these bodies. This movement offers a critical perspective on the version of the 'human' that requires ideal morphologies and the constraining of bodily norms. Butler's idea has been influenced by the New Gender Politics about the issues of intersex and transex. She says:

The intersex community is resistance to coercive surgery moreover calls for an understanding that infants with intersexual conditions are part of the continuum of human morphology and ought to be treated with the presumption that their lives are and will be not only livable but also occasions for flourishing. The norms that govern idealized human anatomy thus work to produce a differential sense of who is human and who is not, which lives are livable and which are not. (4)



The recent efforts to promote lesbian and gay marriage also promote a norm that threatens to render illegitimate and abject those sexual arrangements that do not comply with the marriage norm, in either its existing or its revisable form.

At the same time, the homophobic objection to lesbian and gay marriage expands out through the culture to affect all queer lives. One critical question these becomes how does one opposes the homophobia without embracing the marriage norm as the exclusive or most highly valued social arrangement for queer sexual lives? Similarly, efforts to establish bonds of kinship that are not based on a marriage tie become nearly illegible and unviable into 'family' kinship in communities of sexual minorities are threatened with becoming unrecognizable and unviable as long as the marriage bond is the exclusive way in which both sexuality and kinship are organized. A critical relation to this norm involves disarticulating those rights and obligation currently attendant upon marriage so that marriage might remain a symbolic exercise for those who choose to engage in it, but the rights and obligations of kinship may take any number of other forms. What recognition of sexual norms would be necessary for those who live sexually and affectively outside the marriage bond or in kin relations to the side of marriage either to be legally and culturally recognized for the endurance and importance of their intimacies or, equally important, to be free of the need for recognition of this kind? Butler further explains about transgender he says:

Transgender refers to those person, who cross-identify or who live as another gender, but who may or may not have undergone hormonal treatments or sex reassignment operations. Among transsexual and transgender persons, there are those which identify as men (if female to male) or women (if male to female), and yet others who, with or

without surgery, with or without transwomen each of those social practices carries distinct social burdens and promises. (6)

Colloquially 'transgender' can apply to the entire range of these positions as well. Transgendered and transsexual people are subjected to pathologization and violence that is once again heightened in the case of transpersons from communities of color. The harassment suffered by those who are 'read' as Trans or discovered to be Trans cannot be underestimated.

Although intersex and transsex sometimes seem to be movements at odds with one another, the first opposing unwanted surgery, the second sometimes calling for elective surgery it is most important to see that both challenge the principle that a natural dimorphism should be established or maintained at all costs. Intersex activist's work to rectify the erroneous assumption that everybody has an inborn 'truth' of sex those medical professionals can discern and bring to light on their own. To the extent that the intersex movement maintains that gender ought to be established through assignment or choice, but non-coercively it shares a premise with transgendered and transsexual activism. The latter opposes forms of unwanted coercive gender assignment; and in this sense calls for greater, claim of autonomy a situation that parallels, intersex claims as well. If queer theory is understood by definition to oppose assignment, then the tension seems strong indeed.

Similarly, the transsexual desire to become a man or a woman is not to be dismissed as a simple desire to conform to established identity categories. As Kate Born Stein in her points out it can be a desire for transformation itself, a pursuit of identity as a transformative activity? But even if there are, in each of these cases desire for stable identity at work, it seems crucial to realize that a livable life does require various degrees of stability. In the same way that a life for which no categories

of recognition exist is not a livable life, so a life for which those categories constitute unlivable constraint is not an acceptable option. The task of all of these movements seems to be about distinguishing among the norms and conventions that permit people to breathe, to desire, to love and to live, and those norms and conventions that restrict or eviscerate the condition of life itself. Sometimes norms function both ways at once, and sometimes they function one way for a given group and another way for another group. What is most important is to cease legislating for all lives what is livable only for some, and similarly to refrain from proscribing for all lives what is unlivable only for some. The differences in position and desire set the limits to universality as an ethical reflex. The critique of gender norms must be situated within the context of lives as they are lived and must be guided by the question of what maximizes the possibilities for a livable life, what minimizes the possibility of unbearable life or, indeed, social or literal death.

Traditional concept of gender is related with performance. The performativity of gender revolves around the ‘metalepsis’, the way in which the anticipation of a gendered essence produces that which it posits as outside itself. Secondly, performativity is not a singular act, but a repetition and a ritual, which achieves its effects through its naturalization in the context of a body, understood, in part, as a culturally sustained temporal duration. The view that gender is performativity sought to show that what we take to be an internal essence of gender is manufactured through a sustained set of acts, posited through the gendered stylization of the body. In this way it showed that what we take to be an internal feature of ourselves is one that we anticipate and produce through certain bodily acts, at an extreme a hallucinatory effect of naturalized gestures. Butler elaborates this idea in the first chapter of *Gender Trouble*, says:

Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being. A political genealogy of gender ontologies, if it is successful, will deconstruct the substantive appearance of gender into its constitutive acts and locate and account for those acts within the compulsory frames set by the various forces that police the social appearance of gender. (33)

Gender is not just a process, but it is a particular type of process, ‘a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame’ as Butler puts it. Gender ought not to be construed as a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts follow: rather, gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylized repetition of acts. The effect of gender is produce through the stylization of the body and, hence, must be understood as the mundane way in which bodily gestures, movement, and styles of various kinds constitute the illusion of an abiding gendered self.

Gender reality is created through sustained social performances means that the very notions of an essential sex and a true or abiding masculinity or femininity are also constituted as part of the strategy that conceals gender’s performativity character and the performativity possibilities for proliferating gender configurations outside the restricting frames of masculinity domination and compulsory heterosexuality.

Butler’s reformulates notion of drag as a subversive tactic and “This perpetual displacement constitutes a fluidity of identity that suggests openness to revivification and recontextualization; parody proliferation deprives hegemonic culture and its critics of the claims to naturalized or essentialist gender identities” (176). Butler claims,

“indeed, the parody is of the very notion of an original[...], so gender parody reveals that the original identity after which gender fashions itself as an imitation without an imitation” (175). Butler argues that the recitation of heterosexual constructs in non-heterosexual frames can bring to light the constructed status of the heterosexual.

Extending Butler’s analysis of drag, Purvis says that “Performances associated with drag illustrate how gender is open to imitation” (422). Rather than being a connotative or substantial expression of who or what one is, drag helps to highlight the ways in which gender can also be figured in terms of stylized repetitions of acts for which there is no copy or origin. Drag is not to be understood as a secondary imitation or enactment of a prior, original gender, rather heterosexuality is itself part of a repeated effort to imitate its own society constructed idealizations.

Butler’s contention is that gender does not axiomatically proceed from sex. She reads Beauvoir’s dictum “one is not born a woman, but rather, becomes one” critically, which for Butler means that Beauvoir was willing to affirm that one is born with a sex, as a sex sexed; being sexed and being human are coextensive and simultaneous, sex is an analytic attribute of the human; there is no human who is not sexed; sex qualifies the human as a necessary attribute. Butler debates:

But sex does not cause gender; and gender cannot be understood to reflect or express sex; indeed, for Beauvoir, sex is immutably factive, but gender acquired, and where as sex cannot be changed- or so she thought –gender is the variable construction of sex, the myriad and open possibilities of cultural meanings occasioned by sexed body [...] if gender is not tied to sex, either causally or expressively, then gender is a kind of action that can potentially perforate beyond the binary limits imposed by binary of sex.(143)

Butler does not believe in the causal line about a biological sex, the constituted bodies and the expression for of effect of both in the manifestation of sexual desire through sexual practice. However, Butler revisits that notion by saying that the causal line is established because of the performative effect of gender. She contends, “The truth of sex is produced through the regulatory practices that generate coherent identities through the matrix of coherent gender norms” (23). The truth of stable sex with its passive surface to be written by gender norm becomes a fiction as soon as sex is realized as a performativity aspect of sex and gender. Butler argues. Human identities and subjectivities cannot assume fixed, coherent and essential entities rather as effect of coherent subjects produce through certain mechanisms of cultural norms. Questioning the previous theories of subject which argued that an individual get its identity as it goes through the social norms. Gender performativity theory as forwarded by butler argues that the subject gets its identity not because it undergoes through norms but because the norms provide the semblance of identity acting through a subject. In other words, it is not that a subject goes on to accept an identity by performing a gender rather the very act of imitating the previous performance produce a gender.

Drawing the history of sex and sexuality, Michel Foucault, in *The History of Sexuality* (1978), links sex and sexuality in the realm of power and discourse. Foucault shows that prior understanding of sex (insularity psychoanalysis and Marxist) has depended heavily on what he calls repressive hypothesis. Repressive hypothesis says that our entire culture represses sexual desires by ignoring sex or by silencing sex through various discourses that conceal the sexuality. According to repressive hypothesis the history of sexuality could only be that of him “negative relation” between power and sex the, “cycle of prohibition” (82). Counter to

repressive theory, Foucault argues that modern societies created more discourse on sexuality. Responding to this paradox Foucault writes:

There was a steady proliferation of discourses concerned with sex-specific discourses, different from one another both by their form the eighteenth century onward [...] but more important was the multiplication of discourses concerning sex in the field of exercise of power itself [...] through explicit articulation and endlessly accumulated detail (18).

Instead of envisioning “power” as something exercised prohibitively from the top of the society downward against sexuality. Foucault describes both sexuality and power as relation that are operating circularly and affecting each other. He further says that the entire history of knowledge is not separate realm of sexuality rather it “constructs that sexuality” (qtd in Sedgwick, *Gender Criticism* 279). For him “power is polyvalent” (104) and the tactical polyvalence of discourse can be understood by examining how Foucault charts the identity of the homosexual subject in the 19<sup>th</sup> century examining how Foucault charts the identity of the homosexual subject in the polyvalent nature of discourses means. According to Foucault, the discourses also produce the terms of own resistance and deconstruction. Nineteenth century sexology names, labels and pathologies the homosexuals at the same time, it creates a space for a counter-discourse.

Foucault’s concern in *The History of Sexuality* is with the textual construction of identity. Without discourse which constructs identity, then, it seems that there is no agency. But the identity, which discourse supplies, is constrained by it.

Foucault proceeds to document how the versions of sexual identity which came to dominate western cultures at the end of the nineteenth century was grounded in a discourse which privileged heterosexual object choice. But Foucault famously describes how, during the nineteenth century, non- heterosexual expression of desire- same-sex sex sexual acts- persisted and how the homosexuals and not the heterosexual became a personage [...] a type of life a life form possessing an indiscreet anatomy and possibly a mysterious physiology By stressing the ways in which sexuality is written in or on the body, and in showing how homosexual is forced into cultural (in) visibility, Foucault claims Purvis begins to dismantle that se and discourses (literary, legal and religious which make the sexual into something that is also textual.

By writing the history of sexuality from the viewpoint of discourse, Foucault denaturalizes heteronormative sexuality and opens the way to multiple sexualities. His formulation questions the neatly unified sexual field, so *The History of Sexuality* has been assertive unprecedently in institutionalizing the movement of gay and lesbian criticism. Foucault believes that if regular sexuality happened to be questioned, it was through a reflux movement, originating in these peripheral sexualities. Commenting on the book Sedgwick says that “the book is most famous and agenda setting formulation about the history of individuals” (281).

Foucault argues that the univocal construct of “sex” (one is one sex and therefore not the other) is (a) produced in the service of social regulation and control and (b) conceals and artificially unifies a variety of disparate and unrelated sexual functions and then (c) postures within discourse as a cause, an interior essence which both produces and renders intelligible all manners of sensation, pleasure, and desire as sex specific. In other words, bodily pleasures not merely causally reducible to this



ostensibly sex-specific essence, but they become readily interpretable as manifestation or sign of this “sex”. He asserts:

The notion of sex made it possible to group together in an artificial unity, anatomical element, biological functions, conducts, sensations, and pleasures, and it enabled one to make use of this fictitious unity as a causal principle, an omnipresent meaning: sex was thus able to function as unique signifier and as a universal signified. (154)

By presenting itself in a unitary fashion, it was able to mark the line of contact between knowledge of human sexuality and the biological sciences of reproductions making it quasi-scientificity. By virtue of this quasi-scientificity some of the contents of biology and physiology were able to serve as a principle of normality for human sexuality (155). Foucault further adds that it is through [...] that each individual has to pass in order to have access to his intelligibility, to the whole of his body to his identity (156). So for Foucault, we must not place sex on the side of reality, and sexuality on that of confused ideas and illusions, but “Sexuality is a very real historical formation; it is what gave rise to the notion of sex, as a speculative element necessary to its operation (157).

Foucault began to consider question of transgression and resistance in the face of the technologies of punishment and sexual classification in the first volume of his book *History of Sexuality*. One element of this critical phase, therefore, involves an attention to subjugated or marginal, knowledge, especially those which have been disqualified, taken less than seriously or deemed inadequate by official histories. Certainly they are ranked beneath science. They are the discourse of the madman, the patient, the delinquent, the pervert and other person who, in their respective time held knowledge about themselves which diverged from established categories. Subjugated

persons perform an act of resistance to the usual treatment of them by the various sciences. Foucault writes:-

A whole set of knowledge that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated naïve knowledge, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity... it's through the reappearance of this knowledge, of these local popular knowledge these disqualified knowledge that criticism performs its work.(1980a-81-2)

Yet this way of working (repeating or revealing) also shows how official knowledge (particularly the social sciences) work as instruments of normalization continually attempting to manoeuvre populations into correct and functional, form of thinking and acting. Therefore Foucault also has an interest in examining the methods, practices and techniques by which official discourse go about this process of normalization and, in the process occlude forms of knowledge which are different from them by dividing the normal persons from the pathological specimen and so on.

One way in which happens is when science transforms non scientific discourse into data mere objects for analysis and so produces an implicit (or even quite explicit) hierarchy of knowledge. So, for example, medicine makes diagnoses by using “symptoms” available from the data. And the data, in this case comprise the bodies of patients along with those (inferior) forms of knowledge which patients have about their bodies. What's to count as truth for example the truth about a person's sexuality or health is therefore always the effect of specific kinds of techniques the very kinds of institutional and discursive practices which Foucault analyses in *Madness and Civilization* and *The Birth of the Clinic*. But by way of contrast with these earlier studies, Foucault begins to ask questions of the value of these techniques. For

example, in his case study of a nineteenth century hermaphrodite, Herculine Barbin, Foucault begins by asking: “do we truly need a true sex”? He goes on to investigate how the medical and psychiatric sciences (among other discourses) have been preoccupied with assigning a single sex to all persons, and the consequent difficulties they have faced with cases of hermaphroditism. He is writing as much about our current prejudices and schemes of thought vis-a vis essential and unitary sexual identities as he is about the medical, legal, religious and psychiatric practices of the nineteenth century.

The idea that one must indeed finally have a true sex is far from being completely dispelled. Whatever the opinion of biologist on this point, the idea that there exist complex, obscure and essential relationship between sex and truth is to be found not only in psychiatry, psychoanalyses and psychology, but also in current opinion. For Foucault, no scientific discourse-whatever its claims can represent the truth of crime madness, sexuality and so on. It can only treat them, contain them somehow, with in the “sovereign” discourse of science.

In *The History of Sexuality* Foucault argues that sexuality, is a concept which came into being during the development of biopower; it came to be seen as the very essence of the individual human being and the core of personal identity. Foucault examines the social construction of the body and suggests that the role of sexuality is not a site of repression but rather one of the most powerful technologies for the production of particular kinds of bodies. In the eighteenth, Foucault argues, French administrators gradually began to institute procedures of intervention in the sexual life of the population. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, a major shift had occurred, a recasting of discourse about sexuality into medical terms. Through the mediation of doctors psychiatrists and others to whom one confessed one is private

thoughts and practices it was possible to know the secrets of one's body and mind,

Foucault writes:

The confession has spread its effects far and wide. It plays a part in justice, medicine, education, family relationship and love relations, in the most ordinary affairs of everyday life, and in the most solemn rites; one confesses one's crimes one's sins one's thought and desire, one's illnesses and troubles. One goes about telling, with the greatest precision, whatever is most difficult to tell. One confesses in public and private, to one's parents, one's educators, one's doctor, to those one loves one admits to oneself, in pleasure and pain, things it would be impossible to tell to anyone else, the things people write books about.... western man has become a confessing animal (1979a:59)

Foucault points out that one confesses to a real or imaginary partner who represents not just the other party of a dialogue but the authority who requires the confession prescribes and appreciates it, and intervenes in order to judge, punish, forgive, console and reconcile. The confessional is employed most readily within these institutions which bear on the knowledge of sexual practice. Psychoanalysis, psychiatry, medicine and pedagogy. The confessional allowed for the reconstruction and interpretation of acts and events and incited the development of various forms of commentary on them. The confessional can take the form of interrogations interviews, conversation, consultations or even autobiographical narratives. Biopower is Foucault's term for the institutional control of the body in the modern state, through method, of categorization, measurement, definition and validation. It includes practices in all institutionalized areas of life (including education, health, work, reproduction, law and order) which thereby generate specific kinds of knowledge about the body. And

so produce specific kinds of bodies. In other words, bipower could not be classified as a scale of normalization and pathologisation of the mysterious sexual instinct.

Idea of Bildungsroman and coming of age are useful in analyzing sexual and gender identities. Bildungsroman is closely affiliated with the idea of *Coming of Age* novel that are designated as autobiography or memoir Kenneth Millard in his book *Coming of Age in Contemporary American fiction* writes:

An autobiography is a story of the self that is closely related to the Bildungsroman in many important formal and thematic ways. The protagonist of an autobiography commonly starts out as a novice, encounters as a more mature adult challenges of adversity and ends his or her story as a more mature adult character as a result of their experience. (P3V.Millard)

The autobiography is a form of Bildungsroman. Bildungsroman is closely affiliated with the idea of coming of age novel. The expression coming of age is used to mean “to reach full legal status” and it is commonly seen in studies of the Bildungsroman. This is a term which is widely used in anthropology for example in Margaret Mead’s *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), and which had acquired a currency in literary studies by the time of Maryorie Garber’s *Coming of Age in Shakespeare* (1981). The term also carries an imprecision and a cultural relativity that needs to be taken into account. When exactly does a character come of age and what specific experiences are deemed to be integral to it. Formative experiences can occur at any age, but in terms of literary genre the expression coming of age is conventionally used of adolescence. Flock is fourteen, hold in is sixteen. Barbing White, for example, defines her study of what she terms the female novel of adolescence in term of the parameters of age; this is a genre which developmental forms like the Bildungsroman

and the initiation story, has to be defined in terms of the age of the protagonist. Accordingly 'I' have as a general rule restricted 'my' discussion to fiction with major characters between twelve and nineteen year olds there is when coming of age is deemed to have occurred, and full legal adult status varies between cultures, especially in relation to such cultural markets as a alcohol, sexual consent, driving license, and marriage. The specific age of a fictional character is therefore perhaps not the best guide to that theological process which is the proper focus of the coming of age narrative.

Overall, 'my' study of Butler's theory of 'undoing gender', 'performativity' theory and Foucault's notion of sexuality and gender will be applied to analyze the *Middlesex*. Of course there is no one to one correspondence between the theoretical concept to be used in the analysis and 'my' application as such. Nevertheless, understanding of the principal will help to analyze the novel. 'I' am trying to theorize 'my' analysis with some of the key concept of Foucault's notion the discourse of sexuality such as 'sex' and 'sexual identity' as discursive construct and some key point of gender performativity theory by Judith Butlers like her concept of performativity aspect of identity. Main focuses will be Butlers' theory undoing gender for this research. A key concept in undoing gender is to affirm the instability and sex identities. Gender is not natural; it can be endeavor from my effort. Rather than assuming that identities are self evident and fixed as previous theorist do, Butlers' work traces the process by which identity is constructed? Sex is not a pure physical category. What bodily signals and functions we define as male or female come already entangled in our ideas about gender. Butlers puts the issue more generally; the body or the embodiment of the subject is to understood as neither biological nor a sociological category but rather as a process of construction which can be acquire or

reconstruct by our effort. On the other words undoing in Butler's term reflects to the constraints of the binary system that defines sex and gender. More over the theory of Bildungsroman will be also helpful to analyzed *Middlesex*.

### III. Undoing Gender in *Middlesex*

Jeffrey Eugenide's novel *Middlesex* focuses on the issue of gender trouble of the forty one year old, hermaphrodite Calliope Stephanie. It presents her multigenerational Greek- American family and her struggle to establish a clear sense of self. After opening with the story of her grandparents, Desdemona and Lefty, another subsequent union, Cal traces the damaged gene that brother and sister passed down through the generation to Cal, which cause her gender irregularity. Cal weaves together the story of her grandparents and their descendents with her own; comparing the problems they faced in their efforts to reconcile their Greek heritage with their adopted U S culture.

Cal too attempts to find balance between her female and male halves. The novel opens with the note of two birth dates:

I was born twice: first as a baby girl, on a remarkably Smogless Detroit day in January of 1960; and then again, as a teenager boy, in an emergency room near Petoskey, Michigan, in august of 1974. Specialized readers may have come across me in Dr. Peter Luce's study, "Gender Identity in 5- Alpha- Reeducate Pseudo hermaphrodites" published in the journal of pediatric Endocrinology in 1975. Or maybe you've seen my photograph in chapter sixteen of the now sadly outdated Genetics and Heredity that is me, standing naked beside a height chart with a black box covering my eyes.(1)

These lines show her dual birth, when Cal was born as a baby girl in Detroit in 1960 and the second when she was born again as a teenage boy in a hospital in Michigan in 1974. She notes that she was written up in gender study in 1974 and discussed in gender study in 1974 and discussed in a medical journal.



Despite her dual birth or ambivalence in her gender identities she becomes successful to lead her life happily. Cal admits; “Plato said that the original human being was a hermaphrodite. Did you know that the original person was two halves, one male one female? Then these got separated that why everybody’s always searching for their other half except for us. We have got both halves already”. (220)

Cal begins to feel less alone in the world when she comes to know that the original’ person was two halves, one male, and one female. Hermaphrodite has both halves so they don’t need to search for other halves as heterosexual persons do. When Cal discovers that she is hermaphrodite she also finds herself caught between two worlds. Her position, however, is more complex and disturbing, but she is also able to recognize her uniqueness as well as the universality of her experience, as she notes:

After I returned from San Francisco and started living as a male, my family found that, contrary to popular opinion, gender was not all that import. My change from girl to boy was far less dramatic then the distance anybody travels from infancy to adulthood. In most ways I remained the person I’d always been. Even now, though I live as a man, I remain in essential ways Tessie’s daughter. (234)

Cal is able to gain a measure of acceptance from her family who discovers gender was not all that important. Cal eventually comes to the realization that she has learned to strike a balance between her two selves. She dismantles the very concepts such as gender is pure, monolithic, single, fix and determinate.

Gender is not all that important rather it can be endeavored by our efforts. It is a process, which has neither origin nor end so that it’s something that we ‘do’ rather than ‘are’. This understanding allows her to trust Julie and thus open herself to the possibility that she can now stop running from herself and establish all “last stop”

finally able to accept her difference as well as her connection to her world . She is able to resolve all of the tension involved in the assimilation process by challenging traditional concept of society which considers gender as natural and inborn. Rather than assuming gender as natural or inborn as it was previously taken to be she trace the process by which identity is constructed within society, for example, through Callie becomes Cal when she tells her mother and father (in writing) that she is a boy, she is a boy only because she decides to reject her rearing and selectively interpret her ambiguous physiognomy. She cuts her hair, walks like a boy, and names herself with a boy's name. In the moment that she declares herself male, she begins the process of constructing her gender identities through her own effort by challenging the traditional concept such as gender is pure, monolithic, single, natural, and inborn and fix.

Recognition and identification became central as Eugenides tests the practicality of the middle in the psychosexual narrative of *Middlesex*. Both process address how a subject is situated relative to the power of to produce a normative effectively a human position in social life. In *Undoing Gender* Butler amplifies the Hegelian notion that desire 'is always a desire for recognition and that it is only through the experience of recognition that any of us becomes constituted as socially, viable beings. As Callie enters puberty, she despairs about the difference between her body and the norm her body fails to develop in such a way that she can't be recognized as female. In particulars, she lacks the two iconic marks of the adolescent girl. Neither Cal's breast develops nor has she her period.

She speculates about her own body and identity as follow:

For despite the Dionysian revelry that had broken out in my body (in my throbbing teeth, in the wild abandon of my nose), not everything

about me had changed. A year and a half after Carol Horning came to school with brand-new breast, I was still without any. The brassiere I'd finally wheedled out of Tessie was still, like the higher physics, of only theoretical use. No breasts. No period, either [...] from time to time my nipples became sore. Gingerly touching them i felt a pebble beneath the pink, tender flesh. I always thought that this was the start of something. I thought I was budding. But time after time the swelling and soreness went away, and nothing came of it. (132)

Callie has a relatively normal girlhood, but as an adolescent she becomes troubled by her failure to develop physically or to menstruate. She experiences the feelings of ethnic displacement, especially when her breast remains flat. All the girl of her age came to school with brand new breast but she was still without any. Her mother, Tessie is worried about her because neither her breast has developed nor she has menstruated. The implicit claim here is that the norm is femininity and she has failed to live up to that norm due to her failure to develop physically or to menstruate.

Callie's desire for recognition partakes entirely of the binary heterosexual system of identification according to which normative sexual organs express one of two possible gender categories the system has no room for interstitial sexual bodes or subjectivities Callie wants to be a girl and to be able to produces , the evidence for a girl's 'I' while young she can ignore the body for which she has no comparison or understanding and instead can have recourse to the oppositional stereotypes that code her gender identity as female. Comparing herself to her brother, for example, she can comfort herself; "in doling out our respective gifts God had given me all the important ones. Mathematical aptitude: to chapter Eleven. Verbal aptitude: to me. Fix-it

handiness: to Chapter Eleven. Imagination: to me. Musical talent: to Chapter Eleven.

Looks: to me". (124)

But at puberty, the anxiety she express at her body's distance form the norm is the anxiety of abjection.

Only Calliope, in the second row, is motionless, her desk stalled somehow, so that she's the only one who takes in the true extent of the metamorphoses around her [...] and whom can she ask? Still pretty, Calliope soon finds herself the shortest girl in the room. She drops her eraser. No boy brings it back. In the Christmas pageant she is cast not as Mary as in past year but as an elf .....But there's still hope, isn't there? .... because the desks are flying, day after day; arranged in their squadron, the students bank and roar through time, so that Callie looks up from her ink-stained paper one afternoon and sees it is spring, flowers budding, forsythia in bloom, elms greenening; at recess girls and boys hold hands, kissing sometimes behind trees, and Calliope feels gyped, cheated.(128)

When Callie has reached at puberty her situation becomes more complicated by her genetic irregularities. Initially, her maturation follows a familiar path. Her girlhood beauty makes her feel accepted by her peers. However, her lack of development during puberty makes her worry about being left behind left-out, which in turn makes her feel gyped and cheated. She feels like an outcast in school, especially when her features turn more ethnic, and she does not begin to develop as the other girls do. Callie's awareness of the physical difference that places her in a marginalize position and her ethnic difference from the girls which define the school's hierarchy. Calliope

feels gypped and cheated when no one of her boy friend responds her. Even in the Christmas pageant she is cast not as Mary as in past years but an elf.

The tyranny of the binaries limits the conceptual categories according to which Cal can narrate the transitional phase of puberty. It is not only sense of ambivalent sexual materiality that influences Callie's self image but rather her failure to match the 'right' side of the opposition that is femaleness, the pole to which she has been habituated by upbringing. Callie notes:

At this early stage, before my male secondary characteristics had manifested themselves, before there were whisper about me in the halls and girls thought twice about letting their heads in my lap- in seventh grade, when my hair was glossy instead of frizzy, my cheeks still smooth, my muscles undeveloped, and yet, invisibly but unmistakably, I began to exude some kind of masculinity, in the way I tossed up and caught my eraser, for instance, or in the way I dive-bombed people's desserts with my spoon, in the intensity of my knit brow or my eagerness to debate anyone on anything in class; when I was changeling, before I changed, I was quite popular at my new school.(136)

Cal says before her male self that the secondary characteristics had manifested themselves invisibly but unmistakably; she began to exude some kind of masculinity, in the way she tossed up and caught her eraser, or her eagerness to debate anyone on anything in class which forces her to remain in her school hierarchy.

Callie admits that she doesn't grow as other girls do but she develops as the boys do. Her face is no smoother as other girls have and her voice also changed she says; "I grew tall my voice matured but nothing seemed unnatural. My slight build,

my thin waist, the smallness of my head, hand, and feet raised no question in anybody's mind. Hair was beginning to appear in the required places my voice was beginning to change." (136)

Once she begins to signify the conventional codes of the male body tall, skinny, gangly, Callie suspects she inhabits an unlivable zone of social life. Eugenides juxtaposes Callie's awareness of the physical difference that places her in marginalized position. Ashamed in the locker room she refuses to be naked before the other girls. She waits until all of her friends leave her alone. Then only she undresses herself and ponders over her own body:

I waited until they left before I undressed. First I took off my knee socks. I reached under my athletic tunic and pulled down my shorts [...] the brassiere I had was size 30 AA. It had a tiny rosette between the cups and a label that read "young miss by Olga." (Tessie had urged me to get an old – fashioned training bra, but I wanted something that looked like what my friends had, and preferably padded.) I now fastened this item around my waist, clasps in front, and then rotated it into position. At that point, one sleeve at a time, I pulled my arms inside my jersey so that it set on my solder like a cloak working inside It, I slid the bra of my torso until could slip my arms through the armholes. When that was accomplished, I put my kilt on under my towel, removed my jersey, put on my blouse, and tossed the towel away. I wasn't naked for second. (134)

Callie being ashamed of her body, she never becomes naked before her friend. She waited to be undressed until her friend left she is ashamed of her body which makes her life unlivable she wants to hide her face to escape from the bitter reality.

Cal expresses insecurity and frustration when she is not able to grow according to the heterosexual norms. Her acknowledgements of her difference produce overwhelming bouts of shame. Her growing awareness of her difference brings tension between her and her parents.

A few final, frustrate strokes. Then, plaintively: “At least tie it back. Keep it out of your face.” What could I tell her? That was the whole point of having long hair? To keep it in my face? Maybe I didn’t look like Dorothy Hamill. Maybe I was even starting to bear a strong resemblance to our weeping willow trees. But there were virtues to my hair. It covered tinsel teeth. It covered satirical nose. It hid blemishes and, best of all, it hid me. Cut my hair? Never! I was still growing it out. My dream was to someday live inside it. (137)

Callie begins to hide behind a huge mass of hair to erase the visibility of her body.

Callie suspects she inhabits an unlivable zone of social life so her dream was to someday live inside her hair to escape from bitter reality of her life which makes her failure to develop the right side of the opposition that- is femaleness the pole which she has been habituated by rearing.

In Callie’s anxiously self-effacing behavior Eugenides points out how social recognition of the sex body is intimately related to the visual, in those days, writes Cal, “The world was always growing eyes” (179). The visual has the demonstrated power to position a subject as object. The hermaphrodite presents an unusual case in this regard. Much of the apparent physical evidence male/female by polarity of sex that normally display itself to public view is produced by interpretations-a jawing here, a way of walking-a perceptions of the secondary sexual characteristics. The irrefutable evidence of the intersexes body, however, lies in the genitals and is thus in

the nature of secret, hidden from view. The norms do not prepare perceivers to recognize what falls out side of them. Both Callie's as pediatrician and her family fail to see her non normative genitalia even when they look right at her, at her baptism, no one thinks enough about the impossible art of her wayward urine to (wonder) about the engineering involved. When Callie's brother manipulates her, he becomes surprised to she sister's body which is quite different from another girl. More over Cal does not look like a girl but something in between so he ask his sister to pull down her under paint and left her skirt to examine her gender. Cal admits; "my underpants and lifted my skirt. (If I showed him, he wouldn't tell.) Fascinated as he was, he stayed at a distance. His Adam's apple rose and fell. He looked amazed and frightened. He didn't have much to compare me to, but what he saw didn't misinform either: pink folds, a cleft." (125)When Callie's brother manipulates her at eight into showing her genitals, he remains in the dark, since what he saw didn't misinform him either: pink folds, a cleft.

Jerome, the Object's brother, is the first boy whom Cal has sex. He seems to want to have a relationship with Cal, but Cal rebuffs him due to her neutral body. Her body does not develop as her friend's body does. So while having sex with Jerome, she is afraid that Jerome will bring out all her secrets which make her insecure, and frustrate. She thinks that her reality will make her aloof from her friend and she will be alone in the world. But nothing Jerome has noticed about her. She further says:

It was all over now. There was nothing I could do. Jerome would tell Rex. Rex would tell the Object. I was waiting for Jerome to jump up and run. I felt panicked and, at the same time, strangely calm. As I contemplated my life on the run I peeked over the edge of the cot to



see what Jerome was doing. He was flat on his back, eyes closed. And he was smiling to himself. (170)

Even during her brief sexual encounter with the Obscure Object's brother, Jerome he fails to notice her "crocus" the small phallic that has, during puberty blossomed in the place of the clitoris.

Callie can assumed the position of an intact subject only insofar as her body remain disguised to as a fluid biological identity can only be permitted as long as it remain a discreet invisibility-as a hormonal or chromosomal possibility that can't be directly seen. Any exposure of her interstitial anatomy would threaten Callie's hold a sexual category. When there is intimate relationship develops between Object and she, Object once asked Cal that she was never naked before her. Callie becomes speechless although she knows that Object does not have any intention to insult her. Callie says:

She looks at the photograph and says, 'you're never naked, either.'

I am frozen, speechless.

"Do you have some kind of complex?"

"No, I didn't have a complex."

"What are you afraid of, then?"

"I'm not afraid."(157)

As her friendship with Obscure Object becomes more intimate, Callie is made speechless with fear when the Object casually points out "you never naked". Once and erotic relationship develop between them which Callie can handle with the tools of gender identification at hand, understand as lesbian. It takes place undercover of the dark, unacknowledged and undescribe in the fugue state of adolescence, while the Object either pretends to be or actually nearly unconscious.

Even once the Object becomes as active in their couplings as Callie, Callie's crocus the genital part that place her between the norm for the biological female and the biological male remain unseen, as she says:

Over the course of ten minutes I slid nearer and nearer to her. Finally I felt the heat of her body along my entire length. We were still not touching, only radiating against each other. She was breathing deeply. So was i. we breathed together. Finally, gathering courage, I flung my arm across her waist. After another long while I plunged ahead. I took hold of her T-shirt and lifted it up. I gazed at her naked belly for a long while and, finally, with a kind of woefulness, bowed my head. I bowed my head to the god of desperate longing. I kissed the Object's belly and then slowly, gathering confidence, worked my way up. I reached down and touched her hips. I hooked my fingers in the waistband of her underpants. I began to slip them off. Just then, the Object lifted her hips, very slightly, to make it easier for me. This was her only contribution. (173)

The object was eager for Callie's crocus even while ostensibly remaining unconscious. The object lifted her hips very slightly to make it easier for Callie. If the object does not lift her hips up, Callie need not be constituted as abject. Assuming a sex by way of being recognized in the gaze of the other, Callie escapes the fixity of a process of identification that excludes in between from viability. The middle is by implication impossible with.

The language of Cal's narrating consciousness represents that impossibility with in the economy of desire. During the crucial scene when Callie is coped and penetrated by Jerome at the hunting cabin. In an archetypal triangulation of desire,

Jerome desire Callie who desires the object, who's engaging in sex with Rex Reese. Cal's unique configuration and his mixed experience are unusual, but his feelings aren't:

Passing by the bourbon bottles, I hovered over the other cot, looking down at the Object. And then, because I suddenly know that I could, I slipped into the body of Rex Reese. I entered him like a god so that it was me, and not Rex, who kissed her. While at the same time I was also aware of Jerome's hands ranging over my body, the one I'd left on the other cot. He was on top of me, crushing one of my leg, so I moved it, spread my legs apart, he fell between them [...] Now Jerome was kissing my neck. ...while on the other cot Rex was meeting with no such resistance [...] I let him deal with the shirt buttons, but it was my hands that took hold of her bra, as if snapping up a window shade, let into the room the pale light of the Object's breasts. I saw them; I touched them; and since it wasn't me who did this but Rex Reese I didn't have to feel guilty, didn't have to ask myself if I was having unnatural desire. (169)

Above lines show an archetypal triangulation of desire, Jerome desires Callie who desires the object who is engaging in sex with Rex Reese. Callie's Object choice, as it were together with the duality of her hybridized body, causes her to perceive her experience as if she is in two places at once, in a position that is also tantamount to no place. Cal recounts that intensely focused her on the Object as she say she felt herself dissolving, turning to vapor. She slipped into the body of Rex Reese so that it was she and not Rex, who kissed her. This sustains the impression of Calli's double ness as she alternates in consciousness between the sexually male position with the Object

and the “female” position with Jerome. While Jerome, in the agony of arousal rubs against Callie, the “I” of Callie watches herself with him but also project into Rex’s position. Because Rex was more experience than her so she let him deal with the shirt buttons, but it was her hands that took hold of her bra let into the room the pale light of the Object’s breasts and since it wasn’t her who did this but Rex Reese. She didn’t have to feel guilty, didn’t have to ask herself if she was having unnatural desire. Callie shifts between positions rather than simultaneously inhabiting both. Implicitly, she experience the moment as an either or chose, which is also a hovering in a space of desire absent available subjectivity.

Eugenides emphasizes the lack of both the possibility at the critical moment of discovery when Jerome penetrates her, as Callie gasps from the pain; the language of the visual reenters the narrative, apparently to reify her into an abject position:

I opened my eyes; I looked up and saw Jerome looking down at me.

We gaped to each other and I knew he knew. Jerome knew what I was, as suddenly I did to for the first time clearly understood that I wasn’t a girl but something in between, I knew this from how natural it had felt to enter Rex Reese’s body how right it felt, and I knew this from, how right it felt, and I knew this from the shocked expression on Jerome’s face. (169)

She opened her eyes and saw Jerome looking down at her. This is when Callie discovers herself, a recognition that she then (mistakenly) displaces in shame toward Jerome. She says Jerome knew what she was as suddenly she did too that she wasn’t a girl but something in between. When the subject no longer incorporates the norm in such a way that makes fully recognizable then it becomes to a certain extent unknowable, threatened with invisibility.

One of the Cal's most affecting moments comes in her life, the moment of revelation, when the bewildered Calliope, armed with a few medical terms she has spotted in the notes of the specialist. She has seen the word monoester and, goes to the public library to look the meaning of monster. She proceeds through hypospadias to eunuch to, finally, hermaphrodite where she gets a heartbreaking last word on the subject. Hermaphrodite means one having the sex organs and many of the secondary sex characteristics of both male and female. Anything comprised of a combination of diverse or contradictory elements, which is synonym to monster. When she fined hermaphrodite similar to monster her identity's at stake. She is regarded less than human being.

There is a certain departure from the human that takes place in order to start the process of remaking the human. 'I' may feel that without some reconcilability 'I' cannot live But I may also feel that the terms by which 'I' am recognized make life unlivable Cal life becomes unlivable when she find a synonym for hermaphrodite to be monster:

There it was, monster, in black and white, in a battered dictionary in a great city library. A venerable, old book, the shape and size of a headstone, with yellowing pages that bore marks of the multitudes who had consulted them before me. (193)

The non-normative body of Cal threatens social regulation. At stake is not just a sexual category but also the position of the subject as human because, the "monstrous" by definition excludes the human 'I' at the cost of living in the borderlands of embodiment is a recognizable human subjectivity. The practical problem of living in some non existent middle is therefore male poignantly concrete by the hermaphroditic body. When she finds synonym for, hermaphrodite to be

monster, her subjectivity becomes to a certain extent unknowable threatened with unavailability.

Transvestism is a part of forming Cal's identity. It does not about want to be sexually different from what one is, but is rather an interrogation of how sexuality itself is determined and made manifest. In other words, trasvestism problematises the notion of what one is asking what that it refers to and who or what produces the system of sexual classification. In the twentieth century, transsexual was identified with sexual reassignment by surgical means and the technological -transformation of the body to align it with the subjects and or surgeon is notion of the how the subject desired sexual morphology looked. Dr. Luce sees Cal's indeterminate sex as a problem to be solved. So he wants surgical correction of her anatomy to make her a girl, corresponding with her gendered upbringing.

Luce looked disappointed. He had one arm of his glasses in his mouth, and was chewing on it. Possibly he was imagining what it would be like to discover a whole new population of carriers of the 5-alpha-reeducate mutation. He had to content himself with discovering me. He put his glasses back on. "The treatment I would recommend for your daughter is two fold: first, hormone injection. Second cosmetic surgery. The hormone treatments will instate breast development and enhance her female secondary sex characteristics. The surgery will make Callie look exactly like the girl she feels herself to be. In fact, she will be that girl. Her outside and inside will conform. She will look like a normal girl no body will be able to tell a thing. And then Callie can go on and enjoy her life." (192)

Here Cal is talking about the doctor who would remove all evidence of his maleness so that he could continue to live as a girl Dr. Luce wants to do Cal sexual reassignment by surgical means to help her to grow as a normal girl. Transvestism intrigues people of all sexualities because of its concern, with the borders or boundaries that maintain the sexes in a particular configuration. The fact that it is identified most strongly with gay or hermaphrodite community is, therefore not surprising, since that is the community whose boundaries provide the definition of heterosexuality. The transvertism is sometimes overtly and deliberately shocking because of the way it reveals one of the mechanisms by which the sexes are constructed-physical appearance and (self) presentation. The transsexual movement, which is internally various has called for right to surgical means by which sex might be transformed.

Intersex and transsex sometime seem to be movement at odds with one another, the first opposing unwanted surgery, the second some time calling for elective surgery. The intersexes community is resistance to coercive surgery. Despite Dr. Luce's recommendations the intersexes movement has been galvanized by the Cal case, able now to bring to public attention the brutality, coerciveness and lasting harm of the unwanted surgeries performed on intersexes infants. The point is to try to imagine a world in which individual with mixed genital attributes might be accepted and loved with out having to transforms them into a more socially coherent or normative version of gender. In this sense, the intersexes movement has sought to question why society maintains the ideal of gender dimorphism when a significant percentage of children are chromosomally various and a continuum exist between male and female that suggest the arbitrariness and falsity of the gender dimorphism as

a prerequisite of human development. Cal says when she secretly looks Dr. Luce's reports she came to know her intersexual position:

The patient is fourteen years old. She has lived as a female all her life. At birth, somatic appearance was of a penis so small as to appear to be a clitoris. The subject's XY karyotype was not discovered until puberty, when she began to virilize. The girl's parents at first refused to believe the doctor who delivered news and subsequently ask for to other opinions before coming to the Gender Identity Clinic and New York Hospital Clinic. (195)

During examination, undescended testes could be palpated. The "penis" was slightly hypospadiac, with the urethra opening on the underside. Cal has always sat to urinate like other girls. Blood test confirmed an XY chromosomal status. In addition, blood tests revealed that the subject was suffering from 5-alpha-reductase deficiency syndrome. An exploratory laparotomy was not performed. Cal's blood test confirmed an XY chromosomal status. She is male chromo sonically but Dr. Luce wants to fix her feminine aspect by surgical means. Cal has learned about phallic construction from transsexual context by Luce introductory data. So she feels from the clinic to resistance the rigidity of the Dr. by leaving notes to her parents.

Like a transsexual, Cal makes a conscious decision to change gender identity, but unlike the person who undergoes surgery and hormonal therapy to accomplish the change Cal chooses to forego the surgery the medical specialist has prescribed. That surgery would alter Cal's physiology to match the feminine gender assigned to "Callie" at birth. Cal's change is natural, as emergent adolescent hormones bring on male secondary sex characteristics. She flees and reinvents herself as Cal, partly to protect the capacity for sexual pleasure that, she learns, may be compromised by such



surgery. She revolts with the Dr Luce's idea of sex reassignment to make her normal and left a notes to her parents that she is not a girl but a boy:

Dear Mom and Dad,

I know you're only trying to do and what is best for me, but I don't think anyone knows for sure what's best. I love you and don't want to be a problem, so I've decided to go away. I know you'll say I'm not a problem, but I know I am. If you want to know why I'm doing this, you should ask Dr. Luce, who is big liar! I am not a girl. I'm a boy.

That's what I found out today. So I'm going where no one knows me.

Everyone in Grosse point will talk when they find out.

Sorry I took your money, Dad, but I promise to pay back someday, with interest. Please don't worry about me. I will be ALL RIGHT!

(197)

Cal rebels against the doctor who wants her to live according to the norm. She flees from the hospital to avoid the surgery by giving priority in her self-definition to the Croce's, penis and her chromosomal status, which has been medically identified as male. She protests against the rigid assumption of the medical establishment when she declares she is no more a girl but a boy in her notes.

Michel Foucault, in *The History of sexuality* links sex and sexuality in the realm of power and discourse counter to repressive theory; he argues that modern societies created more discourse on sexuality. He describes sexuality and power as relation that are operating circularly and affecting each other. The entire history of knowledge is not separate realm of sexuality rather it constructs that sexuality.

Dr.Luce who is in power and who posse's knowledge about sexuality tries to

construct Cal's sexuality. In the name of normality, Dr. Luce wants to remove all the evidence of maleness of Cal to construct her female sex.

I was beginning to understand something about normality. Normality wasn't normal. It couldn't be. If normality were normal everybody could leave it alone. They could sit back and let normality manifest itself. But people-and especially doctors- had doubts about normality. They weren't sure normality was up, to the job. And so they felt inclined to give it a boost. (200)

Here Cal is talking about the doctor who would remove all evidence of his maleness so that he could continue to live as a girl. The doctor sees Cal's indeterminate sexes a problem to be solved. The solution is not to help Cal think about his dilemma, to learn what it is like to live between the sexes, or to interrogate the punishing logic of normality instead, the doctor works to bring Cal back into the realm of the intelligible to create a new kind of discourse about sexuality through his limited medical knowledge. For Cal, sexual identity is one of the strategies people have for giving a boost to normality.

By writing the history of sexuality from the viewpoint of discourse, Foucault denaturalizes heteronormative sexuality and opens the way to multiple sexualities. His formulation questions the neatly unified sexual field as Cal notes.

Why should I have thought I was anything other than a girl? Because I was attracted to a girl? That happened all the time. It was happening more than even in 1974. My ecstatic intuition about my self was now deeply suppressed. How long I would have managed to keep it down is anybody's guess. (203)

Cal becomes conscious of changes in everything from posture to feeling that come with the physical change from girl to man. Call's emotional life is a magnificently complicated *mélange* of masculine and effeminate feeling defying clear gender categorization as nearly all human personalities ultimately do. Cal's decision to identify as male is motivated partly by sexual desire. Cal has always liked girls. She liked girls when she was a girl itself which question the unified sex and denaturalize heteronormative sexuality and opens the way to multiple sexualities.

Foucault further began to consider question of transgression and resistance in the face of the technologies of punishment and sexual classification. One element of this critical phase, therefore, involves an attention to subjugated or marginal, knowledge especially those which have been disqualified, taken less then seriously or deemed inadequate by official histories. They are the discourse of the madmen, the patient, the delinquent the pervert and other person who, in their respective time held knowledge about themselves which diverged from established categories. Subjugated person perform an act of resistance to the usual treatment of them by the various science. Cal's flees from the control of Dr. Luce to resistance to the usual treatment of her by the various sciences by leaving notes to her parents, as she says:

I know you're only trying to do what's best for me, but I don't think anyone knows for sure what's best. I love you and don't want to be a problem, so I've decided to go away. I know you'll say I'm not a problem, but I know I am. If you want to know why I'm doing this, you should ask Dr. Luce, who is big liar! I am not a girl. I'm a boy. That's what I found out today. So I'm going where no one knows me. Everyone in Grosse point will talk when they find out. (198)

While waiting for Dr. Luce in his office Cal reads her file, which shows that the doctor's assessment is based in part on his assumption that she is sexually attracted to boys. That conclusion, along with the possibility that the cosmetic surgery will prevent her from experiencing sexual pleasure, prompts Cal to write her parents a note declaring "I am not a girl. I'm a boy" and to run away to perform an act of resistance to the usual treatment of her body by the various science.

Cal also shows how official knowledge (particularly the social science) work as instrument of normalization continually attempting to manoeuvre population into correct and functional, form of thinking and acting. Therefore he also has an interest in examining the method practices and techniques by which official discourse go about this process of normalization and, in the process occlude forms of knowledge which are different from then by dividing the normal persons from the pathological specimen and so on. One way in which happens is when science transforms non scientific discourse into data which produces an implicit hierarchy of knowledge. The data comprise the bodies of patients. Here we can go to investigate how the medical and psychiatric science (have been preoccupied with assigning a single sex to all persons, and the consequent difficulties they have faced with cases of hermaphroditism in Cal case, the sexologist was looking reassuringly medical on the base of data they have collected by examine Cal's activities and by having conversation with her. Dr. Luce explained Cal's parents that the most important, in their daughter's case is that she has been raised for fourteen years as girl and indeed thinks herself as a girl. Her interests, gestures psychosexual makeup all these are female. So on the base of non scientific data Dr.Luce wants to do surgery which would end the nightmare and give their parents back their daughter, their Callope she comments:

The treatment I would recommend for your daughter is two fold. First, hormone injection. Second, cosmetic surgery. The hormone treatments will instate breast development and enhance her female secondary sex characteristics. The surgery will make Callie look exactly like the girl she feels herself to be. In fact, she will be that girl. Her outside and inside will conform. She will look like a normal girl no body will be able to tell a thing. And then Callie can go on and enjoy her life. (192)

After two week the conclusions of Luce's study of Callie are along the side of assigning a single sex to her in the name of normalization. He allegorizes Transexuality in order to achieve a sense of naturalness and to end the night mare and give her parent back their daughter. He diagnoses her as a girl who has a little too much male hormone and he wants to correct to fix her "right" side that is femaleness. Dr Luce conducts medical and psychological exams to determine Cal's sexuality.

Foucault further argues that sexuality is a concept which came into being during the development of biopower; it came to be seen as the very essence of the individual human being and the core of personal identity. Confessional discourse about sexuality in to medical terms gradually develops through the mediation of doctor's psychiatrists and other to when one confessed one's private thoughts and practices. The confessional can take the form of interrogation interviews, conversation, consultations or even autobiographical narratives.

Cal has read Alexina Barbim autobiography, which Michel Foucault discovered in the archives of the French Department of public Hygiene. She says when her story goes out into the world; she may become the most famous hermaphrodite in history. There have been others before her. Alexia Barbim attended a girls' boarding school in France before becoming Abel. She left behind an

autobiography, which Michel Foucault discovered in the archives of the French Department of Public Hygiene. (Her memoirs, which end shortly before her suicide, my make on satisfactory reading, and it was after finishing them years ago that she first got the idea to right own.) Gottlieb Gottlich, born in 1798, lived as Marie Rosine until the age of thirty-three. One day abdominal pains sent Marie to the doctor. The physician checked for a hernia and found undescended testicles instead. From then on, Marie donned men's clothes, took the name of Gottlieb, and made a fortune traveling around Europe, exhibiting himself to medical men.

Hermaphrodite has always symbolized something to someone. Even Foucault, whose edition of the memories of a nineteenth century French hermaphrodite has played as a inspiration for Cal to write her own story. Cal has read very deeply Alexia, autobiography which inspired to write her own. She witnesses:

During my life at the Clinic nearly three decades ago, Dr.Luce ran me through a barrage of tests. I was given the Benton Visual Retention test and the Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test. My verbal IQ was measured, and lots of other things, too. Luce even analyzed my prose style to see if I wrote in a linear, masculine way, or in a circular, feminine one. All I know this despite my androgenized brain there's and innate feminine circularity in the story I have to tell. In any genetic history I'm the final clause in a periodic sentence, and that sentence begins a long time ago, in another language, and you to read it from the beginning to get the end, which is my arrival.(8)

Cal, who is now forty one, says that she feels another birth coming on. As a result, she has determined to write down her history of "the recessive mutation on fifth

chromosome” that polluted her family’s genetic pool and eventually caused her to be born a hermaphrodite. By writing autobiography Cal wants to confess her secret publicly.

Butler proposes a radical critique of all categories of identity. She offers an analysis of gender and sex in terms not of inner capacities, attributes and identities, but of a set of repeated performances that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being. She is convinced that compulsory heterosexuality is not a natural category but rather a system built up by repeating over and over. Cal writes in her farewell note to her parents that she is not a girl but a boy. And also cut her extravagant hair in boyish fashion, Callie works diligently at performing masculinity, as she notes:

I walked across the room, concentrating as I did on walking like a boy. Like a stroke victim, I was having to relearn all the simple motor skills. My skeleton was a male’s with its higher center of gravity. It promoted a tidy, forward thrust. I had a tendency, to walk knock-kneed which made my hips sway and my back end twitch. I tried to keep my pelvis steady now. To walk like a boy you let your shoulder sway not your hips. And u kept Ur feet father apart all thinks I had learned in a day and a half on the road. The suit was only part of my new identity it was the haircut that mattered most. Now, in the barbershop, Ed was going at me with a whisk brush. (198)

Cal makes a conscious decision to change her gender identity by cutting her extravagantly boyish fashion. Callie works diligently at performing masculinity. She walked across the room, concentrating as she did on walking like a boy. Like a stroke she had to relearn all the simple motor skill.

Callie's – now Cal's conviction that he has a choice which comes from a conceptual conflation of anatomy with sexuality and sexuality with gender to be a boy, he need simply rename his equipment and act like a boy as he further says:

In every case, people took me for the teenage boy I was every minute 'more conclusively becoming. My voice continued to deepen. I was a new creation. Myron and Sylvia are treating me like a son under this collective delusion I become that, for a little while at least. I become male identified. (190)

Callie becomes Cal when she tells her mother and father (in writing) that she is a boy; she cuts her hair, walks like a boy, and names herself with a boy's name to identify her as a boy. When she repeated the boyish manner again and again she proves that gender identity is a sequence of acts. People took her as a teenage boy and even Myron and Sylvia are treating her like a son.

Here we can't claim gender ought not to be constructed as a stable identity of agency from which various acts follow; rather, gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylized repetition of acts. The effect of gender is produced through a stylization of the body and, hence, must be understood as the mundane way in which bodily gestures, movements, and styles of various kinds constitute the illusion of an abiding gendered self. Cal dismantles the previous concept sex as single, pure, monolithic and fix. He raises the voice for multiple sexes. Sex is constructed so it can be endeavored by individual effort. Cal acquires her new identity by his effort.



#### IV: Conclusion

*Middlesex* dismantles the binary of male/female. It deconstructs the previous concept of gender as a single, determinate, fix, natural, inborn, pure, monolithic and unchanging. *Middlesex* exposes confusion of sexual identity through pseudo hermaphrodite character, Cal. Her modes of behavior, attitudes and sexual orientations are in a constant flux; therefore, her identities are also changing constantly. She has different sexual orientation in different situation. The research work, therefore, focuses on how the character behaves in different situation and how and why she/he gets on changing. What is the underline cause of the change in the identity of the character, and why he/she cannot fit herself/ himself into the identity categories like male/female and heterosexual, homosexual is the central issue of the research. By taking the help of theoretical insight of undoing gender and gender performative theory from Judith Butler, with her queer outlook and Foucault's notion on discourse of sexuality, this research attempts to answer the question raised above. From this analysis the answer regarding characters' fitness into herself / himself for fixed identity categorise as the constructed one.

Cal Stephanides, a pseudohermaphrodite (he has external female genitalia but male XY chromosome, rather than female XX), is the narration of the novel. Cal states that he was born twice, as a girl in Detroit in 1960, then as a teenage boy in an emergency room in Petoskey, Michigan. Calliope (his young female self) remains confused by her feelings and by her body through her puberty. Callie has a relatively normal girlhood, but as an adolescent she becomes troubled by her attraction to a female classmate, referred to only as the Obscure Object, and by her failure to develop physically or to menstruate. Callie's tale of growing up as a girl increasingly confuses about her identity, and her discovery of her dual self. Her secret comes while

on a vacation with the obscure object. They engage in quasisexual exploration, each pretending that it is not really happening. The Object's brother accuses them of being lesbians and Callie runs away, only to be hit by a tractor.

The emergency room doctor who treats her discovers her physical abnormality and tells her parents that multiple factors determine gender. In his opinion Callie should receive hormone treatments and surgery to allow her to live as a woman. Callie, however, reads his records and sees that genetically she is male. She leaves her parents a note saying that she really is a boy and that the doctor had lied to them and then s/he runs away. She buys a suit adopts the name, Cal to construct her new identity. Her decision to defy her upbringing and live as a man shows the process of breaking away from the past and discovering how to be a different person to subvert the previous concept of gender as single pure determinate, fix and natural. It creates the space for multiple gender identity by deconstructing the binary of male/female.

Gender ought not to be construed as a stable identity of agency from which various act follows; rather, gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted an exterior space through a process. Gender is not natural, inborn or inherent rather it can be constructed by the effort of subject. Rather than to assume gender as fix, single, and determinate it is a process which is constantly going on changing according to time, situation and circumstances.

When Cal defies her upbringing and lives as a man, she dismantles the hierarchy of male/female to open multiple sexual identities. She breaks the heterosexual norms to raise the voice from marginal groups and sought for the space for such groups in the society.

The research work attempts to deconstruct male/female categories which are constructed by the society and raise the voice from the perspective of marginal group

such as hermaphrodite. Gender is performatively constructed. It is formed through the certain practices of 'doing' when the practices are done gender changes its present status and results in undoing gender. All the boundaries of male/female, homosexual and heterosexual are dismantled in modern society which is helpful for marginal groups to exist in society comfortably. It helps the marginal groups to live livable life. Social construction of legal, real, origin, inborn, natural, single, fix, determinate, pure, reliable and possible is in question now. Indeterminate, flux, multiple impossible, illegible, unreliable, unreal and illegitimate is considered positively in modern time. Rather assuming gender as natural, pure and fix, it is a process which can be constructed by the endeavor of individual.

## Works Cited

- Beauvior, Simone De. *The Second Sex*. Trans. H.M. passley. New York: Vintage Book, 1952.
- Butler, Judin. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- - - . *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Cohen, Samuel. "The Novel in a Time of Terro." *Twentieth Century Literature* (Rice) 53.3 (Summer, 2007): 371-93.
- Eugenide, Jeffrey. *The Middlesex*. New York: Picador, 2002.
- Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- - - . *Herculine Barbin: Being the Recently Discovered Memoirs of a Nineteenth-Century Hermaphrodite*. Trans. Richard McDougall. New York: Colophon, 1980.
- Gesse, Keith. "Sense and Sexibility." *Nation* 275 (June, 2002):25-28.
- Gibert, Jen. "Literature as Sex Education." *Changing English* 11.2 (2004): 233-241.
- Griffith, Michael. "Sibling of the Genus Erroneous." *Southern Review* 39.1 ( Winter, 2003): 9-10.
- Hardin, James. *Reflection and Action: Essay on the Bildungsroman*. Columbia: University of Carolina Press, 1991.
- Kenneth Millard. *Coming of Age in Contemporary American Fiction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Warhol, Robin R. "Gender and Feeling." *On Cheering Up* Vol. 12.2 (May, 2004): 226-229.

Whatman, Max. "Suffer the Children." *The New Criterion* 21.2 (November, 2002):  
65-67.

Wood, James. "Union: Book review." *New Republic* Vol. 227 (Winter, 2002): 31-4.