



---

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Julia Bryan-Wilson

Source: *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 89, No. 4 (Dec., 2007), pp. 823-826

Published by: [College Art Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25067365>

Accessed: 23/03/2011 10:00

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=caa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



College Art Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Art Bulletin*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

munication. The poet and painter belonged to two different politico-historical and cultural moments—Renaissance and Baroque in historical shorthand—and their artistic projects, however linked, ultimately diverged. Tasso did not always play by his own rules; Poussin made those rules the basis of his refined art.

DAVID QUINT is Sterling Professor of Comparative Literature and English at Yale University (Department of English, Yale University, 63 High Street, Room 109, P.O. Box 208302, New Haven, Conn. 06520-8302).

## Notes

1. Rensselaer W. Lee, *Ut Pictura Poesis: A Humanistic Theory of Painting* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1967); Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Anthony Colantuono, "Poussin's *Osservazioni sopra la pittura*: Notes or Aphorisms?" *Studi Secenteschi* 41 (2000): 285–309; Elizabeth Cropper, *The Ideal of Painting: Pietro Testa's Düsseldorf Notebook* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); and idem, *The Domenichino Affair* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).
2. I point out an error in Unglaub's translation on page 106, where it is Marino's Venus who takes Adonis on her lap and not the other way around: the mistake is not so trivial, since it would suggest a departure from the passivity that marks Adonis throughout the *Adone*.
3. Timothy Hampton, *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990); and Riccardo Brusciagli, *Studi cavallereschi* (Florence: Società Editrice Fiorentina, 2003). The classic critical description of Tasso's divided imaginative sympathies is in Sergio Zatti, *L'uniforme cristiano e il multiforme pagano: Saggio sulla "Gerusalemme Liberata"* (Milan: Il Saggiatore, 1983).
4. Matteo Residori, *L'idea del poema: Studio sulla Gerusalemme conquistata di Torquato Tasso* (Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2004).

## MIGNON NIXON

*Fantastic Reality: Louise Bourgeois and a Story of Modern Art*

Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005. 352 pp.; 103 b/w ill. \$40.00

Suicide. Madness. Institutionalization. Accident. Illness. The biographies of many of the women artists associated with and influenced by Surrealism contain a litany of tragedies—think of Kay Sage, Leonora Carrington, Frida Kahlo, Francesca Woodman, Eva Hesse, and Yayoi Kusama. Art historians recite these bleak details over and over like incantations, willing them to help us make sense of the unsettling power of these artists' works. We plunder their lives (or untimely deaths) to give shape to their art. Perhaps for women, Surrealism's emphasis on repetition and fantasy provided a resource for working through trauma. Yet recourse to the biographical is disproportionately pressed on these female artists, partic-

ularly the presumed intimacy between their art practice and their fraught personal circumstances.

What to do, then, with an artist like Louise Bourgeois, who, despite her share of sadness, suffering, and struggle, is still sane and thriving well into her nineties? Mignon Nixon's beautiful and provocative new monograph *Fantastic Reality: Louise Bourgeois and a Story of Modern Art* makes the case that neither Surrealism—which the artist herself disavowed—nor biography are sufficient singular lenses for understanding Bourgeois's art. Neither, though, does Nixon think either term should be completely discarded. Billed as the "first full-scale critical study" of Bourgeois's work, *Fantastic Reality* posits an interplay between art and psychoanalysis without reductively psychoanalyzing the artist. When Nixon turns to the question of trauma, she does so not out of a morbid fascination with an artist's early demise that then gives sharp focus to the short career preceding it (as is seen in much writing on Woodman). Instead, she explores the significance of the death drive at the beginning rather than at the end of life: that is, within infantile subject formation as delineated by the pioneering object-relations psychoanalyst Melanie Klein.

While Bourgeois's art has been subject to feminist psychoanalytic readings, informed by Sigmund Freud, Jacques Lacan, and Luce Irigaray, Nixon's pioneering book asserts that her art is above all Kleinian.<sup>1</sup> As Nixon points out, Bourgeois herself was steeped in the practical and theoretical ramifications of Klein's work. In fact, in the mid-1960s, she considered becoming a child analyst; Nixon persuasively makes the case that "Bourgeois's investigation of child analysis with the intention of becoming a therapist consistently informs the development of her art" (p. 7). Nixon does not force a Kleinian template onto Bourgeois's objects; instead, she presents a lucid dialogue between the art and the theory, explicating resonances between Klein's influential theories about childhood aggression and the artworks, while also using the artist's practice as a springboard for her extended meditations on Klein's case studies. She suggests that the art "extends, and at times contests" the vast but neglected theoretical terrain of child psychoanalysis (p. 6). In Nixon's deft text, Bourgeois's work *talks back* to the theory and furnishes a powerful discursive tool for understanding Klein.

The conversation between Klein and Bourgeois clarifies, in particular, the sculptural element of Bourgeois's work (though Nixon does not limit herself to Bourgeois's sculptural practice, looking also at drawings, performance documentation, personal photographs, photo-and-text magazine projects, engravings, and installations). Bourgeois herself has remarked on the familial origins of her sculpture: "Once we were sitting together at the table, I took white bread,

mixed it with spit, and molded a figure of my father. When the figure was done, I started cutting off the limbs with a knife. I see this as my first sculptural solution" (p. 265). While Nixon lets this brief anecdote hover in her text without further explication (these are the concluding sentences of her final chapter), it perfectly encapsulates her overarching premise about the centrality of aggressive play within Bourgeois's art. This creation and dismemberment—indeed, creating in order to dismember—of a substitute father keys into Klein's emphasis on the fundamental roles that incorporation, oral sadism, and destruction play in psychic life, especially as children come to understand themselves relationally. Nixon hones in on Kleinian negativity; mourning, aggression, and death are vital to her accounts of the psyche, in distinction to Freud's stress on the pleasure principle. As Nixon states, Bourgeois's work "argues for the potential of sculpture to encompass the death drive: to enact destruction as an early and persistent trend, but one indissolubly linked to an equally primitive and tenacious tendency towards sublimation" (p. 268). Sculpture, with its dimensionality in space, its surrogacy, its scale, and its bodily effects, tells us something about intersubjectivity; the bread-and-spit father makes that much clear. Rather than relying on psychoanalysis as an explanatory model for art, the book's most potent contribution is that it presents art and psychoanalysis as equally illuminating, interconnected discourses regarding the process of subject formation.

The book is organized as a series of case studies that proceed only roughly chronologically, tracing an arc through Bourgeois's career from the 1940s to the 1990s as she both inhabits and subverts her role as a defiant daughter (*vis-à-vis* Surrealism) and an ambivalent mother (for contemporary feminist art). In chapter 1, "Discipleship: Deference and Difference," Nixon outlines Bourgeois's charged relationship with the "father figures" of Surrealism, including Marcel Duchamp and Joan Miró, arguing that the artist's work constituted a "rebuttal" to male-dominated Surrealism (p. 23). Nixon engages in readings of archival photographs, such as one from 1947 in which Bourgeois kneels alongside a seated Miró, to demonstrate how Bourgeois burlesques the idea of "discipleship" at the feet of her Surrealist masters in order to transform it within the terms of feminism.

Nixon maintains that Bourgeois is both an astute reader and a reviser of Surrealism. Yet Bourgeois's negative transference is, as Nixon admits, "transference nevertheless" (p. 28), and her close ties to the Surrealist milieu—and to Freud—continue to inform her practice. For instance, Nixon believes that Bourgeois's photo-essay *Child Abuse*, published in *Artforum* in 1982, in which the artist confesses that her father's affair with her childhood governess was a defining be-

trayal in her life, closely echoes Freud's celebrated case study of the hysteric Dora; both portray a daughter's psychosexual drama involving a philandering father. These are not simplistic equivalences, however. Nixon refuses to say that Dora had an impact on Bourgeois in any straightforward way. Instead, Nixon's methodology, itself seemingly inspired by Freud, is more lateral and associative than directional. The case study of Dora is juxtaposed to the narrative offered in *Child Abuse*, that is, it asserts a logic of adjacency rather than influence. What is more, Bourgeois, as she reflects on, theorizes, and narrates these experiences, becomes "as much like Freud as she was like Dora" (p. 50).

At the same time, Nixon outlines how Klein moved away from Freud's patriarchal understanding of pleasure and fantasy. This chapter thus presents a complex double narrative, twinning Bourgeois's resistance to Surrealism with Klein's rejection of the emphasis on Eros (as articulated by Freud and his daughter Anna). These parallel renunciations are feminist moves; in their work, Bourgeois and Klein, both mothers, centralize questions of gendered subjectivity and the maternal, refusing to simply play the hysteric who symptomatically enacts the family's larger dysfunction. By outlining the convergence of Bourgeois's feminist transformation of Surrealism with Klein's new psychoanalytic framework that accounts for a reimagined feminine subject, this chapter lays the ground for the chapters that follow.

Chapter 2, "*Femme Maison* (Woman House): What's So Funny about Fetishism?" extends this reading by looking closely at the question of female fetishism, in particular, examining how Bourgeois's vision of the feminine was elaborated by her *femme maison* (woman house) drawings of the 1940s that graft architectural forms onto female anatomy. The *femme maison* was invented, according to Nixon, to "portray the predicament of a woman artist and mother, homesick in exile—carrying her house on her head—trying to make it as a surrealist in New York" (p. 56). In these drawings, Bourgeois exaggerates Surrealism's fetishizing of female sexuality to implode it. Nixon contrasts them with André Masson's mannequins and their evident misogyny to demonstrate how the artist used barbed humor, mimicry, and sly jokes to undermine the Freudian and Surrealist drive to fragment, contain, and objectify the female body. The chapter then jumps ahead several decades to investigate how Bourgeois further mined these issues in her 1968 sculpture *Fillette*. Nixon undertakes a close reading of the piece, a defiantly fleshy, oversize cock and balls, delineating how it productively slides between penis, phallus, and baby. She also pursues how the sculpture became a prop in Bourgeois's photo shoot with Robert Mapplethorpe, poring over the contact sheets that depict the artist cradling the

sculpture as an "object to be mothered" (p. 73). From hyperbolic female fetishism to maternal aggression: Nixon makes the case that Bourgeois's complex rendering of sexuality and parodic motherhood reveals critical failures not only in Freudian accounts of subjectivity but also in much mainstream feminism.

Printmaking is the focus of chapter 3, as Nixon examines Bourgeois's *He Disappeared into Complete Silence*, a series of engravings accompanied by brief texts published in 1947. These works are significantly transitional as the "cutting" of the engravings made a metaphor out of the artist's transition from painting to sculpture. This chapter also investigates Bourgeois's use of words, observing how her "flat, affectless tone" in this series is akin to the withdrawn world of the autistic child (p. 88). If free association and dreams were pivotal for Surrealist artists such as André Breton, generating text works differently for Bourgeois. "What is 'surreal' for Breton is not 'fantastic reality' for Bourgeois" (p. 94). Instead, Bourgeois's "fantastic reality" is closely aligned to Kleinian phantasy—the imaginative field of instincts and drives based in the body. Phantasies are unconscious drives stimulated by physical awareness (of hunger, of pain, of pleasure); ruled by sadistic drives and oral aggression, they are distinct from Freudian fantasies. Merging Klein's phantasy and Bourgeois's fantastic reality, Nixon coins the term "phantasic reality," a "bodily unconscious" that for artist and analyst alike finds its most visible manifestation in the infantile, autistic, schizoid, and psychotic.

Elaborating her definition of phantasic reality, Nixon shifts back and forth from Bourgeois's engravings, Duchamp's *The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors, Even* (*The Large Glass* (1915–23)), and Klein's account of her treatment of Dick, a schizophrenic child. Here, as elsewhere, Nixon does not presume the reader's intimate familiarity with Klein, and she provides helpful summaries as well as critical rereadings of some of her most famous case studies. Bourgeois's engravings detail a series of abrupt traumas and loss, giving an account of psychic (dis)integration that is paralleled in Klein's writing. Nixon further posits that the suspended animation of the manic personality bears on the halted mechanics in *The Large Glass*: "What interests Bourgeois, however, is not the sexual functioning of this apparatus, but its processing of aggression. In effect, she suggests that latent in the autoeroticism of the bachelor machine is auto-aggression, a death drive" (p. 102).

Nixon returns to sculpture in chapter 4, "*Personages*: The Work of Mourning," arguing that the *Personages* series, Bourgeois's earliest sculptures, first shown in 1949, reflect her émigré status in postwar New York. The sculptures "functioned as figures" (p. 124) for Bourgeois—vibrant beings made to encapsulate, and discharge, the exile's

homesickness. Nixon relates the act of mourning—the hard work of detaching from a lost object—to the sculptural process, describing how Bourgeois's construction is akin to the laborious severing and reinventing of psychic bonds. Somewhat obscured in this chapter is the wider political context of the era; Nixon asserts: "Bourgeois's use of reclaimed materials and bricolage techniques invokes a wartime domestic economy of sorting and saving, as against industrially based production and postwar progressive ideals" (p. 149). But did these sculptures merely "invoke" this economy? The thrifty reuse of scraps, as well as these haunting forms, could be understood as a rather more forceful response to the war than the one Nixon discerns.

Here, as throughout the book, Nixon treads delicately when it comes to delineating cause and effect. She is careful to avoid "proving" conscious influence between Bourgeois and Klein, instead evoking interlocking discourses. "Once again Klein's theories of anxiety are useful" (p. 150) reads a typically restrained comment. Nixon relies on elusive or slippery verbiage, as Klein's metaphors constantly "suggest" the art of Bourgeois. Conversely, Bourgeois's works "imply," "invoke," "seem to have a particular resonance with," "touch on," and "are opposite of" Klein. As mentioned, this associative logic seems to have been drawn from Freud, with a chain of related thoughts triggering unexpected insights. The strengths and value of this method of argumentation by parallelism are that it avoids overly simplified models of influence or pat base-superstructure explanations. However, even as it aims to displace what might be limited empirical models, it is occasionally frustratingly elliptical. What kinds of assumptions lie behind this refusal to assert causality?

Georges Bataille reigns over chapter 5, "*Double Negative*: The Death Drive Turned against Death." Nixon tracks Bourgeois's shift in the 1960s from vertical to horizontal sculpture, drawing on Bataille's concepts of the low and the base. Further, she explores how in Bourgeois's art, increasing pliability was tied to her documented interest in child analysis. Her obsession with inconsistency in art is related to the malleability of the infant mind. If the emergence of art and the emergence of subjectivity are linked, then questions of process can be productively rerouted through children and their stirrings of psychic life as analyzed by Klein. Nixon gives a model for how to do this, looking, for instance, at how the infantile fixation on the excremental, the toxic, and the edible form the theoretical basis for Bourgeois's "soft landscapes" of 1967. Other sculptural series, such as the early 1960s *Lairs*, evoke the beginnings, materiality, losses, and unexpected fusions of Klein's subject-in-formation. Nixon also closely examines how instability figures in the work of Eva Hesse. This is perhaps the strongest

chapter, utterly convincing in its account of how Bourgeois's fascination with child analysis informed these works at the moment of their inception, and it opens up new ways of thinking about process and indeterminacy in 1960s art more generally.

As in chapter 1, Nixon again writes on parallel tracks, asserting that the split between Breton and Bataille over the importance of the death drive was echoed in the rift between Anna Freud and Klein over the self-preserving role of the ego. Nixon generates her binary lists: on one side go Breton and Freud, aligned with Surrealism, self-preservation, the libido; on the other side go Klein, Bourgeois, Thanatos, infantile anxiety, negativity. But in chapter 6, "Femme Couteau (Knife Woman): Art Objects as Part-Objects," these columns prove tricky to separate, as the argument returns to Duchamp and investigates the legacy of the "part-object" in Bourgeois as well as other twentieth-century artists. For Klein the infant's world is ruled by "part-objects," such as the breast, through which the infant experiences dependency, pleasure, panic, need, and loss. "First phantasies, Melanie Klein contended, arise from the body in the grip of anxiety and aggression. In rage, the mouth cannibalizes the breast, and so incorporates an object that is at once sustaining and menacing, an object of love and of hate" (p. 213). Nixon intelligently produces a major rewriting of the practices of Hesse, Jasper Johns, and Kusama in the 1950s and 1960s, tracing a Duchampian legacy through the part-object that culminates in Bourgeois's *Femme Couteau* (1969). If part-objects at once symbolize and obviate the porous boundary between self and other, when wielded in art practice, they might also make room for alternative gender politics beyond the masculinity of the heroic avant-garde. Bourgeois's knife woman brings back the terror of female sex, as it "suggests what the logic of a female fetish might be, but also points to other aporias, other blind spots, in the phallogocentric theories of psychoanalysis" (p. 234). For Nixon, this erosion of phallogocentrism indicates the "fledgling gender politics" of Neo-Dada (p. 248). The part-object's logic structure of substitution and equivalence gives Nixon a new way of looking at Johns's *Flag* (1954–55), for instance, as she proposes that its thick, fecal surfaces ask questions about the rooting of symbols in bodily drives.

Nixon likewise hews to a dynamic of equivalence and leveling. For her, Bourgeois's work accomplishes in sculptural form what Klein's does in psychoanalysis. Often she goes from art to psychoanalysis in alternating paragraphs, toggling back and forth between description and Kleinian case study and letting the reader make the associations. There are fewer moments when Bourgeois's art is seen as exceeding those readings, or pushing against them. And yet those are the most crucial moments of all,

and in the epilogue, which concentrates on recent sculpture such as *She-Fox* (1985) and *Spider* (1997), Nixon insists that the artist's return to maternal aggression contributes to an area that Klein herself overlooked. Her art thus "counters Klein, inventing maternal ambivalence as a psychic position of potential imaginative power" (p. 270). For, while Bourgeois is at the heart of this art historical book, it also significantly contributes to the literature on Klein, as Nixon pushes us to see how Bourgeois's art elaborates on several of Klein's blind spots. This is one of Nixon's most consistently impressive feats: convincing the reader that the art has something to say to the analyst beyond serving as a diagnostic tool, that it can expose contradictions or extend theoretical readings—that art, in effect, discursively contributes to psychoanalytic debates.

Bourgeois is famous for her aphorisms. They punctuate the collection of her writings, *Destruction of the Father/Reconstruction of the Father*, and constitute special appendices in numerous recent books about Bourgeois.<sup>2</sup> These pithy statements often reiterate the psychic suffering of her childhood and how art has played a therapeutic, reparative role for her. Nixon makes strategic use of the artist's statements, which mark section breaks throughout the text. Yet they are only one source among many; including Julia Kristeva, Judith Butler, Jacqueline Rose, Joan Copjec, Leo Bersani, Daniel Lagache, Jane Gallop, and Jessica Benjamin. Obviously, given the book's psychoanalytic bent, passages from Freud and Klein crowd the pages. While in general Nixon does not spend her time assessing the literature on Bourgeois, one figure to whom Nixon frequently refers is Rosalind Krauss, a former teacher of Nixon's and now her colleague at *October*. The fact that Krauss's interpretations are often presumed as given rather than argued for (along with, to a lesser extent, those of Annette Michelson) alludes to another kind of family story here.

For at least the past decade, readers of Bourgeois's work such as Krauss and Mieke Bal have positioned themselves against using the artist's words or background to produce reductive psychobiographies of her work.<sup>3</sup> Nixon herself believes that biography has weighed too heavily on readings of the art: "In much of the critical literature devoted to Bourgeois's art, it is as if, in compensation for an unbinding at the level of sculptural form, there is a countervailing appeal to unity at the level of biographical interpretation" (p. 2). To contradict this impulse, Nixon doles out personal anecdotes sparingly—one could almost say timidly—offering biographical information tucked away within parentheses or bracketed by dashes, weaving relevant details into the texture of the analysis. Some biography is shunted to the notes, including potent quotes from Bourgeois on motherhood. While this is a necessary corrective to the

overwhelming impulse to psychoanalyze the art as if it were a person, the absolutely pivotal fact that Bourgeois wanted to be a child psychologist and thought seriously about entering graduate school to study it is at times treated almost like a casual aside.

Nixon does not completely throw out the biographical baby with the bathwater. She allows that Bourgeois's intellectual history, her Surrealist milieu, her interest in child analysis, and her motherhood all inform her making. In so doing, she acknowledges that biography need not be strictly opposed to social, political, or historical analysis. Feminism, of course, is what gives us a way out of that false binary of thinking that the personal is opposed to the political. Such a feminist framework might be pushed further. Nixon mentions that both Klein and Bourgeois combined parenting and their professional endeavors but does not elaborate on the tensions and difficulties of such a situation. How might this have worked economically, given the gendered division of labor? What particular class and social circumstances might have enabled these dual roles? Such questions are only glanced at. Others have speculated that there might have been a much more profound conflict between Bourgeois's motherhood and art than Nixon allows. Robert Storr claims that there have been times when Bourgeois "has stopped making art at full throttle. Specifically, this happened in the early 1940s, when she attempted to be a conventional wife and mother; and in the mid-1950s, when she briefly took courses on psychology and French literature with the intention of changing careers."<sup>4</sup> The tension between art and motherhood in the postwar era raises larger questions, not addressed by Nixon, about the historically specific rhetoric of maternity.<sup>5</sup>

The subtitle of Nixon's book promises a "story of modern art," but one actually finds very little specifically on modernism here. Instead, Nixon insists that Bourgeois's art "anticipate[s] the postmodern" (p. 3). The blurred line between modern and postmodern comes up several times; the part-object "cuts across the history of the modern and the postmodern," for instance, and Duchamp and Bourgeois share "both a modernist and postmodernist history" (p. 10). Perhaps these statements admit the very exhaustion of these categories. More important, the very terrain of canonical modernism is currently being rewritten by feminism. Lucy Lippard forcefully asserted in 1980 that "feminism's greatest contribution to the future of art has probably been its *lack* of contribution to modernism."<sup>6</sup> This has been challenged, if not contradicted outright, by recent scholarship and art exhibitions, including Helen Molesworth's *Part Object/Part Sculpture* at the Wexner Center for the Arts (2005–6), whose title refers to Klein, and Connie Butler's *WACK! Art and the Feminist Revolution* at the Los Angeles Museum of

Contemporary Art (2007), both of which featured art by Bourgeois. Such curatorial and art historical work, including Nixon's, signals a full-scale revision—one increasingly coming into view—of the modern/postmodern divide, in which that divide is interrogated by the imperatives of feminism. Moving beyond an exclusive focus on women artists, this larger shift allows questions of parenting to drive theoretical and art historical inquiry beyond the Oedipal, making the whole history of twentieth-century art look different. We thus might need Bourgeois's relation to modernism, even as that relation is framed as a rejection of Surrealism, just as we need aspects of her biography to fully appreciate her work.

Juliet Mitchell posits that one of Klein's most significant contributions was the power of description she demonstrated in her case studies.<sup>7</sup> One could say the same of Nixon; a gifted writer, she conjures artworks with economy and evocative phrasing. For instance, Bourgeois's sculpture *Amoeba* is "a puckered disk of plaster, swelling and drooping like clay or dough, kneaded thin" (p. 180). This language helps animate the works that are otherwise slightly dulled by the lack of color reproductions. Clinical observation is, of course, not the same as *ekphrasis*, but it is tempting to draw a parallel. Mitchell's point about the role of description in Klein's therapeutic analysis is applicable to art historians as well, as both clarify relationships, analyze small but significant details, provide structure for interpretation, and generate meanings.

The current major retrospective of Bourgeois's art in Europe and the United States will only increase the artist's already stratospheric stature (organized by Frances Morris and Marie-Laure Bernadac, it will travel from the Tate Modern, London, to the Centre Pompidou, Paris, the Guggenheim Museum, New York, the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, and the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Washington, D.C., from 2007 to 2009). *Fantastic Reality* importantly takes Klein's emphasis on child analysis, especially the death drive, mourning, and the part-object, and makes it central to the story of Bourgeois's art. It also makes Bourgeois central to readings of Klein; indeed, the book is at its most successful and exciting when it demonstrates how Bourgeois exceeds Klein. Nixon's elegant book provides a fresh way of thinking about the richness and strangeness of Bourgeois's practice and about the broader psychic dimensions of creating and looking at art.

JULIA BRYAN-WILSON is assistant professor of art history and visual studies at the University of California, Irvine [85 Humanities Instructional Building, Irvine, Calif. 92697-2785].

## Notes

1. For example, see Griselda Pollock, "Old Bones and Cocktail Dresses: Louise Bourgeois and the Question of Age," *Oxford Art Journal* 22, no. 2 (1999): 71–100; Julie Nicoletta, "Louise Bourgeois's *Femmes-Maisons*: Confronting Lacan," in *Reclaiming Female Agency: Feminist Art History after Postmodernism*, ed. Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 360–71; and Hillary Robinson, "Louise Bourgeois's 'Cells': Looking at Bourgeois through Irigaray's Gesturing towards the Mother," in *Museum of Modern Art Papers*, vol. 1, *Louise Bourgeois*, ed. Ian Cole (Oxford: Museum of Modern Art, Oxford, 1996), 21–30. I am indebted to Carrie Lambert-Beatty for helping me think through these issues.
2. Louise Bourgeois, *Destruction of the Father/Reconstruction of the Father: Writings and Interviews 1923–1997*, ed. Marie-Laure Bernadac and Hans-Ulrich Obrist (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1998). See also Bernadac, *Louise Bourgeois*, trans. Deke Dusinberre (Paris: Flammarion, 2006); and Christiane Meyer-Thoss, *Louise Bourgeois: Designing for Free Fall* (Zurich: Ammann Verlag, 1992).
3. See Rosalind Krauss, "Louise Bourgeois: Portrait of the Artist as Fillette," in *Bachelors* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999), 51–74; and Mieke Bal, *Louise Bourgeois' Spider: The Architecture of Art-Writing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
4. Robert Storr, "A Sketch for a Portrait: Louise Bourgeois," in Storr, Paolo Herkenhoff, and Allan Schwartzman, *Louise Bourgeois* (London: Phaidon Press, 2003), 40.
5. These issues are explored in a different context by Anne Wagner's recent book *Mother Stone: The Vitality of Modern British Sculpture* (New Haven: Yale University Press for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2005). Wagner has also argued for rethinking biography beyond the "merely personal" in Bourgeois's art, in her "Bourgeois Prehistory, or The Ransom of Fantasies," *Oxford Art Journal* 22, no. 2 (1999): 3–23.
6. Lucy Lippard, "Sweeping Exchanges: The Contribution of Feminism to the Art of the 1970s," *Art Journal* 40, nos. 1–2 (1980): 362.
7. Juliet Mitchell, "Introduction to Melanie Klein," in *Reading Melanie Klein*, ed. John Phillips and Lyndsey Stonebridge (London: Routledge, 1998), 11–31.