

# Freud in French Poststructuralist Aesthetics

A Research Design

by

© PD Dr. Peter Mahr, Vienna 2007/2009

1 scientific aspects .....	1
1.1 international state of research .....	1
1.2 breaking new ground scientifically .....	4
1.3 importance of expected results for the discipline .....	19
1.4 methods .....	19
2 aspects implied for scientific community and beyond ..	21
3 list of literature relevant to project .....	21-28

1 scientific aspects

1.1 international state of research

This is a research design in philosophy, more precisely in philosophical aesthetics (50 % philosophy, 10 % aesthetics, 10 % history of science, 30 % psychoanalysis).

It is widely agreed upon today that aesthetics deals on the one side with the aesthetic in terms of aesthetic qualities and the activity of aesthetic aisthesis (aesthetic experience, attitude, judgment) and on the other side with the arts producing the aesthetic (Zimmermann 1996, Gardner 1996, Genette 1997, Jimenez 1997, Scheer 1977, Mahr 2003, Reicher 2005). Equally acknowledged by now is the fact that philosophical aesthetics entered a crisis already some hundred years ago when it became apparent that the link between the two sides could not be founded on a psychological basis as intended for some time (Burgin 1986, Carroll 1987, Sim 1992,

Mahr 1998c, Rancière 2002), moreover was undermined by psychological facts like aesthetic anaesthesia, the aisthesis of disgust or the bodily subversion in language (Mahr 2003a, 18f./22, 20f., 22f.). One of the few scholars drawing unintentionally philosophical consequences from that crisis (Willy 1899, Bühler 1927, Mahr 1999d) was Freud. What was his philosophy?

It does not come as a surprise that Freud's philosophical suggestions, even ambitions - from his student years until at least the 1890es - have been cleared by now as philosophical, despite and in face of Freud's increasing skepticism and final rejection of philosophy in his later years (see Assoun 1976, 1981, 1993, Hemecker 1991, Wucherer-Huldenfeld 1994a, Wucherer-Huldenfeld 1994b, Gödde 1999), as echoed by all analytical, hermeneutic, sociological and phenomenological schools of philosophy reading Freud (Wittgenstein 1967, MacIntyre 1958, Wollheim 1971, Cavell 1993; Binswanger 1942, Boss 1957, Ricoeur 1965; Fromm 1931, Adorno 1951, Marcuse 1955; Dufrenne 1953 (Mahr <2001b>), for Sartre, Hippolyte, Merleau-Ponty and phenomenology on psychoanalysis in general see Waldenfels 1983, 417-441, 468-474, and Mahr <2000a>). Anti-metaphysical in attitude toward much of late 19th century academic philosophy, Freud advanced and at times even radicalized certain parts of philosophical discourse: *biologism* if not physicalism, albeit moderately; original and complex *terminology* as common to great philosophy; the semi- or quasi-philosophical need for *supplementing scientific research; shares in philosophical disciplines* like *téchne rhetoriké* (metapsychology, analytics, topics/topology, an ethics of therapy by hypnosis, catharsis or self recognition); a totalizing *theoretical activity* based on medicine, anthropology, social sciences and the humanities (nosography, metapsychology, psychopathology/clinical psychology, sexual/cultural/mass/art theory, critique/diagnosis of e. g. religion, general and specialized journals); the *autobiographical search for a discipline* as common with Augustine, Descartes, Rousseau, Kierkegaard or Nietzsche; the use of *mixed method* as typical for some philosophy since Plato (Ricoeur 1965; compare Mahr <2002>) fluctuating between hermeneutic, reductive, experimental, quantitative methods. As for philosophical aesthetics or the philosophy of the arts, historical accounts

acknowledge Freud's place on the map by now (Hauser 1958, Eagleton 1990, Restaino 1991, Schneider 1996, Jimenez 1997 and already Listowell 1933). Monographs in philosophical aesthetics focusing on Freud have given further evidence to this fact (Kofman 1970, Kuhns 1983, Bersani 1986). This situation encourages to conceive of a complex aesthetic theory and philosophy of the arts considering Freudian contributions. To start with the fact that although sublimation is absent from the theory of dreams, sublimation derivative of sexuality may be seen as relative to dream work: as substitutive formation (parapraxis, jokes), compromise formation, reaction formation. It may further be assumed even for Freud himself that metapsychology nourished the hopes for arriving at more general conclusions including the humanities and *a fortiori* aesthetic theory. In my forthcoming book partly devoted to Freud's psychological aesthetics, Freud's psychoanalysis of aesthetics and art is included, from a historical perspective toward philosophy, into what I term there as „psychological philosophy“. This philosophical current may be taken as specific for late 19th and early 20th century philosophy, for the continuous transformation of metaphysical philosophy into sciences and humanities as is the case with various kinds of empirical and experimental psychology and in particular with what has become known as psychological aesthetics. Freud's psychoanalysis belongs to this area although, to some extent, it resists suspicions of falling under the verdict of psychologism as used for separating philosophy from psychology, one of the points of departure both for phenomenology and analytical philosophy. In any case, this conflictual feed, if perceived, remained strong in French philosophy and aesthetics throughout the 20th century. To begin with, the first monograph about Freud's philosophical aesthetics (Kofman 1970) reveals an inspiration by then very recent philosophy of Derrida, Foucault and Deleuze (the latter reflected by psychoanalyst Green). As the titles of the their texts do not explicitly show their authors' occupation with Freud's aesthetics, and as these are the only contemporary philosophers referred to by Kofman, the question arises whether they themselves dealt with Kofman's subject matter. And, are they intrinsically linked to each other in a more programmatic way?

Historiographically, they have been put under the umbrella term poststructuralism, a term to be strengthened in showing the contributions that confront Freud. To be sure, the frequent rejection of „structuralism“ or „poststructuralism“ by the authors named may be understood all the more so as the prefix of „poststructuralism“ refers to a determinate current of thought in the negative. No matter how different the approaches of the individual representants may have been, „post structuralism“ means positions transgredient, after, yet relating to hermeneutics, phenomenology, existentialism, Marxism, psychanalysis and of course structuralism. Philosophers like Deleuze, Foucault, Derrida and, now adding to them, Kristeva, Irigaray, Kofman, Baudrillard, Cixous share the spirit of the indirect structuralist „attack“ of Lévy-Strauss, Lacan, Althusser and Barthes on traditional philosophical thought who drew consequences from Saussurean linguistics in the fields of anthropology, psychoanalysis, political economy or literary criticism. However, as these scholars refrained from a systematical critique of philosophy, potential was left for philosophy critiquing even one sided structuralism itself. At stake became, in post-metaphysical terms, the search for decentered *structures* in the process of (un)making and dependent from social and cultural context; a critique of the *subject* as applied to history/power/desire as well as a return to the *subject* as an effect of identity in difference (gender, class, belief); the fugitive *sense* of signs or works of art as an effect of structures with awareness of its illusionary character like that of presence, unity and form (Bloom 1975, Frank 1984, Munker/Rösler 2000, Belsey 2002, Williams 2005, Schrift 2006).

## 1.2 breaking new ground scientifically

*Selected as object of investigation* are all early, i.e. French philosophical, poststructuralist's texts pertaining to Freud and aesthetic matters.

The early ones from 1965 through the 1970es because it is contended that these are the most important and influential ones for today's discussion in the field.

The French ones because they have been published as early until the mid-1970es, the exception being late Foucault.

The philosophers' approaches because they resulted in texts significant for a variety of explicit and implicit references to Freud and philosophical aesthetics respectively. Linguist, literary critic and psychoanalyst *Kristeva* is included here because of her partly philosophical book 1974, her frequent philosophical references throughout her work and her monograph on a philosopher (1999a; see Schmitz 2000). *Irigaray's* aesthetic including literary connections to her feminist philosophy frequently run along Lacanian and Freudian psychoanalysis. And *Kofman's* first philosophical monograph about Freud's aesthetics is to be assumed as crucial for all what she has later written in aesthetics and beyond. (*Derrida* fulfils the requirements although rarely addressing philosophical, aesthetic topics directly and only drawing consequences in distant writings. *Foucault* and *Deleuze* belong here because their sometimes strong criticism of Freud contains aesthetic matters important to their own conceptions of aesthetics and the philosophy of the arts. *Lyotard* is an aesthetician right from the beginning of his philosophical comeback around 1970 whose not only aesthetic publications are strongly influenced by Freud.)

To announce a breaking of new ground it is emphasized that until now these authors have neither been assembled as poststructuralist philosophers, nor as readers of Freud, nor as participants in the philosophy of aesthetics and the arts.

(As will be shown and may become evident from the date of the texts, a good deal of them stem from the later 1960s until the early 1980es. For a better understanding, some of Foucault's and Deleuze's early texts referring to Freud *and* aesthetics as well as selected important texts of all major authors of later times will be included.)

(Not all poststructuralist thinkers bearing philosophical significance and interest in Freud and aesthetics are included in full. Their texts will be consulted not just when research leads to them. Literary critic *Barthes* is to be observed with his occasional particular approach to psychoanalysis and despite his rejection of a desire/lust framed by pleasure principle (1973), his separation of Freud's from Bachelard's and Sartre's psychoanalysis on methodological purposes (1965) and his expressed relationship to psychoanalysis as indifferent and not conscientious, for instance reflecting on a direct proximity of erotics and aesthetics (1975). Sociological theoretician *Baudrillard*

belongs here because of his developing a psychoanalytic critique of Cartesian *cogito* (1973), expanding on the notion of fetishism in Freud in order to claim that objects today have become pure signs detached from use (1968), and commenting on the aesthetics of Lyotard and Kristeva concerning jokes as requiring symbolic exchange, besides references to Freud in non-aesthetic contexts (1976). Writer and psychoanalysis historian *Clément* who was influenced by Lévi-Strauss and wrote two books on aesthetics has criticized psychoanalysis from a feminist point of view and insisted on reactualizing it by imposing social functions (1975, 1978a, 1978b; compare Turkle 1978). And against phallic dominance of writing, English studies professor and writer *Cixous* has called, following the surrealists and Derrida, for a body oriented *écriture féminine* explicitly conceiving of a liberation of women by way of the aesthetic technique (1975; see also Mahr 2003, 92f.) with reference to aesthetic aspects of Freudian theory time and again (1972, 1976a, 1976b, 2003.) Also, texts will be taken notice of, when met in case by Nancy, Lacoue-Labarthe, Ranciére, Badiou, Dolar and Zizek. The same applies to American poststructuralist like de Man, Hartman (see his (ed.) 1978), Bloom, J.H. Miller, Culler, Krauss, Weber, Ronell, Bolter, Wills, Butler, Rorty, Spivak, Jameson, Poster or Bersani. (What has been published in the USA from the 1970es belongs to literary criticism including philosophical reflection in its widest sense and needed to be contextualized philosophically and aesthetically in the US context and is therefore considered when necessary in the course of research.)

It is particularly necessary to keep in mind the preeminence of Freud and psychoanalysis in French thought before 1970: the multiple attempts of phenomenology (Mahr 1985) and psychiatry philosophically and anthropologically absorbing Freud as did Lagache, the surrealist artistic program and practice nourished by open academic discussion of psychoanalysis and psychiatry since the 1920's, psychology and psychiatry making Freud a focus in French philosophy after 1945 - when scholars like Lagache and Foucault taught psychology *and* philosophy, poetical *or* historical *épistémologie* (Bachelard 1938, Canguilhem 1958) - , the Colloque de Bonneval in 1960 bringing together philosophers and psychoanalysts (a. (ed.) 1966;

Roudinesco 1986, 317-328).

The most important thinker however, Lacan, was not a philosopher by education. Lacan's call for a return to the unconscious structured like language, interwoven with philosophical elements of Husserl (Mahr 1998a), surrealist theory (Mahr 1998a, 1998b), Heidegger, Hegel, French phenomenology (Mahr 1996a, 1998a, 2005a), Lévy-Straussian anthropology and Jakobson's linguistics (Roudinesco 1993), resulted in revealing ontological implications of dream within an extended concept of narcissist imaginary and the according (partial) object with coining „mirror stage“, challenging the fundamental rule of psychoanalytic technique and borrowing new sense to Freudian notions like the ideal ego, deferred action, phallus, pre-oedipal, the symbolic, overdetermination, transference, displacement and foreclosure (Lacan 1966). Lacan can well be taken as *the* point of reference to whom all of the seven author's work out relationships with almost never referring to him explicitly, the exception being Irigaray. Therefore the pertinent writings of the authors chosen are to be examined with attention to what Lacan offered them in the context of their theories. (Despite his turn to new directions in aesthetic style with for instance „Encore“, the most noted seminar of Lacan after the *Écrits* of 1966, and his mathematical musings in the last decade of his life, Lacan never disputed his credo of the unconscious being structured as language, of the primacy of the signifier, or the priority of the symbolic order for the imaginary, a credo that was put into doubts by all poststructuralists. For this reason, Lacan cannot be considered as a “poststructuralist” no matter how basic his philosophical challenge remained.)

The most important event in this philosophical history was *De l'Interprétation* of Ricoeur, the first philosophical monograph on Freud (Ricoeur 1965, Mahr <2001a>), including an energeticist reading of the metapsychological chapter of Freud's „Interpretation of Dreams“ understanding symbols as psychological productions that belong to a culture of interpretations in conflicts. The strong reaction to Ricoeur - strikingly his thorough and ground-breaking treaty is cited by none; after his „defeat“ against Foucault being elected member of the Collège de France in 1970, Ricoeur seems to have been obliterated from vanguard memory - corresponds with a new

wave of philosophical confrontation with Freud and his aesthetics, especially concerning (Ricoeur's) archeology, concept of interpretation and triple Marx-Nietzsche-Freud in Foucault, Derrida, Lyotard, Deleuze (Foucault 1969a, Derrida, Lyotard, Deleuze 1972a), difference (, compare Mahr 2007a, 320-325), desire (Deleuze , Lyotard ).

As it happens, French poststructuralist philosophy showed an interest in aesthetics to a degree that should make us think that this philosophy was intrinsically aesthetic in a certain sense, something mostly as a reproach so far. Yet the proposal here does not engage in an investigation in traditional philosophical aesthetics. Aesthetic topics undergo scrutiny here as far as they come in extent and significance with the publications to be read referring to Freud who has been inspiring with different parts of his thought in different ways. The challenge is perceived surprisingly not only from his applied "aesthetic" writings but also from his „philosophically“ important ones: Entwurf einer Psychologie 1895 (Kofman 1973), Die Traumdeutung 1900 (Foucault 1984b with critical discourse theory paving the way to an aesthetics of existence), Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten 1905 (Baudrillard 1976, Kofman 1985b), Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie 1905 (Deleuze 1972 on alternative accounts of organs for setting up desiring machines, Irigaray 1974 on sexual difference, Lyotard 1974a on the libidinal dispositif, Kofman 1980 on women), Das Unheimliche 1919 (Kofman 1975), Jenseits des Lustprinzips 1920 (Lyotard 1975c, Derrida 1980), Notiz über den Wunderblock 1925 (Derrida 1966a, on the writing apparatus), Die Verneinung 1925 (Kristeva 1974, on the semiotic process of chora/maternality), Fetischismus 1927 (Baudrillard 1968, Derrida 1978). (Taking this broad range of texts in account from which the various readings are realized, it becomes obvious that it is not advised to focus on Freud's texts written immediately after *Die Traumdeutung*, *Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens*, *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewußten* and the writings about art that followed after.)

*Kofman*. Having studied with psychoanalyst Green for two years and made the *doctorat d'État* with Deleuze (1972, 1974a), Kofman's work oscillated between



thinking about Nietzsche and Freud to a great deal. Another point of reference was Derrida (1984). Not long after her long review article on Jean Bollack's „Empédocle“ and Freud's „Die endliche und die unendliche Analyse“ (1969) Kofman published her philosophical treatise on Freud's theory of art (1970). Her philosophical position is to be found by means of a close reading of „L'Enfance de l'art“, a book aiming at recognizing the philosophy of Freud. Accounting for Freud's attitude to art - no genius/artist is gifted by nature - as a child to the father, Kofman departs from the difference between a factual reading of the artwork as a model for unconscious processes and a symptomal reading of the (text of) the artwork as a patricide, this difference as one of saying/doing being applied to Freud himself. The symptomal of the artwork is shown to be a compromise between eros and thanatos that contains the phantasma and the pathema inseparably. *Freud's theory of art read as symptomal text and child ambivalent to the father implies an understanding of Freud in the medium of (philosophical) thought.* Soon after, she dealt with the photographic aspects of Freud's „Entwurf einer Psychologie“ (1973). With a strong interest in the philosophy of art and literature as well as in feminist theory she kept exploring Freud's writings (1980a, 1985b, 1987, 1991a, 1991b, 1995) with interpreting Freud's „Der Wahn und die Träume ...“ (1974), applying the aspect of the double in Freud's „Das Unheimliche“ to imitation (1975, 1976), pondering the attraction of narcissist women to men with comparison to the attraction of children, animals, comic or criminal persons (1980b), and relating Freud to the philosophy of Plato, Kant, Rousseau and Diderot (1982, 1985a, 1988). Also, as an extension of her early book on Freud, the relations of wit to language and women are examined (1980a, 1980b, 1982), and the role of mixed pleasure in wit (1985b). Her second focus and object of study was Freud's „double“ Nietzsche (1972, 1979, 1993). In order to delineate Kofman's position, her views on Freud and Nietzsche shall be compared with her own philosophical position, referring to psychoanalysis as border discipline between science and philosophy aesthetically relevant (1991a). *Freud is Nietzsche's uncanny doppelgänger.*

*Liotard.* Probably the only one to transform Merleau-Ponty's late philosophy into a

Freudian aesthetics, Lyotard radicalized it as a philosophy of desire (Waldenfels 1983; Lyotard 1979b), not unlike that of Deleuze (1975a). At a time when Freud-Maxism was already in full swing, Lyotard completed a thesis on representation and figuration according to Freud's dream mechanism *Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit* (1971; compare Deleuze 1972b) preceded by the proto-aesthetic manifesto „Dream work does not think“ where Lyotard had already credited Freud with opposing to the universality and uniqueness of dreams (1968). In order to include artistic energy, it was intensities to play the lead, now opposite to discourse and figuration - at that time, he re coined Foucault's notion of *disposition* as *dispositif* with the Freudian epitheton „libidinal“ and within a Freudian model of an instinctual „pulsional“ economy (1973a, 1973b, 1973c, 1974a, 1975b) that should become important in 1980es art theory (compare Mahr 1996b, 174f./184f., with an attempt to apply „Libidodispositiv“). With a theory of the sublime, Lyotard made recourse to Kant and Burke (1982, 1984, 1986a, 1986b, 1988a, 1988b, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c) but kept following traces of Freud: Mahr 2003c). *The concept of the libidinal economy/dispositif allows an extended theory of the sublime/sublimation.* A step further is set by Lyotard with his attempt for a Freudian aesthetics of apathic theory pondering the ambiguous status of theory in science (1975c). This and other 1970es writings about and with Freud enable a new consideration of Lyotard's theory of postmodernity with respect to art and architecture as well as to Freud's essay on Schreber and his notion of deferred action (1987/1988, 1979a, 1983; Mahr <2000b>). *The postmodern „structure“ of for example the arts came to effect when Lyotard exploited his poststructuralist stake with Nachträglichkeit historically and aesthetically.* Lyotard also examined Freud for contributing to film theory (1977a, 1979c) and effectively to a theory of the non-motional visual arts (1977b, 1978, 1981a, 1981b).

*Derrida.* Continuously thinking about Freud throughout his life, Derrida set out to use Husserl and Heidegger in the context of his theory of writing that drew inspiration from the assumptions of surrealist *écriture automatique*. His is the endeavour of a philosophy of trace without presupposed subject. Hence, Derrida

bases Freud's mnemonic Bahnungskräfte in the „Entwurf einer Psychologie“ on posterior elements, as the origin in general is supplementary or *hors-texte* in Freud too, an argument used against phonologism. Placed between two essays on Artaud (1965, 1966b) and Althusserian in its anti-humanist tone and hidden reference to a theatre without author (Althusser 1993 <1964/65>), the seminal paper of Derrida on Freud's „Wunderblock“ (1966a), later extended to the scene of dream (1967), was as inspiring as to later stimulate the apparatus theory of film and literature (compare about the visual model of the brain of Freud's „The Id and the Ego“ in Mahr <1999b>, Mahr 2006a). The remark on Freud in the systematics of *difference* further included a temporisation in the field of an originary economy with Bataille relevant to Freud (1968c, Mahr 2003b). *The surrealist writing of the unconscious shares with the theater/scene/play of writing an aesthetic and literary philosophy*. Seconded with reflections on the psychoanalytic importance of Lacanian subtext as done in his interpretations of Artaud, Rousseau, Lévi-Strauss, Kant and Plato, Derrida suggested a return to mythos with anti-phenomenologically criticizing *logos* in front of allegory and phallogocentrism (1965, 1966b, 1967, 1968a, 1968b, 1969, 1974a, 1975, 1976, 1978, for a criticism of 1978 see Mahr 1993). He dealt with Lacan (1971), finally attacking him (1980a). *Against Lacan, the return to myth supports an aesthetics parallel to para-philosophical discipline of „grammatology“*. At the same time he intensified his occupation with Freud from the late 1970ies (1979a, 1980a, 1983) culminating in a volume inspired by Levinas's concept of the other (1987a, 1987b). With re-reading Lacan, Foucault and Lyotard (1990a, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 2001a) and criticizing some psychoanalytic institutions, for instance archives (1981, 1995), Derrida continued to take particular points of departure for work on more general philosophical topics (1996, 2000, 2001b, 2002; 2001; Roudinesco 1986). (An account of Derrida's several approaches to Freud ought to constantly keep in the corner of the eye - by way of a hermeneutics of suspicion - that Derrida's reflections about theatre, music, literature, architecture and art are (or may be) inspired by his occupation with Freud (1965, 1966a, 1966b; 1967, 1979b; 1972, 1974b, 1980b, 2000; 1985b, 1986a, 1986b, Mahr <1999d>; 1978, 1985a, 1990b, 1990c).)

*Irigaray*. Philosopher, psychologist, psychopathologist and linguist by education as well as trained in psychoanalysis, Irigaray became known with analyzing the language of mental illness, especially dementia (1973). In the first third of her opus magnum (1974) she subjected Freud to heavy criticism (see also 1977c) under the premises of a feminist theory of sexual difference. Transgressing Beauvoir's egalitarian feminism, Irigaray's work represented the focus for liberation of writing as an act subverting male, phallogocentric language. With respect to sexualization as an act before sublimation, Irigaray aimed at returning of the suppressed. Rejecting interconnected gazes, poses and genitalia in Freud's sexual theory with upholding a feminine imaginary, enabled Irigaray to gain insight into an unknown, feminine desire and an acting-out of masquerades of femininity. Also, for a long time women were destined to mimicry; now they play with mimesis revealing women's place elsewhere (1975). *Masquerade as sexuality inscribed is seen as theatrical practice*. Non-located pleasure came to the fore, a pleasure of a being-always-more-than-one (1977a; compare Mahr 2003a, chapter „Sex“, 75-98, 92f. and 89-91, 94, with regards to Irigaray's influence on conceiving sex as theatrical practice in Butler 1990). She further developed and applied her position in various essays (1977a, 1977b, 1979, 1981, 1984, 1992). As she had done with Plato on the background of Freud (1974), another critique emerged from a more detailed reading of Heidegger (1982). Like Kofman, Irigaray needs to be studied in her interpretations of philosophical texts like that of Nietzsche and Freud (1989) and in writings concerning the feminine in art (1988, 1994). With regards to sexual difference, sublimation is considered neither genital nor female altogether like Freud, says Irigaray, who did not acknowledge genitally determined drives in women accordingly related to the minor arts and only exceptionally to poetry, painting and music - a recognition that allows for conceiving „non-sublimation“ in women's activity directed toward the Other (1984; compare 2003, 2004). *With criticizing Freud, Irigaray's concept of sexual difference entails a new aesthetics of sexualization understood as an act before sublimation*.

*Kristeva*. From the outset, Kristeva has been examining the theoretical uses of psychoanalysis. Educated in linguistics and literary studies and later trained as

psychoanalyst she conceived of a *sémanalyse* to merge the tasks of psychoanalysis and semiology/semiotics (1969), an endeavour further involving philosophical reflection (1974; Schmitz 2000). What Kristeva made term as revolutionary, semiotic primary process of poetic language - differing from Lacan's symbolic - was at the same time resuming Lacan's discourse of the real, now taken as an appearance of a drive: the vehicle for explaining phenomena like the appearance of the surrounding maternal bodily *chora*, with reference to Plato (1974, 1979; compare Derrida 1987c). In order to „dynamize“ signs, Kristeva threw the subject back into sensual dynamics (1973, again 1977a, 1976, 1977b), only to play the card as a form of revolt (1974; compare <1999b> (= Mahr <1999c>) on the imaginary complicit with a revolution of the unconscious decentering the conscious subject of exterior experience as in the borderline states of psycho-social pathologies in modern literature; reversely, Kristeva shed increasingly light on the literary potential of psychoanalysis itself (1990, 1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1998b, 2002, 2003). *The program of sémanalyse is a psychoanalytic philosophy of language expanded by a bodily based aesthetics of poetic revolt.* With interpreting for instance art and literature, psychoanalysis stayed on the agenda with the topics disgust - the abject, an offspring of *Aufhebung* as (non)sublimation/*Verwerfung* (1974) - , the city, love, identification (1980, 1983, 1984a, 1984b). Particular attention deserve Kristeva's later publications, for instance her apprehensions of Barthes's occasional comments on psychoanalysis (1996, 1997) or the philosophical work of Arendt and Klein. It is claimed that Kristeva reactualized the philosophical momentum in Freud now based on the aesthetic of linguistic differentiation in bodily based interaction (1999a, 2000). Also, a concept of phantasy is reformulated preserving the uproaring potential contrary to Freud's notion of phantasizing as sublimatory (1998b). *Phantasy can be read as a revolt against sublimation.* More recently Kristeva reconsidered feminist aspects of her position concerning the phenomenon of the holy (1998a) and on philosopher Hannah Arendt as well as psychoanalyst Melanie Klein confronting the Kantian fragile faculty of taste as a pleasure on duty with the Freudian concept of suppression (1999a, 2000). *Foucault.* At a time when Freud was still to be found among psychologists,

philosopher and psychologist by education Foucault was concerned with transcending psychology by means of Binswanger's *Daseinsanalyse* (1954a, 1954b, 1957a, 1957b, 1965). A bit later, the analysis of dreams was considered to reveal Husserl's theory of meaning as subjective and Freud's symptomatology as objective with leading a psychoanalysis of images to an ontological analysis of imagination (1957b). With attacking psychiatry and the psychoanalytic conceptions of melancholy and hysteria, and with demanding psychosis and schizophrenia be left un-diagnosed Foucault focused on the role of madness as a mental and epistemic phenomenon (1961, 1962a, 1962b, 1964a; for an application of the last chapter of the English translation of 1961 to modern art see Mahr <1999a>). Yet Foucault continued to revolve around the unconscious and its traces in the literary interpretations of Rousseau (1962c), Flaubert (1966c), Bataille (1963), Blanchot (1966b), or Klossowski (1964b) in order to reclaim Freud as liberating language as such from madness as French literature had done since Mallarmé (1964a). Although Foucault accords to Freud a modest place in his monumental historical epistemology of modern times, the last spurs of modern *epistémé* in Lacanian psychoanalysis and Lévi-Straussian anthropology are characterized within an unfolding of the unconscious the modern sciences exhausting the epistemic and literary subject (1966, Mahr <1999a>). *The unfolding of the unconscious and its traces of literature of Rousseau, Flaubert, Bataille, Blanchot, or Klossowski yield a structural function of Freud for dissolving representation in modern arts and episteme*. This paves the way for rephrasing Ricoeur's skepticist trio Marx/Nietzsche/Freud with interpretation not anymore giving way to the being of language (1964a), but as integral part of discourse to be observed, the effect being sexuality not seen as nourishing language but being regulated by the powers of discourse (1967, 1976a). Yet, a renewed hermeneutic concept of interpretation will serve as part of a concept of care when, besides and against Freud and his theory of dreams, Foucault, with his hermeneutic/technology of the self (1988), prepares for an aesthetics of existence with Freudian ingredients (1981, 1984a, 1984b, 1984c). *An occupation with Freud and the method of interpretation lays the basis for an aesthetics of existence on the basis of a hermeneutics of the self*. Before arriving at

this conclusion, Freud will have served Foucault as demonstration point for a critical discourse theory of the constraint to speak the truth, of the relation of sex and power, of Freud's discourse founding an „authorship“ inextricably linked to autoanalysis (1969a, 1973, 1976a, 1977a) and for explicit criticism on Freud siding with Deleuze in his lecture on king Oedipus (1994) as already in remarks concerning Freud's text on *Teufelsneurose* (1969b) and in a discussion circle of psychoanalysts (1977b). *The para-philosophical disciplines „archeology“ and „genealogy“ carry paraaesthetical dimensions as demonstrated by Freud.*

*Deleuze.* The number of Freud occurrences in Deleuze's earlier non-monograph writings is only matched by Kant, Foucault and Nietzsche (2002). Although he referred to Freud in his book about Nietzsche only three times, there is a similarity between Nietzsche and Freud as Deleuze himself indicates (1962). As Deleuze's reading of Nietzsche relates to the period's intensive occupation with Freud in and besides philosophy around 1960 (Roudinesco 1986, see also Gasser 1997) and Nietzsche is crucial for Deleuze's concepts of repetition and differential, the hypothesis is as follows: *The double and counterpoint of Nietzsche to Freud may be conceived as a poetic figure.* A first explicit difference with Freud is shown in the theory of masochism with respect to the significance of a heterogeneous world without symbolization as shown in the literature of Sacher-Masoch (1967a, 1967b). A more complex picture of Freud with further criticism is shown in the major books of the period (1968, 1969) and a remark on the differential unconscious in Deleuze's account of structuralism (1973b). According to it, the order of the symbolic by way of the elements' positions depends on the differentiability prior to the structure and sense of all effects. Therefore, a concept of a differential unconscious cannot be maintained. Then, together with psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Félix Guattari. *The return of the repressed body and affect gives way to an anti-oedipal aesthetic of desiring machines.* At stake was a promotion of the return of what was repressed by Lacan as well as Freud in part, a return of the Freud of affects, a Reichian antipsychiatrist synthesis with holding polymorphous-libidinal madness and schizophrenia against familial Oedipian psychoanalytic conformism with the concept of desiring machines

(1972a, 1970a, 1973a). What does the conception of a radical philosophy of desiring machines consist of (1970b, 1973b)? Which is the Anti-Oedipus Freud share of Guattari who thought psychoanalysis miserable (Roudinesco 1986)? A second volume of „Capitalism and Schizophrenia“ was called „Mille Plateaux“ instead of „Schizoanalysis“ because of the dawn of Freudianism to be observed in the late 1970ies (1980; 1970b, see also 1975c, 1975b, 1975a; Roudinesco 1986) although there are frequent occurrences of Freud (Mahr <2006b>). Also, a more clarified stance on Freud is given at that time, for instance about Freud's analysis of the Wolf Man (1977a, 1977b, 1975a). As the essay on Sacher-Masoch (1967a) is about a novelist like the books about Carroll, Proust and Kafka (1969, 1970, 1975d) the questions arise to which extent Deleuze's readings of literature contain ingredients resulting in a theory of literature and how this theory resists or adapts to psychoanalytic interpretation. Deleuze wrote his later monographs in part on the visual arts clarifying his position on Freud (1981, 1983, 1985) this time influenced by Foucault's aesthetics of existence (1986, 1991).

*Freud's theory is important for poststructuralist philosophy as far as it is heteroclitite, diagnostic, therapeutic and transgressive.* If not a post-structuralist himself, he certainly prepared for decentering the conscious ego and subverting/deducing it from familial, cultural, social and historical context and practice, drawing the consequential elements for a construction of identities in difference (gender, class, belief), ascertaining already a seemingly endless interpretation of aesthetic signs as effect of symbolic structures and considering it as illusionary. If undermined by aesthetic anaesthesia, disgust or bodily subversion in language today, a philosophical theory of the aesthetic in terms of aesthetic qualities/aisthesis *and* of the arts producing aesthetic like Freud's psychological one helped to prepare assumptions that

*there might be no unity of the aesthetic in Freud* taken as a consequence with Freud's theory. Moreover there is an anti-aesthetic actualized and radicalized with the notions of the sublime (Lyotard), of disgust (Derrida, Kristeva), the terrific (Lyotard), the uncanny (Kofman), the phantastic (Kristeva). According to more recent



extravaganzas of the ideology of the aesthetic (Mahr 2003a), this may be read as an anti-aesthetization, a desublimation in discontents with culture, a desublimation of our environment and an aesthetization of philosophy.

*there might be no work of art with Freud*, no theory of art because of the nature of writing (Derrida), the aesthetic machines instead (Deleuze), a pathological absence of work (Foucault), painting only as libidinal dispositif (Lyotard), a childhood of art instead of adult production (Kofman), a child as work of art (Irigaray), figuration without representation (Lyotard). What Freud holds - that the artist/genius makes the best of his/her neuroses, and play and phantasizing may but need not result in a work of art - makes the poststructuralists dispense with art as a primary object of reflection and shift attention to the fragile semiotic expressions.

*there might be no stable aesthetic experience with Freud* because sublimation is undermined by a permanent sources of discontents, difference of roles and fluent entities. Moreover, aesthetic experience dissolves into a field of forces of intensities (Lyotard), sexual difference by masquerade (Irigaray), the sensual dynamics of chora (Kristeva), an aesthetics of existence to be constantly weighed out (Foucault), the finitude of desiring machines (Deleuze).

Now, assembling all the hypotheses relating to the seven authors above, they may be grouped with respect to the tackling of the aesthetics of sublimation, of the unconscious, the self and of Freud's theory as applied to history, the history of philosophy, and philosophy.

Firstly, the unconscious is not so much structured as language but as more dynamical bodily activity and writing. A revolution of the body is contained in two programs. The return of the repressed body and affect gives way to an anti-oedipal aesthetic of desiring machines (Deleuze). The program of *sémanalyse* is a psychoanalytic philosophy of language expanded by a bodily based aesthetics of poetic revolt (Kristeva). The scene of writing may be identified as another point against stark linguistic structure. The surrealist writing of the unconscious shares with the theater/scene/play of writing an aesthetic and literary philosophy (Derrida). Masquerade as sexuality inscribed is seen as theatrical practice (Irigaray).

Secondly, sublimation has become a hotly disputed topic: The concept of the libidinal economy/dispositif allows an extended theory of the sublime/sublimation (Lyotard). Phantasy can be read as a revolt against sublimation (Kristeva). With criticizing Freud, Irigaray's concept of sexual difference entails a new aesthetics of sexuation understood as an act before sublimation (Irigaray).

Thirdly, an aesthetics of the self is delineated by a conflictual care of the self transgressing the mode of art work. An occupation with Freud and the method of interpretation sets the base for an aesthetics of existence on the basis of a hermeneutics of the self (Foucault). Freud's theory of art read as symptomatic text and child ambivalent to the father implies an understanding of Freud in the medium of (philosophical) thought (Kofman).

Additionally, a series of applications - the reach of psychoanalysis into history, the history of philosophy, and philosophy - needs to be examined for gaining the contribution value to aesthetics. The first couple of hypotheses concern the *history of the "modern"*. The unfolding of the unconscious and its traces of literature of Rousseau, Flaubert, Bataille, Blanchot, or Klossowski yield a structural function of Freud for dissolving representation in modern arts and episteme (Foucault). The postmodern „structure“ of for example the arts came to effect when Lyotard exploited his poststructuralist stake with „Nachträglichkeit“ historically and aesthetically (Lyotard). The second couple of claims concerns the proximity of a Freud contemporary. For Kofman, Freud is Nietzsche's uncanny doppelgänger (Kofman). The double and counterpoint of Nietzsche to Freud may be conceived as a poetic figure (Deleuze). And the third two theses question at least indirectly the philosophical status of aesthetics itself. Against Lacan, the return to myth supports an aesthetics parallel to para-philosophical discipline of „grammatology“ (Derrida). The para-philosophical disciplines „archeology“ and „genealogy“ carry paraaesthetical dimensions as demonstrated by Freud (Foucault).

More pervasively, the hypothesis may be formulated that *Derrida, Foucault and Deleuze, as referred to by Kofman 1970, Kofman herself and philosophers of the period like Lyotard, Irigaray and Kristeva contribute to poststructuralism by way of*

*their approaches to the oeuvre of Freud: decentered structures* in the process of (un)making and dependent from social and cultural context, critique of and return to the *subject* applied to history/power/desire as effect of identity in difference, fugitive *sense* of works of art as an effect of structures with awareness of its illusionary character.

(In contrast to this more connective hypothetical account, there must not be forgotten - for the sake of further differentiation - that there are significant distinctions between the authors under examination. Two directions of research need to be gone here. As a prerequisite, a painstaking characterization of the several individual philosophical positions - and positions in philosophical aesthetics - is to be rendered in order to recognize why which writings of Freud were chosen. And a determination of the respective treating of the Freud passages/writings and topics by comparable readings will unearth the final differences of the poststructuralist authors to be read.)

### 1.3 importance of expected results for the discipline

The expected results should give further evidence for including the thought of Sigmund Freud into philosophy, a more critical discussion of systematic philosophical aesthetics, a deeper understanding of the philosophy covered by the term poststructuralism.

Another more particular goal is to foster the discussion with the philosophy of psychoanalysis in the analytic tradition (Giampieri-Deutsch (ed.) 2004).

The most important aim however is to give to the discipline aesthetics fresh impulses in order to give back to aesthetics the role it deserves, but seems to have lost since the 1980es.

### 1.4 methods

In order to achieve the research goal in three years, a strict reading methodology needs to be observed. The steps include -

*concerning Freud*

- to collect the passages of texts of the French philosophers pertinent to (which?)

Freud's writings, in case of long Freud portions (for example Deleuze 1972a, Derrida 1980a) with particular attention to aesthetic matters in them

- to take notice, in passing, of references to the psychoanalysis of Lacan, Klein and other psychoanalytic authors referred to explicitly or implicitly
- to re-read Freud for a better understanding of the passages found
- to re-collect all the French passages found in order to coordinate them to the singular texts of Freud and within the context of his work (compare double reading method in Mahr 2004a)

*concerning French poststructuralism*

- to determine the various uses of Freud texts by the French authors' in the context of their own respective work/texts
- to situate Freud in the writings screened and assess the role Freud's writings play
- to evaluate the findings with respect to the (non-)proximity to the author's core thought (passages and chapters)
- to compare the various uses by the French authors' and assess their importance
- to give preliminary accounts of the French authors' interpretations of Freud and address the differences between their interpretive perspectives (method Mahr 2004a) with respect to central topics like autoanalysis, sexuality, sublimation, Freud-Marxism, the unconscious, symbolization, women, melancholy, technique, psychic apparatus (compare the Taureck (ed.) 1988 sections on subject, metaphysics, sexuality, violence)

*concerning aesthetics*

- to refocus the passages found according to the aesthetic topics immediately found in the French authors or according to the aesthetic position of the authors
- to address the aesthetics of the French theoreticians in order to establish a philosophical framework of what is their philosophical aesthetics
- to pay particular attention to Freud mentionings in longer aesthetics portions

*finally*

- to assess lacks in poststructuralism and in consequence criticize misapprehensions or highlight valuables in Freud
- to develop an awareness for a possible history of reception similar to that of Nietzsche (Le Rider 1997, an example of a short and concise account full of verve)

- to indirectly bring relief, expansion and suggestions for the German Lacan reception reading Ricoeur, Laplanche and Pontalis, but nobody of the poststructuralists (compare hypocritical Gadamer 2000).

2 aspects implied for scientific community and beyond

Results and effects to be expected will be important for further research in psychoanalysis and other humanities involved with French philosophy, particularly in Vienna where a significant part of research in French philosophy is done today (Arno Böhler, Ulrike Kadi, Peter Kampits, Yvanka Raynova, Susanne Moser, Sylvia Stoller, Gerhard Unterthurner, Erik Vogt, Eva Waniek; see also for Vienna continental philosophy in general <http://foo.phl.univie.ac.at/fb01/> Also, the discussion with the philosophy of psychoanalysis in the tradition of analytic philosophy shall further be enhanced (Giampieri-Deutsch (ed.) 2004). Being aware of this aspect, impulses for research in German philosophy and continental philosophy abroad may be expected.

Impulses and effects for other fields of research and beyond the scientific community are to be expected with an additional translation of activities described in last paragraph.

3 list of literature relevant to project

Included are short titles of monographs (year of publication in bold face) and of articles (with the sources providing full titles of main authors to be examined, and their respective indications of secondary literature to be read).

A. (ed.) **1966**VIe Colloque de Bonneval: L'Inconscient - **ADORNO** 1951Freudian Theory and the Pattern of Fascist Propaganda - **ALTHUSSER** **1993**Écrits sur la psychanalyse. Freud et Lacan. Textes réunis - **ASSOUN** **1976**Freud, la philosophie et les philosophes - **1981**Introduction à l'épistémologie freudienne - **1993**Introduction à la métapsychologie freudienne - **BACHELARD** **1938**La psychanalyse du feu - **BARTHES** **1965**Michelet par lui-même - **1973**Le plaisir du texte - **1975**Roland Barthes par Roland Barthes - **BAUDRILLARD** **1968**Le Système des objets - **1973**Le

Miroir de la production - **1976a**L'Echange symbolique et la mort - **BELSEY**  
**2002**Poststructuralism, a very short introduction - **BERSANI 1986**The Freudian  
 Body: Psychoanalysis and Art - **BINSWANGER 1942** Grundformen und Erkenntnis  
 menschlichen Daseins - **BLOOM 1975**Kabbalah and Criticism - **BOSS**  
**1957**Psychoanalyse und Daseinsanalytik - **BÜHLER 1927**Die Krise der Psychologie  
 - **BURGIN 1986**The End of Art Theory. Criticism and Postmodernity - **BUTLER**  
**1990**Gender Trouble - **CANGUILHEM 1958**Qu'est-ce que la psychologie? -  
**CARROLL 1987**Paraesthetics. Foucault. Lyotard. Derrida - **CAVELL 1993**The  
 Psychopanalytic Mind: From Freud to Philosophy - **CIXOUS 1972**La fiction et ses  
 phantômes. Une lecture de l'*Unheimliche* - 1976aLe Rire de la Méduse - 1976bLa  
 missexualité, où jouis-je? - **2003**Rêve, je te dis - **CLÉMENT 1975**Miroirs du sujet -  
**1978a**Bildoungue, une vie de Freud? - **1978b**Les fils de Freud sont fatigués -  
**DELEUZE 1962**Nietzsche et la philosophie 1967aPrésentation de Sacher-Masoch -  
 1967b - **1968**Différence et répétition - **1969**Logique du sens - 1970aSchizologie -  
**1970b**Proust et les signes - **1972a**(+Guattari)Capitalisme et schizophrénie -  
 1972bAppréciation <on Lyotard's Discours, figure - 1973a(+Guattari)  
 Bilanprogramme pour machines désirantes - 1973À Quoi reconnaît-on le  
 structuralisme? - 1975a(+Guattari)<on Freud's Wolf Man> - 1975bSchizophrénie et  
 société - 1975c(+Lyotard)A propos du departement de psychanalyse -  
**1975d**(+Guattari)Kafka. Pour une littérature mineure - **1976**(+Guattari)Rhizome:  
 Introduction - **1977a**(+Parnet)Dialogues - 1977b(+Guattari)Politique et psychanalyse  
 - 1978Presentation on: "Freud et la psychanalyse" - **1980**(+Guattari)Capitalisme et  
 schizophrénie 2 - **1981**Francis Bacon - **1983**Cinema-1 - **1985**Cinéma-2 - 1986aSur le  
 régime cristallin - 1986bLa vie comme une oeuvre d'art - **1991**(+Guattari)Qu'est-ce  
 que la philosophie? - **2002**L'Île déserte (Didier Gazagnadou, Deleuze / Bibliographie  
 et mondes inédits, [http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php?](http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php?cle=187&groupe=Bibliographie%20et%20mondes%20in%20édits&langue=2)  
 cle=187&groupe=Bibliographie%20et%20mondes%20in%20édits&langue=2 dl Jan  
 2, 2007) - **DERRIDA 1965**La Parole soufflé - 1966aFreud et la scène de l'écriture -  
 1966bLa théâtre de la cruauté ou la clôture de la représentation - **1967**De la  
 grammatologie - 1968aLa pharmacie de Platon <I> - 1968bLa pharmacie de Platon

<II> - 1968cLa différence - 1969Nature, culture, écriture - 1971Entretien avec Houdebine et Scarpetta - **1972**La Dissémination - **1974a**Glas - 1974bMallarmé - **1978**La Vérité en peinture 1979aMe - Psychoanalysis (Introduction to Abraham's Le Verbier de l'homme aux loups) - 1979bCe qui reste à force de musique - **1980a**La Carte postale: De Socrate à Freud - 1980bThe Law of Genre - 1981Géopsychanalyse - 1983La chance - 1985aDroit de regards: photographie - 1985bBernard Tschumi. La Case vide: La Villette - 1986aArchitecture et philosophie - 1986bPoint de Folie - Maintenant l'architecture - **1987a**Psyché: Inventions de l'autre - 1987bEntretien avec Jacques Derrida - 1987cChora - 1990aLet us not Forget - Psychoanalysis - **1990b**Mémoires d'aveugle. L'autoportrait et autres ruines 1990cVideor - 1991Pour l'amour de Lacan - **1992a**Résistances - 1992bEtre juste avec Freud: L'histoire de la folie - **1995**Mal d'archive. Une impression freudienne - 1996As *if I were dead* - 2000Word Processing - **2001a**(+Roudinesco) De quoi demain - 2001bLyotard et *nous* - 2002Psychoanalytic Searches (Peter Krapp, Jacques Derrida - Bibliography of Works, <http://www.hydra.umn.edu/derrida/jdyr.html> accessed Aug 10, 2007 and Peter Zeillinger, Jacques Derrida. Bibliographie der französischen, deutschen und englischen Werke, Wien: Turia + Kant 2005) - **DUFRENNE 1953**Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique - **EAGLETON 1990**The Ideology of the Aesthetic - **FOUCAULT 1954a**Maladie mentale et personnalité - 1954bIntroduction - 1957aLa recherche scientifique et la psychologie - 1957bLa psychologie de 1850 à 1950 - **1961**Histoire de la folie - 1962aMaladie mentale et psychologie - 1962bLe 'non' du père - 1962cIntroduction aux Dialogues de Rousseau - 1963Préface à la transgression - 1964aLa folie, l'absence d'oeuvre - 1964bLa prose d'Actéon - 1965Philosophie et psychologie - **1966a**Les mots et les choses - La pensée du dehors - 1966cUn „fantastique“ de bibliothèque - 1967Nietzsche, Freud, Marx - 1969aQu'est-ce qu'un auteur? - 1969bMédecins, juges et sorciers au XVIIe siècle - 1973Em torno de Édipo - **1976a**Histoire de la sexualité 1 - 1976bL'Occident et la vérité du sexe - 1977aPreface Anti-Oedipus - 1977bLe jeu de Michel Foucault, in *Ornicar?* - 1981Sexuality and Solitude - **1984a**Histoire de la sexualité 2 - **1984b**Histoire de la sexualité 3 - 1984cL'éthique de souci de soi comme pratique de liberté -

1988 Technologies of the self - **1994** La vérité et les formes juridiques (Michael Buchmann, Bibliografie der Texte Michel Foucaults, <http://www.poststrukturalismus.ag.vu/originalausgaben.html> accessed Aug 10, 2007 and James W. Bernauer, The Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984, in: Michel Foucault's Force of Flight, New Jersey/London-E: 1990, 231-254) - **FRANK 1984** Was ist Neostrukturalismus? - **FROMM 1931** Die Entwicklung des Christudogmas. Eine psychoanalytische Studie zur sozialpsychologischen Funktion der Religion - **GARDNER 1996** Aesthetics - **GASSER 1997** Nietzsche und Freud - **GADAMER 2000** Geleitwort >Lang, Strukturele Psychoanalyse> - **GENETTE 1997** L'OEuvre d'art. II. La relation esthétique - **GIAMPIERI-DEUTSCH** (ed.) 2004 Psychoanalyse im Dialog der Wissenschaften. Bd. 2: Anglo-Amerikanische Perspektiven - **GÖDDE 1999** Traditionslinien des Unbewußten. Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Freud - **HARTMAN** (ed.) **1978** Psychopanalysis and the Question of Text - **HAUSER 1958** Philosophie der Kunstgeschichte – **HEMECKER 1991** Vor Freud. Philosophiegeschichtliche Voraussetzungen der Psychoanalyse - **IRIGARAY 1973** Le Langage des déments - **1974** Speculum de l'autre femme - 1975 Pouvoir du discours/Subordination du féminin - 1977a Ce sexe qui n'en est pas un - 1977b Retour à la théorie psychanalytique - 1977c Cet autre, la femme - 1979 Et l'une ne bouge pas sans l'autre - 1981 Le Corps-à-corps avec la mère - **1982** L'Oubli de l'air chez Martin Heidegger - **1984** Éthique de la différence sexuelle - 1988 Die Kunst von Frauen - 1989 Nietzsche, Freud et les femmes - 1992 J'aime à toi: esquisse d'une félicité dans l'histoire - 1994 Le jardin clos de l'âme: l'imaginaire des religieuses - 2003 A Future Horizon for Art? - 2003 To Paint the Invisible – **JIMENEZ 1997** Qu'est-ce que l'esthétique? - **KOFMAN 1969** Freud et Empédocle - **1970** L'Enfance de l'art: une interprétation de l'esthétique freudienne - **1972** Nietzsche et la métaphore - 1973 Freud - l'appareil photographique - **1974** Quatre romans analytiques - 1975 Vautour rouge (Le double dans *les Élixirs du diable* d'Hoffmann) - 1976 <on mimesis> - **1979** Nietzsche et la scène philosophique - 1980a L'Énigme de la femme: la femme dans les textes de Freud - 1980b La femme narcissique: Freud et Girard - 1982 Le



Respect des femmes: Kant et Rousseau - 1983Un Métier impossible - **1984**Lectures de Derrida - **1985a**La Mélancolie de l'art - **1985b**Pourquoi rit-on? Freud et le mot d'esprit - **1987**Conversions: "Le Marchand de Venise" sous le signe de Saturne - 1988Mirror and Oneiric Images. Plato, Precursor of Freud - **1991a**"Il n'y a que le premier pas qui coûte": Freud et la spéculation - **1991b**(+Masson)Don Juan ou le Refus de la dette - **1993**Explosion. II, Les enfants de Nietzsche - **1995**L'imposture de la beauté: et autres textes (Duncan Large, Sarah Kofman: Bibliography, 1963-1998, in: Penelope Deutscher/Kelly Oliver (Hg.), Enigmas. Essays on Sarah Kofman, Ithaca-NY/London-E: Cornell University Press 1999, 264-275) - **KRISTEVA 1969**Séméiotiké: recherches pour une sémanalyse - 1973Le Sujet en procès - **1974b**La Révolution du langage poétique: l'avant-garde à la fin du XIXe siècle - 1976Contraintes rythmiques et langage poétique - **1977a**Polylogue - 1977bLa Musique parlée - 1979Il n'y a pas de maître à langage - **1980**Pouvoirs de l'horreur. Essai sur l'abjection 1983Psychoanalysis and the polis - **1984a**Histoires d'amour - 1984bDe l'identification: Freud, Baudelaire, Stendhal - **1987a**Soleil noir. Dépression et mélancolie 1987bLa Vierge de Freud - **1988**Étrangers à nous-mêmes - 1990A quoi bon des psychanalystes en temps de détresse qui s'ignore - 1992Hystérie, les signes et le roman - 1993aPsychanalyse et linguistique - 1993bLa psychanalyse c'est du roman - 1994The Semiotic and the symbolic - **1996**Sens et non-sens de la révolte - **1997**La Révolte intime - **1998a**(+Clément)Le féminin et le sacré - 1998bPsychoanalysis and the Imaginary - **1999a**Le Génie féminin: la vie, la folie, les mots: Hannah Arendt - 1999bDas literarische Denken denken (= Mahr <1999c>) - **2000**Le Génie féminin: Mélanie Klein - 2001Artaud entre psychose et révolte - 2002Psychanalyse et liberté - 2003Pelléas et Mélisande: Ein tönende Melancholie (Hélène Volat, Julia Kristeva: A Bibliography, <http://ms.cc.sunysb.edu/%7Ehvolat/kristeva/kristeva.htm> accessed Aug 10, 2007) - **KUHNS 1983** Psychoanalytic Theory of Art: A Philosophy of Art on Developmental Principles - **LACAN 1966**Écrits - **LISTOWELL 1933**Modern Aesthetics. An Historical Introduction - **LYOTARD 1968**Le Travail du rêve ne pense pas - **1971**Discours, figure - 1972Psychanalyse et peinture - **1973a**Des Dispositifs pulsionnels - **1973b**Dérive à partir de Marx et Freud - 1973cLa Peinture comme

dispositif libidinal - **1974a**Économie libidinale - 1975a(+Deleuze)A propos du  
 departement de psychanalyse - 1975bIn cui si considerano certe pareti ... -  
 1975cApathie théorique - 1977aThe Unconscious as Mise-en-Scène - **1977b**Les  
 Transformateurs Duchamp - **1977c**Rudiments païens, genre dissertatif -  
**1977d**Instructions païennes - 1978Notes préliminaires sur le pragmatique des oeuvres  
 - **1979a**La Condition postmoderne - 1979bThe Psychoanalytic Approach - 1979cThat  
 Part of Cinema Called Television - 1981aTheory as Art - 1981bLa Philosophie et la  
 peinture à l'ère de leur expérimentation - 1982Réponse à la question: qu'est-ce que le  
 postmoderne? - **1983**Le Différend - 1984The Sublime and the Avant-Garde -  
 1986aGrundlagenkrise - **1986b**L'Enthousiasme: la critique kantienne de l'histoire -  
 1987/1988Vertiginous Sexuality: Schreber's Commerce with God - 1988aLes  
 Lumières, le sublime 1988bL'Intérêt du sublime - 1991aLa Réflexion dans  
 l'Esthétique kantienne - 1991bLectures d'enfance - **1991c**Leçons sur l'Analytique du  
 sublime: Kant - (European Graduate School EGS, Jean-François Lyotard,  
 Bibliography, <http://www.egs.edu/faculty/jeanfrancoislyotard.html> accessed Jan 2,  
 2007 and R. Clausjürgens, Bibliographie zum Gesamtwerk, in: Lyotard 1983 dt., 309-  
 323) - **MACINTYRE 1958** - The unconscious. A conceptual analysis - **MAHR**  
 <**1985**>Hegels Kritik der Wissenschaft in seinem System von 1807 <Wien: PhD  
 Dissertation, 154 pages> - 1993Aus dem Rahmen gefallen. Philosophische  
 Spurensicherung <Derrida **1978**, dt. >, in: Parnass, September/Oktober, 104f. - 1996a  
 Marketing wissenschaftlicher Weltauffassung, in: Peter Mahr (Hg.) Erinnerung an  
 Moritz Schlick. Textbeiträge und Ausstellungskatalog anlässlich des 60. Todestages, =  
 Biblos-Schriften 165, Wien: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1996, 78-84. -  
 1996bDer Falco-Effekt. Zur Theorie österreichischer Kunst von 1977 bis 1988, in:  
 Patrick Werkner (Hg.), Kunst in Österreich 1945-1995. Ein Symposium der  
 Hochschule für angewandte Kunst in Wien im April 1995, Wien: WUV-Verlag, 165-  
 185 - 1998aStil, Dalí und Spiegelstadium. Zum Surrealismus Jacques Lacans, in:  
 Karl Stockreiter (Hg.), Schöner Wahnsinn. Beiträge zu Psychoanalyse und Kunst,  
 Wien: Turia & Kant 1998, 174-197 - 1998bÜbersetzung. 14. Jacques Lacan, hiatus  
 irrationalis (1929). Übersetzung in: 1998a, 174 - 1998c Graz, Wien, Prag - zur

universitären Ästhetik der Donaumonarchie von 1880-1914. Vorlesungsverzeichnisse, Kurzbiographien, Interpretation, in: Benedikt/Knoll (Hg.), *Verdrängter Humanismus - Verzögerte Aufklärung*, Bd.4: Philosophie in Österreich (1880-1920), Klausen-Leopoldsdorf/Klausenburg (RU): *Leben-Kunst-Wissenschaft/Editura Triade* 1998, 793-816.- <1999a>How Foucault Could Have Approached Modern Art: Archaeology Expanded. Korrigierte Fassung eines Referats für die Sektion "Foucault, Bourdieu, Practice" von "Passions, Persons, Powers", 7. Jahreskonferenz der International Association for Philosophy and Literature an der University of California at Berkeley 1992, am 2. Mai 1992, in: *mvä 2* (1999) Nr.1/März, 14528 Zeichen. /991f4-01.html - <1999b>Wir probieren eine Existenz aus. David Cronenbergs Film *eXistenZ* (1999), in: *mvä 2* (1999) Nr.2/Juni, 27289 Zeichen. /992f4-03.html - <1999c>(trsl.) Julia Kristeva, *Das literarische Denken denken (Penser la pensée littéraire)*. Vortrag vom 28. Mai 1999 beim Kolloquium "Où en est la théorie littéraire?", Université Paris 7 Denis Diderot am 28. und 29. Mai 1999, in: *mvä 2* (1999), Nr.4/Dezember, 48247 Zeichen. /994f4-11.html - <1999d>Hausmusik. In: *mvä 2* (1999) Nr.4/Dezember, 13466 Zeichen. /994f4-03.html - <2000a>(Rev.)Günther Pöltner (Hg.), *Phänomenologie der Kunst. Wiener Tagungen zur Phänomenologie 1999*, = Reihe der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Phänomenologie, Bd. 5, Frankfurt am Main/Berlin/Bern: Peter Lang 2000, 229 S., in: *mvä 3* (2000) Nr.4/Dezember, 30699 Zeichen. /004f4-10.html - <2000b>Hollein mit Lyotard. Annäherung an die Erzählung der Architektur. in: *mvä 3* (2000) Nr.3/September, 36797 Zeichen. 003f4-03.html - <2001a>"Die Traumdeutung" als Kunstphilosophie (Kuhns, Marquard, Ricoeur). Vortrag innerhalb der Reihe "Kunst und Psychoanalyse" (Konzept: Karl Stockreiter) im Institut für Wissenschaft und Kunst/Wien am 25. Juni 1993, in: *mvä 4* (2001) Nr.1/März, 42385 Zeichen. /011f4-02.html - <2001b>(trdl.)Mikel Dufrennes Verteidigung seiner Thèse principale und seiner Thèse sècondaire, = Übersetzung von: (anon.) *Soutenance de thèse*, in: *Revue de la Métaphysique et de Morale* 58 (1953), 432-436. Mit freundlicher Genehmigung der *Revue de la Métaphysique et de Morale*, in: *mvä 4* (2001) Nr.1/März, 22036 Zeichen. /011f4-13.html. For Mahr 2002 ff. go to „10 Peter Mahr’s publications (last five years; ten in bold as requested)“

below - **MARCUSE 1955**Eros and Civilization - **MÜNKER/RÖSLER 2000**Poststrukturalismus- **RANCIÈRE 2002**Le ressentiment anti-esthétique - **REICHER 2005**Einführung in die philosophische Ästhetik - **RESTAINO 1991**Storia dell'estetica moderna - **RICOEUR 1965**De l'interprétation. Essai sur Freud - **ROUDINESCO 1986**La bataille de cent ans. Histoire de la psychanalyse en France.2 1925-1985 - **1993**Jacques Lacan. Esquisse d'une vie, histoire d'un système de pensée - **SCHEER 1997**Einführung in die philosophische Ästhetik - **SCHMITZ 2000**Die Unterwelt bewegen. Politik, Psychoanalyse und Kunst in der Philosophie Julia Kristevas - **SCHNEIDER 1996**Geschichte der Ästhetik von der Aufklärung bis zur Postmoderne - **SCHRIFT 2006**Twentieth-century French Philosophy: key themes and thinkers - **SIM1992**Beyond Aesthetics. Confrontations with Poststructuralism and Postmodernism - **TAURECK (ed.) 1988**Französische Philosophie im 20. Jahrhundert. Analysen, Texte, Kommentare - **TURKLE 1978**Psychoanalysis and Politics: Freud's French Revolution - **WALDENFELS 1983**Phänomenologie in Frankreich - **WILLIAMS 2005**Understanding poststructuralism - **WILLY 1899**Die Krisis der Psychologie - **WOLLHEIM 1971**Sigmund Freud - **WITTGENSTEIN 1967**Conversations on Freud - **WUCHERER-HULDENFELD 1994a**Das Philosophische im Denken Sigmund Freuds. Vorlesungen an der Universität Wien, gehalten im Winter-Semester 1987/88 - **1994b** Philosophisches im Denken Sigmund Freuds, Ursprüngliche Erfahrung und personales Sein. Ausgewählte philosophische Studien I - **ZIMMERMANN 1996**Ästhetik.

© PD Dr. Peter Mahr, Vienna 2007/2009