

n.paradoxa

online, issue 3

May 1997

Editor: Katy Deepwell

Published in English as an online edition
by KT press, www.ktpress.co.uk,
as issue 3, *n.paradoxa: international feminist art journal*
<http://www.ktpress.co.uk/pdf/nparadoxaissue3.pdf>
May 1997, republished in this form: January 2010
ISSN: 1462-0426

All articles are copyright to the author
All reproduction & distribution rights reserved to n.paradoxa and KT press.
No part of this publication may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or
by any electronic, mechanical or other means, including photocopying and recording,
information storage or retrieval, without permission in writing from the editor of
n.paradoxa.

Views expressed in the online journal are those of the contributors
and not necessarily those of the editor or publishers.

Editor: ktpress@ktpress.co.uk
International Editorial Board: Hilary Robinson, Renee Baert,
Janis Jefferies, Joanna Frueh, Hagiwara Hiroko, Olabisi Silva.
www.ktpress.co.uk

List of Contents

Dot Tuer Mirrors and Mimesis: An Examination of the Strategies of Image Appropriation and Repetition in the Work of Dara Birnbaum	4
Hilary Robinson Louise Bourgeois's 'Cells' Looking at Bourgeois through Irigaray's Gesturing Towards the Mother	17
Katy Deepwell Feminist Readings of Louise Bourgeois or Why Louise Bourgeois is a Feminist Icon	28
Nima Poovaya-Smith Arpana Caur : A Profile	39
Violetta Liagatchev Constitution Intempestive de la République Internationale des Artistes Femme	44
Diary of an Ageing Art Slut	47

Louise Bourgeois's *Cells*: Looking at Bourgeois through Irigaray's Gesturing Towards the Mother

Hilary Robinson

'It is difficult to find a framework vivid enough to incorporate Louise Bourgeois's sculpture. Attempts to bring a coolly evolutionary or art-historical order to her work or to see it in the context of one art group or another, have proved more or less irrelevant. [...] Rarely has an abstract art been so directly and honestly informed by its maker's psyche.'¹

So wrote Lucy Lippard in 1975. Twenty years later the same case can still be made. Reading various articles and essays about Louise Bourgeois, I have been struck by the continuing search for frameworks within which her work can be discussed and tested but also how writers come to terms with it. While the commentators have not had violent arguments with each other, their lack of unity is notable. Thus one writer will account for Bourgeois's work within expressionism; another will call it formalist. One writer will say it is materials-led: another that it is shaped by the artist's life story. One will describe it as symptomatic of a dysfunctional family background: another, as symptomatic of Bourgeois's involvement with Surrealism. The one thing that the writers do all seem to agree upon is that the work is somehow something to do with the body and with sex though whether it is descriptive symbolic, metaphorical, representational or evocative in its relation to the body is not something about which there seems to be any consensus. Likewise, the writers exhibit similar ambiguity about the work's relationship with sex - extending to lack of clarity about whether its apparent sexiness is related to the body of the artist; whether it is a result of its relationship to their bodies: whether it is gender-specific; etcetera. The cumulative effect of reading the extant literature on Bourgeois is that in general the terms 'body' and 'sex', in the discussions of her work, remain

remarkably unproblematised as if in and of themselves these words are universally understood and experienced and can be used as some form of benchmark. What I would like to do here, far from supplying any overall key to Bourgeois's work, will probably add to the stirring and muddying of the waters. I want to supply a partial reading of some of Bourgeois's works through a partial reading of some of the writings of the French psychoanalyst and philosopher Luce Irigaray. I am doing this for quite pragmatic reasons: Bourgeois is an artist to whom I have long been drawn, but with little clarity in my reasons for responding to her work. The invitation to contribute here has arrived whilst I am in the middle of a research project on Irigaray and I have found some of my work on her has given me clearer insight and understanding of Bourgeois, in particular. I have come to an understanding of the more recent Cell series.

There is a paradox in this, and I think it important to outline briefly the aspects of Irigaray's writing which are of use in such a discussion. After all, Irigaray tends to locate visual pleasure within the realm of the male (particularly in her earlier writings) while locating female pleasure within the body and more specifically within touch. In an often-quoted passage she states:

'The predominance of the visual ...is particularly foreign to female eroticism. Woman takes pleasure more from touching than from looking and her entry into a dominant scopic economy signifies, again, her consignment to passivity: she is to be the beautiful object of contemplation'.²

This would imply a closure for a discussion of work by a woman artist. Further, it is the passages of her writing which touch upon sexuality, ethics and criticism that can be most easily extracted and worked upon, not her discussion of the visual. Thus her work can most easily (but I think misguidedly) be seen as having more relevance for her discussion of either the ostensive subject matter of artworks or for the broader contextualising and frame of reference that an artist might construct; and as having less relevance for the material practices of making art works, looking at them and understanding those processes. Yet it is precisely the latter not the former which drew me to recent work by Bourgeois. While thinking about the Cells I have found passages in Irigaray which have aided my understanding of and accounting for, particular practices involved in them. In the reading of Irigaray I offer here I will concentrate on the essay 'Gesture in psychoanalysis'.³

In this essay Irigaray explores two sites of gesture from her experience of the psychoanalytic scenario - gestures which are particular to the analytic scenario and those which originate beyond it, but which she has uncovered as a result of her participation in it. Irigaray begins her paper with a long discussion of the gender-specific experiences of the classic analytic scenario as embodied through physical gesture - the lying down of the woman the unseen-ness of the man who sits behind her. Irigaray's subsequent discussion of gestures from beyond the analytic scenario (but discussed within it) is then reflected back upon this initial discussion to re-

enforce from other viewpoints her original contention that this is a gendered experience readable through physical expression. It is this aspect of Irigaray's essay - her findings of gestures and their practices which, although uncovered during analysis are in fact extra-analytic - which is of particular use to the present discussion. Much of Irigaray's argument derives from her exploration and understanding of the girl / mother relation and in particular from her insight into the ways in which the little girl comes to terms with her mother's absence. I wish to argue that the gestural practices Irigaray has located in this process of the little girl may also be discovered resonating within a strand of Bourgeois's practice cumulating in the Cell series and related works.

But how does this concentration of Irigaray upon the girl/mother relation aid our understanding of work by Louise Bourgeois? After all Bourgeois is now famous for making work which stems from her feelings about her father not her mother. As Robert Storr has written describing conversations he had with Bourgeois:

'It was while preparing a slide show autobiography for her 1982 MoMA exhibition [...] that she first told in full the story of her father and the mistress which has since become myth of origin for much of her work.'

However, he does go on to complain:

'Enlightening in many respects, in others this story has restricted the interpretation of what she has done to narrowly personal of archetypically Freudian sources.'⁴

In our eagerness to hear another version of the Freudian family romance - in this case, the charming, philandering, autocratic and ultimately intolerable father, whose mistress is not only the daughter's nanny, but who is also moved by the father into the marital home - it becomes easy to focus on the daughter-to-father emotion; the anger, the desolation of the daughter, the young Bourgeois. It becomes manifest in the work: and indeed is of great importance for it. Bourgeois herself helps us focus on this through her own words, providing a moving, at times devastating, account of her autobiography: 'My father betrayed me by not being what he was supposed to be... It is just a matter of rules of the game, and in a family the rules of the game are such that a minimum of conformity is expected'; and 'My father provoked in me a continual loss of self-esteem'.⁵ She has also stated that when her mother died, her father ridiculed her grief.⁶

But this dysfunctional father/daughter relationship has functioned as a *suitable* subject for critical voyeurism. Among the commentators on Bourgeois, Julie Nicoletta has written:

"The story of this affair [...] has taken on the aura of myth. No one interested in Bourgeois's work has looked beyond this Freudian idea of a traumatised childhood to see what other factors may have inspired Bourgeois."

Nicoletta's option is to follow a Lacanian model in a discussion of Bourgeois's *Femme-Maison* series - which may or may not be a way out of this particular family romance. But what struck me when reading the literature on Bourgeois was the lack

of discussion of Bourgeois's relation to her mother. For instance Mira Schor has written '[Bourgeois's] insistence on the source of her work residing in psychological wounds inflicted on her by her father contravenes any formal theories of art and yet embodies the Oedipal crisis that psycholinguistic theory interprets as the entrance of human beings into the Symbolic Order of the Father. Bourgeois obsessively returns the critical audience of her work to its motivating source the murderous rage of a betrayed daughter. Her admission to the symbolic order has been warped by her father's open affair with her governess.'⁸

Schor then continues the paragraph:

'[Bourgeois's] link back to the Imaginary (completeness of relation to the Mother) is damaged by her mother's presumed complicity.'⁹

However, she does not develop this. Donald Kuspit does propose an argument about the importance of Bourgeois's mother:

'Bourgeois's entanglement with her mother, not her father, is becoming clear as the inner content of her work. She has filled the void of mother/artist in spirit as well as substance, an Oedipus replacing the mother instead of the father, a Sphinx whose Secret is that a story about a relationship to a father is really a story about a relationship to a mother.'¹⁰

This, however, is the conclusion, rather than the starting point, of his article and a theme which does not appear to have been taken up by anyone else. Maybe a girl's relationship with her mother is seen as having less potential for scandal and tragedy, less glamour, and less scope for critical voyeurism. Bourgeois herself however, gives us plenty of prompting to take her relationship with her mother seriously. To give just three examples:

'These titles are informative. 'Blind Vigils' is like 'Blind leading the Blind'. Blindness came from the blush I experienced at the side of the people around me, everybody. As I say, my father was promiscuous. I had to be blind to the mistress who lived with us. I had to be blind to the pain of my mother.'¹¹

'When I was afraid of my mother dying, a challenge I could not meet, the warding off of her death, not to let her disappear, I made a vow. I swore to myself if my mother survived that morning I would give up sex.'¹²

The material was there taking all that room and bothering me, bothering me by its aggressive presence. And somehow the idea of the mother came to me. This is the way my mother impressed me, as very powerful, very silent, very judging, and controlling the whole studio. And naturally this piece became my mother. At that point, I had my subject. I was going to express what I felt toward her... First I cut off her head, and I slit her throat ... And after weeks and weeks of work. I thought, if this is the way I saw my mother, then she did not like me. How could she possibly like me if I treat her that way? At that point something turned around. I could not stand the idea that she wouldn't like me. I couldn't live if I thought that she didn't like me. The fact that I had pushed her around, cut off her head had nothing to do with it. What

you do to a person has nothing to do with what you expect the person to feel toward you... Now at the I became very, very depressed, terribly terribly depressed."¹³

I find it interesting that these comments of Bourgeois have surfaced in recent years, and I would like to link them to a strand in her work which, although it can be traced back, has also emerged in a particularly notable manner over the past decade in the *Cell* works and other related pieces. In these we can find Bourgeois's embodiment through particular manipulation of space through materials, of her earlier interest in the spiral and circling movement. This is manifested in earlier works in a more straightforwardly representational manner. We also find a blurring of subject/object relations: the Cells are not easily containable art objects as such, and neither are the 'objects' comprising them clear in their object status to either the viewing subject or to Bourgeois herself. These aspects of Bourgeois's work can be brought into focus with the aid of the Irigaray essay 'Gesture in Psychoanalysis'.

As I have indicated, much of Irigaray's argument derives from her exploration of the specificity of the girl/mother relation, and in particular how this is made manifest through the gestural processes of the girl. As a context for her discussion, Irigaray refers back to Freud's observations of his grandson, little Ernst who devised what Irigaray describes as "an action designed to master" the absence of his mother.¹⁴ He did this with a reel and string, repeatedly throwing the reel away, then retrieving it with the string, accompanying this with noises interpreted as 'fort-da' - 'away-here'. Irigaray indicates in 'Gesture in Psychoanalysis' the gender specificity of the story; her point is firstly that Ernst is a boy, and nowhere does Freud suggest that a girl might act in the same way. (He was a boy. It is important to be faithful to the text. Not every substitution is possible, especially when sexual difference is involved in Freud's text, the child is a boy. And Freud never wrote that it might have been a girl' (p.97). Irigaray also discusses the story of little Ernst in an earlier lecture reprinted in the same volume of essays.¹⁵ The responses of girls to the absence of their mothers therefore merit some separate attention. Irigaray states that a girl could not have produced the same action:

'My hypothesis is that the child in the story couldn't have been a girl. Why?. A girl does not do the same things when her mother goes away. She does not play with a string and a reel that symbolise her mother, because her mother is of the same sex as she is and cannot have the object status of a reel. The mother is of the same subjective identity as she is' (p.97) Irigaray's French privileges the concept of gesture more strongly than the Gill translation, starting this passage 'Une fille ne fait pas les mêmes gestes'. p.111.

Instead the girl:

"plays with a doll, lavishing maternal affection on a quasi subject, and thus manages to organise a kind of symbolic space; playing with dolls is not simply a game girls are forced to play, it also signifies a difference in subjective status in the separation from the mother. For mother and daughter, the mother is a subject that cannot easily be reduced to an object, and a doll is not an object the way that a reel, a toy car, a gun, etc., are objects and tools used for symbolisation."¹⁶

Here we have an insight that might begin to aid our understanding of some approaches of women to making art works. Such an accounting would be located in an understanding of the girl's organisation of 'a kind of symbolic space'. The subjective status 'of the relationship which leads to play, and the fact that the thing played with "is not an object' in the way that the boy's toys are. This certainly differs from the approach of many male artists, male curators and the masculinist art market, which in its mainstream manifestation can verge on the anal: i.e. the insistence upon the production and showing of the object. Instead, Irigaray is offering, in this image of the little girl and her dolls, an approach where process can be stressed, where the importance of the art object as object is fundamentally compromised, and with it the notion of mastery. (It is noticeable that the concept of the integrity of the object and the construction of mastery and genius both mainstays of masculinist discourses have repeated come under fire from various feminist analyses. See for example, the cumulative work of writers such as Lucy Lippard and Griselda Pollock). It is an insight Irigaray gained from analysing an experience which is predominantly female, which is pivotal in the engendering of an *appropriate* femininity in girls - Irigaray acknowledges the social coercion of play - and one which also reflects and makes manifest the girl's psychic accommodation of the social absence of her mother. Thus through this argument of Irigaray's we can propose a woman's relation to the art works she is making which is both specifically female and yet variable among women. Any such accounting would of necessity be embedded materially in particular practices. The practices of play (their processes and effects) are embedded in and understandable through social practices. Thus the embodiment of such play practices in art practices may well be discernible, but is by no means inevitable. This is a model which might, therefore, be appropriate for particular practices which are likely to sit uneasily in any mainstream (masculinist) discourses, yet also resist any simplistic collapse back into an essentialist discourse. It is also an insight through which we can begin to account for the desire of many women artists to work with representations of the female body or *bodiliness* - if you like, an accounting which would refute charges of narcissism. Artists as diverse as Louise Bourgeois, Leonora Carrington, Geneviève Cadieux, Helen Chadwick, Mona Hatoum, Laura Godfrey Isaacs, Jana Sterbak could be discussed in this context. *The Cell* series is just such an instance. As I indicated, Bourgeois's work has proved highly resistant to co-option by any mainstream art discourse: it has also not provided openings for an essentialist discourse while clearly manifesting a *bodiliness*.

Irigaray can aid our understanding of Bourgeois's bodily practice within the space of the Cell works. She proposes that dance is another way in which girls cope with the absence of the mother. and in particular a whirling or spinning dance:

'This dance is also a way for the girl to create a territory of her own in relation to the mother. [...] Among women, the relationship to sameness and to the mother is not mastered by the '*fort-da*'. The mother always remains too familiar and too close. [...]

the sexual movement characteristic of the female is whirling round rather than throwing and pulling objects back as little Ernst does. The girl then tries to reproduce around and within her an energetic circular movement that protects her from abandonment, attack, depression, loss of self. Spinning round is also, but in my opinion secondarily, a way of attracting. The girl describes a circle while soliciting and refusing access to her territory. She plays with this gestural territory and its limit. There is no object here, in the strict meaning of the word, no other that has had to be introjected or incorporated. On the contrary, girls and women often set up a defensive territory that can then become creative, especially in analysis."¹⁷ Again there are some significant choices in the Gill translation. In Irigaray's original, little Ernst has '(un) geste de lancer et rapprocher'; Gill offers 'attracting' as the translation from Irigaray's 'séduire'. The sentence 'She plays with this gestural territory and its limit' is my own translation of the original 'Elle joue avec ce territoire gestuel et sa limite.' Gill offers 'She is making a game of this territory she has described with her own body'.

This passage is quoted at length because it clearly adds to the earlier discussion of process. Here, there may be space for developing a model for performative aspects of women's art practices - actual making and doing, gestures in the studio, the physical negotiation of the work by artist and viewer alike - all of which anecdotally so many women artists hold in high esteem. In doing this it is important not to collapse the term 'performative' back solely into the category of performance as it might be commonly be understood in a visual art context, particularly as performance art by women has rarely been accommodated within feminist cultural theory, which has been dominated by the motion of both body and image of woman as Object of the male gaze.¹⁸

An Irigarayan model of a woman performance artist 'soliciting and refusing access to [...] this territory she has described with her body' could well begin to account for the resistant position many women performers feel themselves to be in with regard to both the male gaze and to this strand of feminist theory. Crucially, however, the way in which Irigaray uses the word 'gesture' - her constant description of gestures as being in some way performed (whether that performance is the reason for the gesture's being or whether the performance of the gesture is considered pragmatic, or a means to an end) - this suggests also that this is a specific concept through which we can begin consideration of the physical gestures of women artists in their studios, certain gestural structures they build into their work, their approach to the spaces in which their work is made public and the manner in which it is made public. In short, it suggests a space for analysis of what where and how the performative gestures of women artists are in their practices. As with the distinction I have just made of performance art from a notion of 'the performative', so too 'gestural' should be read as literally 'of the gesture' in the manner in which Irigaray charts the gestures of lying or sitting in the analytic scenario, and not gestural as used in relation to, for instance, Expressionism - this particular distinction is crucial,

given the naming and over-determination of a particular form of gesture within the area of visual art discourse, and how it is redolent of patriarchy, modernism, essentialism and genius.

Irigaray rounds up this part of her essay by saying:

'Girls do not enter language in the same ways as boys. [...] They enter language by producing a space, a path, a river, a dance and rhythm, a song... Girls describe a space around themselves rather than displacing a substitute object from one place to another or into various places.'¹⁹

To summarise: if the relation with the mother leads girls to a distinct relation with the thing that becomes the representation of the mother in her absence; if it leads them to particular approaches to the definition of space - space which is both a defensive space which speaks of the experience of loss, and a display at the same time; and if this is achieved through movement which is gendered, sexualised even, which is gestural, movement which attends to process rather than object - then I think we have a set of concepts which can facilitate a developing analysis of aspects of Bourgeois's practice. We have to return to Bourgeois's relation to her mother.

I think we can take it as read that all little girls at some point will miss their mothers, or have to come to terms with their mother's absence: it is part of the usual and inevitable process of separation. In *Gesture in Psychoanalysis*, Irigaray is not referring to particularly notable or extreme case studies; rather she is locating her discussion within a realm of *usual-ness*. Louise Bourgeois would have experienced such moments. But for Bourgeois the experience of missing her mother would have been intensified by Madame Bourgeois's displacement from her position as mother within the family as a result of her husband's introduction of his mistress into the house. She no longer had a relationship to her husband which was clear and comprehensible to little Louise. There was also no longer clarity in the mother/daughter relationship, as the mistress was also tutor to the girl, in loco parentis in more ways than one. Madame Bourgeois was still physically present, but her position as mother was displaced; it is this removal that caused such pain, anger and anxiety in her daughter. The anger is expressed towards the father for doing what he did; and towards the mother for not being all she should have been. It is notable that in this story the father's position as patriarch of the family remains intact: in this respect he was still what he should have been although personally flawed and unethical in his relationships with these three women.

Bourgeois has frequently referred to her life history as the cause of her impulse to work. For example Deborah Wye quotes her as saying of some earlier works that they 'had nothing to do with sculpture, they meant physical presences. That was an attempt at not only recreating the past but controlling it.'²⁰ Drawing upon the insights offered by Irigaray, I would like to argue that the past decade during which Bourgeois has been articulating in interviews the intensities and complexities of her feelings towards her mother has also been the period in which she has articulated this relationship through her work. Irigaray indicated that the girl missing her mother will (amongst other things)

organise a symbolic space around herself . She produces a territory through gestures of spinning, sexuate, gender-specific circular movement. This performs three main functions for the girl: it protects her from abandonment, depression, attack, loss of self, it attracts; it refuses access. It is also a process in which there is no clear object in relation to the subject.

This is precisely the process I think Bourgeois has performed with her Cell pieces and related works such as *Precious Liquids*(1989). Constantly referred to by critics as 'installation pieces' these are rare among installation work for making manifest a self-determined, architectural, material description of the artist's own psychic space, rather than the artist making manifest their psychic (or intellectual or whatever) space within a given architectural space. Their role in protecting the artist from her childhood abandonment and loss of self is apparent from her own statements. Little in the work is reducible to object-status ; things in the works are never treated in a manner that can be identified as symbolic objects but retain an ambivalent status. Thus, for instance, marble 'sculptures', referring in both material and its working to a well-established tradition of object-making are placed in space or juxtaposed with other materials. Likewise, found objects, in the works are not placed to emphasise their Surreal nature or their usage as universal symbols or to encourage a reading of them as fetish objects: rather they are used as visual material with which an idiosyncratic narrative is being articulated. Viewers are attracted in to the *Cells*. but at the same time kept at bay through Bourgeois's description of this her symbolic space. She does this sometimes literally by making us peer in, while refusing us clear physical or visual access: sometimes she does this through her image. With what can be for the viewer a baffling lack of didacticism for such precisely selected or made things and such rigorously articulated space

The dimensions of the Cells are significant too. There is here an engagement with gestural territory and its limits and a spatial relationship to the human body. Their general title recalls on the one hand cells of incarceration or contemplation with their connotations of space in tight relation to body size and, on the other hand, evocations of body cells and implications literally of incorporation of experience. With the *Cells*, Bourgeois does in indeed 'produce a space, a path, a river, a dance and rhythm, a song'. One can almost imagine Bourgeois performing the Irigarayan dance, spinning around, arms outstretched, to find the dimensions that are appropriate. She has made many comments about the significance to her of spiralling, in a manner which equates with Irigaray's notion of spinning. For instance:

"There are a lot of spirals... but they are not automatic. The spiral is a vacuum it represents something... the void, the anxiety void, the void of anxiety" ²¹
and

"The spiral is an attempt at controlling the chaos. It has two directions. Where do you place yourself ; at the periphery or at the vortex? Beginning at the outside is the fear of losing control; the winding in is a tightening, a retreating, a

compacting to the point of disappearance. Beginning at the centre is affirmation, the move outward is a representation of giving, and giving up control : of trust, positive energy, of life itself " ²²

and

'The spiral is the beginning of movement in space. As opposed to the rigidity of the monolith, the subject is exploring space.' ²³

The spiral anti the spinning figures can be found as a theme in many works earlier than the Cells. There it is in sculptures such as the *Spiral Women* of the late forties and early fifties; *Life Flower*¹ (1960); *Spiral/Summer* (1960); *Spiral Woman* (1984). This last has a slate disc some three feet wide placed on the floor; hanging above it, at about head height, suspended on a wire and able to turn, is a small bronze of a female figure. Her torso and head arc surrounded by a thick coil of bronze: her limbs are positioned as if she were twirling round. In the terms of this discussion this appears to be a transitional work, somewhere between, on the one hand, the earlier projection onto materials of what it is to spin and spiral, as in the earlier *Spiral Women*; and, on the other, in the subsequent *Cell* works, a manifestation through the performative manipulation of materials of that spinning, its causes and indeed its pleasures.

Robert Storr has looked back to what he calls 'the whirling dervish figure' in plate 4 of *He disappeared into Complete Silence* (1947):

'When she [Bourgeois] comes round it is never to close the circle but to re-inscribe its course with a new emphasis, widening or narrowing its scope as she proceeds. [...] The animating force of her formal language and a self portrait, that figure is the direct spatial expression of an insatiable need. she is the spiral-woman, seeking but never finding the absolute core of her being, always advancing even when she seems to be retracing her steps, always restless because she has not reached her outer limits. Nothing in the psychic or aesthetic economy of Bourgeois's obsessions has altered these terms.' ²⁴

But Storr, for all his acute perception in his essay, also forgoes any account of Bourgeois's mother, despite mentioning both her father and his mistress. In doing so he also demonstrates the effect of this lack, by suggesting that the artist is 'seeking but never finding the absolute core of her being' in missing the mother, and the little girl's relation with the mother, the void is, rather, in the centre of his discussion of Bourgeois: a void, that to use another Irigarayan concept, represents in a patriarchal structure "the horror of nothing to see."²⁵ If however we accept the importance of the mother/daughter relationship, we can also explore in Bourgeois's work a specificity of form, body, and meaning which otherwise remains unacknowledged.

Notes

1. Lucy Lippard 'Louise Bourgeois. From the Inside Out' *ArtForum* (March 1975) p..27
2. Luce Irigaray *This Sex which is Not One* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press,1985) (trans. of 1977 text) pp.25-26
3. Irigaray *Sexes and Genealogies* New York: Columbia University Press (trans G.C. Gill) pp.89-104

- French edition in *Sexes et Parentés* (Paris , Les Éditions Minoit 1987) pp.103-118
4. Robert Storr in *Tate Gallery Magazine*, no.6. (Summer 1995) p.29
 5. Christine Meyer-Thoss *Louise Bourgeois: Konstruktionen Für den Freien Fall: Designing for Free Fall* (Zurich,Amman,1992)
 6. Deborah Wye 'The Drama of the Self: the Prints of Louise Bourgeois' in Wye and Carol Smith *The Prints of Louise Bourgeois* (New York,Museum of Modern Art, 1994) p.18
 7. J.Nicolette 'Louise Bourgeois' Femmes-Maisons' *Women's Art Journal* (Fall/Winter 1992-3)
 8. Mira Schor 'From Liberation to Lack' *Heresies* Vol 6 No. 4 (1989) p.20
 9. *ibid.*
 10. Donald Kuspit 'Louise Bourgeois: Where Angels Fear to Tread' *Artforum* (1987) pp.120-121
 11. Alain Kirali 'The Passion for Sculpture: A Conversation with Bourgeois' *Arts Magazine* (March 1989) p.71
 12. Meyer-Thoss *Louise Bourgeois* (1992).
 13. Mignon Nixon 'Bad Enough Mother' *October* No.72 (Winter 1995) p.87
 14. Irigaray 'Gesture in Psychoanalysis' in *Sexes and Genealogies* p.56
 15. Irigaray 'Belief in Itself'. *Sexes and Genealogies* p.23-53
 16. Irigaray 'Gesture in Psychoanalysis' in *Sexes and Genealogies* p.97
 17. *ibid* p.98
 18. This can be found in strands of feminism as diverse as, on the one hand , the anti-pornography movement , in its activist form e.g Andrea Dworkin *Pornography: Men Possessing Women* London: Women's Press,1981 or in psychoanalytic film theory,particularly the line of enquiry engendered by Laura Mulvey's 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' *Screen* Vol.16 no.3 pp.6-18.
 19. Irigaray 'Gesture in Pyschoanalysis' in *Sexes and Genealogies* p.99
 20. Deborah Wye 'One & Others' in Wye *Louise Bourgeois* (New York: Museum of Modern Art,1982) p.19
 - 21.Christine Meyer-Thoss *Louise Bourgeois: Konstruktionen Für den Freien Fall: Designing for Free* (Fall 1992) pp.72-73
 22. *ibid* p.179
 23. Alain Kirali 'The Passion for Sculpture: A Conversation with Bourgeois' *Arts Magazine* (March 1989) p.74
 24. Robert Storr *Tate Gallery Magazine*, no.6. (Summer 1995) p.31
 25. Irigaray *This Sex which is Not One* p.26

Copyright © : H.Robinson, 1996
 n.paradoxa : Issue 3, May 1997

This essay was first published in Ian Cole (ed) *Louise Bourgeois* (MOMA,Oxford Papers)Vol 1 1996.