

13

INSIDE-OUT

Sculpting Sacred Space in Bernini and Bourgeois

Victoria Turvey Sauron

Bernini's extraordinary seventeenth-century sculpture group *Saint Teresa in Ecstasy*, usually taken to be an illustration of one of the visions of the Spanish mystic Teresa of Avila, is the quintessential Baroque sculpture, spectacularly transgressive of the traditionally-conceived boundaries between the sacred and the erotic, body and soul, but also inside and outside.¹ Like its later 'sister' sculpture the *Blessed Ludovica*, depicting the reclining holy woman supposedly in the throes of both ecstasy and death, the remarkable folds of *Teresa's* robe paradoxically both cover all her skin (except for her face, hands and feet), and also exaggeratedly display a fantasized body, the dark crevices of marble suggesting the intimate surfaces of the female body.

In another sense however, the agitated folds forming the surface of these sculptures not only index the layer of skin hidden beneath the drapery folds, but reveal something much deeper. It may be possible that the sculpture's surface visually realizes, externally, the inner experience of religious ecstasy. In one convincing argument to try to explain the work, Giovanni Careri attributes to the extraordinary folds of the *Ludovica* an independent, signifying power. Calling it a 'surface for the inscription of pathos', he continues, 'Bernini has created, on top of/beyond Ludovica's body, a "performing" body (or a body on display), composed of a "real body" and an "imaginary body" in the throes of spiritual passion.'²

While the folds, in their excess, therefore signify and over-signify the female sex, *Ludovica's* drapery also paradoxically negates the physical body. The interior experience of the saint's encounter with her God, undecidedly oscillating between the deeply sacred and the deeply erotic, is dramatically exteriorized in an extraordinary ecstasy of marble, beyond, *au-dessus*, any possible 'real' body.³



13.1 Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini, *Altar of the Cornaro Chapel (Ecstasy of St Teresa)*, c.1645–52, marble, height 350 cm, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. Copyright 1990 Photo Scala, Florence/Fondo Edifici di Culto.

In the chapter entitled 'Beckoning Bernini' from *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, Mieke Bal sees the *Teresa* sculpture group very much in terms of fire, that the *Teresa's* body is a burning flame. This metaphor permeates her text and also colours the particular characterization of the sculpture which sparked off my inquiry in this paper. Bal writes that 'her body's inside cannot be distinguished from its outside'.⁴ She also notes that

the ecstasy is due to, or rather consists of, literal ec-stasy: the propagation of the fire of love from inside out, so that *Teresa's* skin, that outer limit of the body, partakes of it; hence, her body's limits are themselves no longer limits ... Her whole body becomes a flame: each part of it, of its cover, its surface but beneath which nothing else remains, becomes a flame; fire comes to overrule previous shapes.⁵

In a sense, Bal is saying that *Teresa* is already inside-out, or that such a concept has no relevance for a sculpture consumed with flame, inside which nothing remains. When Bal moves on to discuss one of Louise Bourgeois' sculptures, the *Homage to Bernini* (1967), she writes that 'this work turns Bernini's painterly surfaces inside-out'.⁶

In this paper I wish to further problematize and question the consequences of this almost throwaway phrase of Bal's, so suggestive and problematic for not only the nature of sculpture, but also about the nature of body and spirit, the experience of the sacred, and of the body, sexuality and femininity. Bourgeois and Bernini are here thrown together into a conceptual space formed by the specific physicality of



13.2 Louise Bourgeois, *Homage to Bernini*, 1967, Bronze, 54.6 × 49.5 × 58.4 cm. Courtesy Cheim & Read, New York. Photograph: Peter Bellamy.

their sculpture, but which also pulls together debates and discourses of visibility in general; an indescribable, sacred space, where, I will argue, their encounter across the centuries has the potential to interrogate and realign visual discourses of the female body throughout western art history.

Bal presents the *Teresa* sculpture as Bernini's masterpiece of layering. Her conception of the interior of the sculpture is, however, problematic—we remember she wrote about 'its surface ... beneath which nothing else remains'.⁷ What troubles me about this metaphor is the void at its centre. When this body is inside out, for Bal it is demystified: the saint's experience is known completely because *nothing else remains*. In fact, it seems to me that Bernini attempts to represent

Teresa of Avila's entirely 'interior' experience of ecstasy but in doing so, she negates and transfigures her actual body so that only a fetishistically excessive 'outside' remains. It is visualized and at the same time neutralized. Before asking whether there is an alternative to Bernini's interpretation, it is important to ask why a female 'interior' is so threatening that its visualization results in the simultaneous and cataclysmic bodily negation and excess which we find in the *Teresa*.

The threat represented by the interior of the female body in particular has, in Laura Mulvey's words, 'haunted representations of femininity through the ages, not consistently manifest, but persisting as an intermittent strand of patriarchal mythology and misogyny'.⁸ Nowhere is the inside of the female body construed as more disturbing than in the misogynistic texts of the early Church fathers. There we find a recurring theme of the horrific nature of the female body, and in particular a strong and strangely angry revulsion at the thought of the treacherously beautiful exterior, a semblance of purity, hiding the horrors dissembled under the skin. I cite here only St John Chrysostom:

The whole of her body is nothing less than phlegm, blood, bile, rheum and the fluid of digested food ... If you consider what is

stored up behind those lovely eyes, the angle of the nose, the mouth and the cheeks you will agree that the well-proportioned body is only a whitened sepulchre.⁹

Similar texts can be traced up to late medieval times.¹⁰ Bernini's sculptures come at the climax of this cultural impulse, at the end of the Renaissance, where the despised body had become an ambiguous sign in a visibility which now had incorporated the pagan into the rediscovery of the antique, in particular in the visual language used for the mystical aspects of Christianity.

This female body, constructed in that discourse precisely in terms of the horror of the inside, is also mentioned by Freud, where he anatomizes the fear of castration, informing in turn the mechanism of fetishism. As Laura Mulvey summarizes,

Masculine desire is caught in an oscillation between erotic obsession with the female body and fear of the castration that it signifies. It is, of course, the fear of castration, and subsequent disavowal of the woman's body as castrated, that Freud saw as the cause of male fetishism.¹¹

If erotic desire in women is not enabled by the resolved Oedipus complex, then the defence mechanism of fetishism comes into play, where the object of desire is displaced away from the woman's body or genitals, onto an object or item of clothing for example. In misogynistic early Christian writings neither mechanism seems to operate in a context where women are not valued as objects of desire, and this deeply-felt fear is dramatically unveiled in these texts.

A Freudian psychoanalytical approach forms the theoretical basis for the book *Ouvrir Vénus* by Georges Didi-Huberman.¹² Referring to Kenneth Clark's famous separation of 'nude' and 'naked', Didi-Huberman argues that this separation or distancing, and associated idealization, of the female nude in art history is a form of obsessional neurosis which operates a defence mechanism against the sexual desirability of these nudes, and in particular against a desire tinged by the fear of a nudity which is by definition threatening, according to the author, because nudity suggests and leads towards the horror of the body's insides and internal organs.¹³ He bases his argument around a dense text of Freud's from 1926, 'Inhibitions, Symptoms, and Anxiety', which focuses on forms of defence, amongst which Didi-Huberman focuses on *isolation*.¹⁴ He is interested in isolation because of how the touch taboo functions. Because the act of touching simultaneously incorporates the possibility of physical aggression and of erotic pleasure, it contains the

paradoxical 'oscillation' between erotic desire and fear, which, as mentioned by Mulvey, characterizes the visual economy of the female nude in art. Touching could equally be a caress or an attack, just as opening (the larger concern of Didi-Huberman's book) could equally be a liberation or a wound. Referring to the work of both Aby Warburg and Walter Benjamin, Didi-Huberman argues that images of nudes are a *dialectique à l'arrêt*, or 'halted dialectic', a status quo of disparate and balanced tensions: nudity is fundamentally 'impure'.¹⁵

Although intended to track the operation of the 'isolation' defence mechanism and thereby to explain the unnameable threat the sealed nudes convey, Didi-Huberman's analysis opens for me quite another can of worms about the operation of fetishism in art history. In his model, interior and exterior are stringently kept separate; in this way, he writes, 'Organic images would thus be ... double sided'.¹⁶ What is more, the interior is invariably characterized in terms of violence and horror—'To open a body is surely to disfigure it, to destroy all its harmony'.¹⁷ Just as *all* nudity is seen as mortally dangerous, so, he writes, 'it is impossible to isolate or to be unaware of the mortal unease which is created by any nudity of the flesh', but the nature of the universality of this danger is not further investigated.¹⁸

For Didi-Huberman, the threat posed by the unified, sealed nudity of a female body, is perhaps that as defined by Freud: the threat of castration. Didi-Huberman's text reinforces rather than breaks down the binary split between inside and outside, which itself operates the fetishism defence, and defends the male child against the horror of the primal scene, but which, at the same time, problematizes depictions of the female body throughout the whole of society as well as in art history. For Lynda Nead, fetishism creates 'an aesthetic that has structured the representation of the female body in western art since antiquity'.¹⁹ She argues that, as a result,

one of the principal goals of the female nude [in art] has been the containment and regulation of the female sexual body. The forms, conventions and poses of art have worked metaphorically to shore up the female body—to seal orifices and to prevent marginal matter from transgressing the boundary dividing the inside of the body and the outside, the self from the space of the other.²⁰

Many of the central concerns of Nead's seminal book *The Female Nude*, from which this extract is taken, arise out of Julia Kristeva's *Powers of Horror*, the English translation of which appeared ten years previously.²¹ In it, Kristeva develops the concept of the 'abject', primarily a psychoanalytical concept, but a concept which also has consequences

in a semiotic sense for the functioning of power systems in society. To attempt to summarize the abject would necessarily be to misrepresent the complex argument of *Powers of Horror*, but in the simplest terms the abject could be described as the borderline between subject and object. Psychosis is the result of the inability of the subject to identify an exterior object, resulting in the failure to construct its own identity: the subject cannot be autonomous without identifying with an Other. Desire is impossible because it requires a clear concept of an Other, therefore desire is expressed in terms of abjection (breaking down of boundaries). Lynda Nead returns to this idea to explain why the female nudes in art history are perfect, sealed, idealized:

What seems to be at stake ... is the production of a rational, coherent subject. In other words, the notion of unified form is integrally bound up with the perception of self, and the construction of individual identity.²²

An interesting element of *Powers of Horror* is the way Kristeva visualizes abjection in architectural terms. The reason for the failure of the subject is a lack of awareness of the body's limits, paradoxically causing the subject to become sealed within those limits, a 'fortified castle', with the ego sealed off, with no possibility of the Other outside.²³ This image reminded me of Teresa of Avila's book, *The Interior Castle*; Teresa was another theorist who was also a figurative architect.²⁴ In *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, Mieke Bal posits a theoretical framework of architecture as a rich metaphor for body and art, critical theory and psychoanalysis. As a figurative as well as literal space, architecture is an obvious site of articulation of inside and outside. Art historians of the Baroque such as Wölfflin and Jean Rousset have specifically characterized Baroque architecture in terms of the scission between the lavish style of the façade and the serenity of the interior.²⁵ In *Le Pli*, Deleuze sees this as quintessentially Leibnizian, expressing it in terms of the theory of the 'monade': 'The monade is the independence of the interior, an interior without exterior. But its correlative is the independence of the façade, an exterior without interior.'²⁶ For Deleuze, the ideal Baroque architecture is *un pur dedans*—a pure interior—not even hinting at an exterior; for example, an interior with external light sources disguised.²⁷ An example of this can be found in the Cornaro chapel housing Bernini's *Teresa*, where the golden rays above the sculpture conceal a source of light which seems supernatural.

There is a marked insistence on purity in Deleuze's text, and on the fact that there should be no confusion between inside and outside, reminding us of the discourse of Didi-Huberman. Referring to Bernini's

sculptures, Deleuze discusses the relationship between clothes and skin as being 'publicized, extended, and enlarged' in the Baroque.²⁸ The scission itself is being privileged, as is indeed later the very space between clothes and skin, a euphoria of surfaces which for Deleuze is embodied by the elements: fire for *Teresa* and earth for *Ludovica*. Mieke Bal makes a similar characterization in the quotation we saw earlier: 'Her whole body becomes a flame: each part of it, of its cover, its surface but beneath which nothing else remains, becomes a flame; fire comes to overrule previous shapes.'²⁹

Ironically, in a chapel which is a masterpiece of interior architecture, *Teresa* is a masterpiece of exterior surface: there is no interior because everything is exterior—body and spirit alike are represented in the play of light and shade on marble. Fire, embodying surface for Deleuze, *is* body for Bal—but a burnt body, negated in a dancing flame which, since it consumes and moves and overrules shapes, traps the gaze in innumerable surfaces. *Teresa* is transgressive and liberating in many ways, but surprisingly Bal's reading, which on first sight appears enabling, seems to also reinforce and remain integral to a fetishistic visual economy, where excess of surface denies and represses an interior, enabling the reality of the body to be completely subsumed in the all-consuming fire. For Perniola, 'Saint Theresa's body disappears in the drapery of her tunic'—her body is 'engulfed' and 'transformed into fabric'.³⁰ This characterization of being 'engulfed' surely becomes suggestive of Kristeva's characterization of the function of religious rituals to defend against the abject; 'to ward off the subject's fear of his very own identity sinking irretrievably into the mother'.³¹ There is also a certain element of the fear of castration inherent in the idea of being engulfed in this substance which seems to be shaped like female folds. Not coincidentally portrayed forever poised just before receiving the penetration of the angel's golden dart, the saint becomes a cipher of a masculine psychosis where sexuality and desire are either diverted or abjected via the mechanism of excessive surface.

The ruched, creased, folded marble of the fully-clothed *Teresa* seems to be operating in a similar way to the sealed, perfect, smooth female nudes which Lynda Nead is attempting to deconstruct. Smoothness or folds, the difference here is irrelevant, as both can operate in the same way—the insistence on surface operates a visual detour enabling the interior of the body to be negated. The discourse of interior and exterior is not only put to work, however, by literal representations of female bodies. A parallel with several works by British artist Anish Kapoor from the last two decades can help shed light on the way in which the *Teresa's* folds uphold a fetishistic visual economy.

The first awareness of a point of view, Bal notes in *Quoting Caravaggio*, seems to be articulated in Baroque art.³² That is, the gaze can now be situated outside of the self; it becomes non-monolithic and multiple. This means that the subject is put in danger: its position is no longer certain, as it can be inherent in the object. In what are, for me, very Baroque sculptures, Kapoor's *Inside-out* and *Upside-down*, from 1995 and 1998 respectively, the supremely reflective surface not only diverts and disallows the gaze focused upon it, but in turns sucks self, Other, and gaze into the indeterminate space of its 'interior'.³³ It is a mirror which is simultaneously deeply self-absorbed, just as an excess of reflection is an excess of the self-image, but also deeply self-alienating. Unlike the mirror in Lacan's theory of the mirror stage, where the image of seductive unity allows a 'self', albeit an illusory one, to be conceived of, the mirror in the work of Kapoor operates in a different way. The curved, impossible surface refuses, controls and possesses the false self-image until it is put in doubt. Viewers of the 2004 sculpture *Cloud Gate*, designed for Chicago's Millennium Park, feel compelled to search for their own image in the bewildering swoops and curves.³⁴ This all-surface is both fascinatingly beautiful and profoundly threatening, profoundly implicating the subject's gaze while threatening its very coherence, by suggesting that both subject and gaze are being sucked inside an interior which cannot be known or imagined, the sense of surface is so overwhelming. It is a metaphor both for the primal scene and for the mechanism of fetishism, which destabilizes the subject/object relationship.³⁵

The tradition of the depiction of the female nude is a form of art which, I suggest, is sited in a fundamentally masculine aesthetic. Bernini's *Teresa* and the three sculptures by Anish Kapoor are but two examples, from vastly different contexts, of the ways in which this masculine discourse can be present throughout western visual culture. Such images, by articulating the particular threat posed to the masculine psyche by the abject through the transgression of boundaries, uphold a psychosis within visual culture, which attempts to close off boundaries of the body and reinforce fetishism: a neurotic form of sexuality, characterized by the fear of the wounded and wounding woman.

Identifying the 'agenda' of such artworks is a deeply problematic pursuit. Laura Mulvey, for example, draws on a series of photographs from the late 1980s by Cindy Sherman to illustrate her larger project to defeat the damaging power of fetishism.³⁶ The series entitled *Disasters* includes very difficult images, involving blood, vomit and suggestions of human excrement of different types, where the eye cannot fix on one point; disturbing and upsetting pictures which are tremendously provocative in their absolute refusal of the type of clichéd, masquerading female body which Sherman plays with in her earlier photographs.

For Mulvey, in these photographs 'the topography of exterior/interior is exhausted'.³⁷ I feel, however, that while these photographs oppose fetishism in one sense, they are also working within its economy, reinforcing the same 'horror' associations of femininity. Rather than removing or exhausting questions of exterior/interior, they are, on the contrary, pigeonholing femininity into an excess of interior. Although the boundaries of the body are transgressed, they are still operating; we are merely on the other side. These works are therefore still functioning within the same psychoanalytic/sexual model. Having identified a discourse of visibility working within fetishism, I want therefore to conjecture about a form of art, and a form of art history, which does not think in terms of inside or outside, and which escapes from the visual model of the feminine imposed on women by fetishism.

We might approach these issues by taking yet another step further away from the *Teresa* and its universe, to evoke the mathematical figure of the Klein bottle. Very reminiscent of the shape and concept of the sculptures by Anish Kapoor, the Klein bottle is a conceptual, four-dimensional figure developed in the field of topology, which is visualized by a three-dimensional shape, but is itself able to be represented, via perspective, in a two-dimensional plane. Felix Klein's original conception for the bottle, which he developed in 1882, was as a shape where 'outside and inside meet'.³⁸ Mathematician Konrad Polthier provides a summary description. 'The bottle is a one-sided surface—like the well-known Möbius band—but is even more fascinating, since it is closed and has no border and neither an enclosed interior nor exterior ...' and, unlike a torus or 'doughnut' form, 'the Klein bottle does not bound a volume—in other words, it has no interior'.³⁹ The Klein bottle is literally and mathematically all surface. The philosophical enigma posed by this hypothetical form brings into focus the play of concepts in the artworks maintaining fetishism: there is no interior, it is all surface. However, the concept also opens up new possibilities. The bottle cannot 'contain'—yet it is still called a 'bottle'. The notion that a bottle does not have to contain, might open up a space where skin does not have to contain.⁴⁰ Another description of a Klein bottle reads, 'Its inside is its outside. It contains itself.'⁴¹

Kristeva's *Powers of Horror*, while grounded in Freud, sets out to move away from Freud's masculine-centred incest model to return to the negated sign of the woman and mother, and the misunderstood sign of the feminine, throughout Freud's writings. Kristeva does this by focusing on the potent image of the transgression of the boundary between the masculine and feminine realms. The moves made in *Powers of Horror* have been extremely enabling for subsequent feminist theorists. To look backwards instead, among the writers whose work enables Kristeva's

own, I find a textual trace of a possible solution to the visual problem in the thread Kristeva picks up from Georges Bataille. Kristeva writes:

Georges Bataille remains the only one, to my knowledge, who has linked the production of the abject to the *weakness of that prohibition*, which, in other respects, necessarily constitutes each social order ... Bataille is also the first to have specified that the plane of abjection is that of the subject/object relationship (and not subject/other subject) and that this archaism is rooted in anal eroticism rather than sadism ... [the prohibition] does not seem to have, in such cases, sufficient strength to dam up the abject or demoniacal potential of the feminine.⁴²

For Kristeva, the importance of Bataille is his awareness of the interdependency between systems of power and the limits of the body, and the revolution inherent in the possible erosion of those limits.

In ideas initially set down in 'The Notion of Expenditure', Bataille modifies the Freudian view of the symbolic relationship between gold and excrement as transposition, retention to defecation, inside to outside, to imagine 'a world without transposition'.⁴³ For Bataille, as Yve-Alain Bois summarizes in *Formless*, gold and excrement 'share a condition of pure loss (the jewel is economic waste by definition). The jewel, shit, and the fetish are all on the level of sumptuary expenditure'.⁴⁴ Crucially, ecstasy, tears, laughter and sexual pleasure are the sites of what Bataille calls 'strong communication', or 'moments of pure loss ... when identity abolishes itself'—for example, referring to the sexual act, he says, 'No communication is more profound; two creatures are lost in a convulsion that binds them together ... binds them only through wounds where their unity, their integrity disperse in the heat of excitement'.⁴⁵

In a world without transposition, just as gold and excrement are indistinguishable, so are subject and object: a true space where questions of inside and outside are set aside. This text is from a lecture, and similar ideas permeate Bataille's non-fiction writing, but the true articulation of the search for the loss of identity, for this 'strong communication' which is also the space of ecstasy and of the sacred, is in fact found in his fiction. Bataille's understanding of the 'sacred' is that which is wholly other: excrement, tears, ecstasy, laughter and sexual pleasure occupy the same conceptual space, a space which is defined by Rosalind Krauss in *Formless*. Krauss moves towards a definition of the formless which I feel moves within this very space, operating as a space of loss of self which is essentially postmodern: not a threatening destabilization of the subject as in Kapoor's *Cloud Gate*, but the specific form

of *entropy*, a term which refers to the space where hot and cold water meet and become tepid, the space where a camouflaged insect can no longer differentiate between its own body and the leaves around it—not so much a lack of boundaries between self and other, as a profound putting-into-question of the place of the self within space at all.⁴⁶ Krauss also draws upon Robert Caillou's metaphor of the Praying Mantis, the body of which, after death, automatizes the appearance of life to such an extent that the creature is still capable of 'playing dead', and therefore can be in a position to say the unsayable, 'I am dead':

Reflexive modernism wants to cancel the naturalism in the field of the object in order to bring about a newly heightened sense of the subject, a form that creates the illusion that it is nothing except the fact that 'I am seeing it.' The entropic, simulacral move, however, is to float the field of seeing in the absence of the subject; it wants to show that in the automatism of infinite repetition, the disappearance of the first person is the mechanism that triggers formlessness.⁴⁷

Georges Bataille depicts this space very powerfully in a paragraph from his novel 'Madame Edwarda', an at once concise and poetic evocation of a *jouissance* of loss of self, intense but strangely calm and without fear, passing beyond questions of limits and surfaces.

Her naked thigh caressed my ear: I seemed to hear the sound of sea swell, the same sound you hear when you hold a large shell against your ear. In the darkness of the brothel and in the confusion which surrounded me (I felt choked, my face was red, I was sweating), I was strangely suspended, as if Edwarda and I were lost one windy night on the seashore.⁴⁸

It is not only the imagery of the lovers being suspended together in an indefinable space which is important here, but the fact that this is associated with hearing the sound of a seashell pressed against the ear, a sound which of course is none other than the pulsing of your own blood reflected back. This is an infinite reflection of self, Krauss's 'automatism of infinite repetition', at the moment of oral sex; a moment when, inevitably and powerfully, the masculine is visually confronted with the feminine Other.⁴⁹

Kristeva uses this very phrase, *confrontation with the feminine*, in *Powers of Horror*, when she comes to the essence of the difference between the two forms of art I am articulating. She writes:

I shall set aside in this essay a different version of the confrontation with the feminine, one that, going beyond abjection and fright, is enunciated as ecstatic ... a coming face to face with an unnameable otherness—the *solid rock of jouissance* and writing as well.⁵⁰

In this strikingly sculptural term, Kristeva names the space, the matter, of the sacred and the ecstatic, refusing the ethereal 'primeval essence' of femininity and using writing to sculpt out of formless, threatening *jouissance* nothing less than solid rock. And this is finally where I come back to Louise Bourgeois. In a 1983 sculpture, part of Bourgeois' series *Femme-Maison*, questions of femininity, architecturality and the nature of sculpture and matter are being engaged with. Something similar is happening in *Homage to Bernini*, the bronze sculpture of which Mieke Bal wrote that 'this work turns Bernini's painterly surfaces inside-out'.⁵¹ If 'nothing remains' inside *Teresa*, then for Bourgeois to represent *Teresa* inside-out is a contradiction. Bourgeois' homage to Bernini is not a rejection or updating of his work, but rather an affectionate nod to another theorist of the feminine, to a sculpture which offers a compelling

theory and debate of femininity, but at the same time to suggest an alternative theorization which has indeed perhaps only become possible in sculpture thanks to Bernini's intervention. Bal entitles her chapter 'Beckoning Bernini'; emphasizing the temporal relationship between past and present art, not seen in terms of influence. Bourgeois' sculpture is seen as 'enfolding' and 'debating' that of Bernini.⁵² Perhaps Bernini and Bourgeois meet, paradoxically, in the Baroque fold.

Bal's own writing already moves beyond 'turning inside-out'. She first characterizes the sculpture as an egg, then goes on to write:

the object *is* bark, just as coarse, but solid, massive. There is no inner wood that it hides. Yet the



13.3 Louise Bourgeois, *Femme-Maison*, 1983, marble, 63.5 × 49.5 × 58.4 cm. Courtesy Cheim & Read, New York. Photograph: Allan Finkelman.

INSIDE-OUT

13

object is not entirely solid; it is also hollow. And inside, where you least expect it, is a tiny bit of Berninesque smoothness. Multiple, like the master's folds; but then again, inside-out. No suggestion of hollowness here.⁵³

The result of the debate is an apparent paradox; an eternal suspension between whether or not the sculpture is all-surface, a mass of tree-bark, or hollow. This is for me the brilliance of Bourgeois' work. Centuries of art are enfolded within the softness of the marble: not contained by it, but part of its shape and structure. The suspended movement, travelling beyond inside-out, pays homage to Bernini to move beyond the visual economy of fetishism, and sculpt the solid rock of *jouissance*.

NOTES

Chapter 13

- 1 Teresa's account of her vision is quoted and translated by Suzanne Warma, 'Ecstasy and Vision: Two Concepts Connected with Bernini's Teresa', *The Art Bulletin* 66/3 (1984), pp. 508–11. 'Beside me, on the left hand, appeared an angel in bodily form ... In his hands I saw a great golden spear, and at the iron tip there appeared to be a point of fire. This he plunged into my heart several times so that it penetrated into my entrails. When he pulled it out, I felt that he took them with it, and left me utterly consumed by the great love of God. The pain was so severe that it made me utter several moans. The sweetness caused by this intense pain is so extreme that one cannot possibly wish it to cease, nor is one's soul then content with anything but God. This is not a physical, but a spiritual pain, though the body has some share in it—even a considerable share. So gentle is this wooing which takes place between God and the soul that if anyone thinks I am lying, I pray God, in his goodness, to grant him some experience of it.'
- 2 Giovanni Careri, *Bernini: Flights of Love, the Art of Devotion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp. 71, 234–35. Translations are my own except where otherwise indicated.
- 3 It is this oscillation between the spirit and body, purity and sexuality, which make the sculptures at once fascinating and difficult, and which demands a new approach to the sculptures in order to move away from more traditional analyses which would either sanctify or debase them, to instead further examine how this compelling tension operates.
- 4 Mieke Bal, *Louise Bourgeois' Spider: the Architecture of Art-Writing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), p. 94.
- 5 Bal: *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, p. 94.
- 6 Bal: *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, p. 100.
- 7 Bal: *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, p. 94.
- 8 Laura Mulvey, *Fetishism and Curiosity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), p. 63.
- 9 St John Chrysostom (c.347–407), Doctor of the Church and Bishop of Constantinople, available online at: <<http://www.geocities.com/paulntobin/womenfathers.html>> (accessed 17 December 2006). [2]
- 10 Notably St. Clement of Alexandria (c.150–c.215), Tertullian (c.160–c.225), Origen (c.185–254), St Jerome (c.342–420), St Augustine (354–450), St John Chrysostom (c.347–407).
- 11 Mulvey: *Fetishism and Curiosity*, p. 59.
- 12 Georges Didi-Huberman, *Ouvrir Vénus* (Paris: Gallimard, 1999).

- 13 Kenneth Clark, *The Nude: A Study of Ideal Art* (London: Penguin, 1960).
- 14 A summary: 'When something unpleasant has happened to the subject, or when he himself has done something which has a significance for his neurosis, he interpolates an interval during which nothing further must happen... In endeavouring to prevent associations and connections of thought, the ego is obeying one of the oldest and most fundamental commands of obsessional neurosis, the taboo on touching. The avoidance of touching is of paramount importance in this illness because it is the immediate aim of the aggressive as well as the loving object cathexes.' Carrie Lee Rothgeb (ed), *Abstracts of the Standard Edition of the Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 1926D 20/77: Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety (1926), available online at <http://www.nyfreudian.org/abstracts_24_20.html> (accessed 17 December 2006).
- 15 Didi-Huberman: *Ouvrir Vénus*, p. 28.
- 16 'les images organiques seraient donc... à double face'. Didi-Huberman: *Ouvrir Vénus*, p. 40.
- 17 'Ouvrir un corps, n'est-ce pas le défigurer, briser toute son harmonie?' Didi-Huberman: *Ouvrir Vénus*, p. 40.
- 18 'impossible de l'isoler, c'est à dire d'ignorer l'inquiétude mortelle que porte en soi toute nudité de la chair'. Didi-Huberman: *Ouvrir Vénus*, p. 63.
- 19 Lynda Nead, *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality* (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 6.
- 20 Nead: *The Female Nude*, p. 6.
- 21 Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, trans. Leon Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press 1982).
- 22 Nead: *The Female Nude*, p. 7.
- 23 Kristeva: *Powers of Horror*, p. 46.
- 24 St Teresa of Avila, *Interior Castle*, trans. Mirabai Starr (New York: Riverhead, 2004).
- 25 See Gilles Deleuze, *Le Pli: Leibniz et le Baroque* (Paris: Minuit, 1988), p. 39.
- 26 'La monade est l'autonomie de l'intérieur, un intérieur sans extérieur. Mais elle a pour corrélat l'indépendance de la façade, un extérieur sans intérieur.' Deleuze: *Le Pli*, p. 39.
- 27 Deleuze: *Le Pli*, p. 39.
- 28 'médiatisé, distendu, élargi'. Deleuze: *Le Pli*, p. 165.
- 29 Bal: *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, p. 94.
- 30 Gen Doy, *Drapery: Classicism and Barbarism in Visual Culture* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2002); quotations taken from M. Perniola, 'Between Clothing and Nudity', in M. Feher, R. Nadaff and N. Tazzi (eds), *Zone 4: Fragments for a History of the Human Body* (New York: Zone, 1989).
- 31 Kristeva: *Powers of Horror*, p. 64.
- 32 Mieke Bal, *Quoting Caravaggio: Contemporary Art, Preposterous History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1999), p. 27.
- 33 Anish Kapoor, *Turning the World Inside-Out* (1995), and *Turning the World Upside-Down #4* (1998), both at Barbara Gladstone Gallery, 515 West 24 Street, New York, 9 April–22 May 1998. Available online at <http://www.artnet.com/magazine_pre2000/features/kuspit/kuspit4-29-98.asp> (accessed 01 May 2007).
- 34 Anish Kapoor, *Cloud Gate* (2004–5, Chicago Millennium Park, Chicago). Available online at <http://www.millenniumpark.org/artandarchitecture/cloud_gate>.

- html> (accessed 01 May 2007).
- 35 I do not propose to generalize about Kapoor's work as a whole. I refer to these isolated sculptures, as with the Klein bottle, in order to provide a visual metaphor or analogy for the problem articulated in the rest of the paper in relation to the female body, surface, interior and visibility, and to suggest that these particular art-works could be inscribed in a particular visual discourse.
 - 36 See in particular Cindy Sherman's *Disasters* series, such as *Untitled #234* (1987–90), Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). Laura Mulvey deals with these photographs, in particular in her essay, 'A Phantasmagoria of the Female Body: The World of Cindy Sherman', *New Left Review* 188 (1991). Mulvey argues against fetishism particularly persuasively in her landmark essay on 'Pandora's box', where a 'feminist curiosity' of looking into the box is posited against the masculinist and damaging fetishism mechanism. Laura Mulvey, 'Pandora's box: Topographies of curiosity', in *Fetishism and Curiosity* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1996).
 - 37 Mulvey: 'Phantasmagoria', p. 148.
 - 38 Konrad Polthier, 'Imaging maths—Inside the Klein bottle' (2003), <<http://plus.maths.org/issue26/features/mathart/index-gifd.html>> (accessed 01 May 2007), referring to F. Klein, *Über Riemann's Theorie der algebraischen Functionen und ihrer Integrale* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1882).
 - 39 Polthier: 'Imaging maths'.
 - 40 See Elizabeth Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Towards a Corporeal Feminism* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1994) for a theorization of the female body based on the concept of the Möbius strip.
 - 41 Cliff Stoll, 'Acme Klein Bottles', <http://www.kleinbottle.com/whats_a_klein_bottle.htm> (accessed 01 May 2007).
 - 42 Kristeva: *Powers of Horror*, p. 64.
 - 43 Georges Bataille, 'The Notion of Expenditure' [1933], in *Visions of Excess*, ed. and trans. Allan Stoekl (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985), pp. 116–29.
 - 44 Rosalind Krauss and Yve-Alain Bois, *Formless: A User's Guide* (New York: Zone, 1997), p. 55.
 - 45 Bataille, 1939, quoted in Krauss and Bois: *Formless*, pp. 205 and 209. [3]
 - 46 See the chapter entitled 'Entropy' in Krauss and Bois: *Formless*, pp. [4]
 - 47 Krauss and Bois: *Formless*, p. 78.
 - 48 'Sa cuisse nue caressa mon oreille: il me sembla entendre un bruit de houle, on entend le même bruit en appliquant l'oreille à de grandes coquilles. Dans l'obscurité du bordel et dans la confusion qui m'entourait (il me semble avoir étouffé, j'étais rouge, je suis), je restai suspendu étrangement, comme si Edwarda et moi nous étions perdus dans une nuit de vent devant la mer.' Georges Bataille, 'Madame Edwarda', *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Denis Hollier, (Paris: Gallimard, 1970), p. 21. See also Brian T. Fitch, *Monde à l'envers/Têteversible—la fiction de Georges Bataille* (Paris: Gallimard, 1982), p. 14.
 - 49 Krauss and Bois: *Formless*, p. 78.
 - 50 Kristeva: *Powers of Horror*, p. 59, emphasis added.
 - 51 Bal: *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, p. 100.
 - 52 Bal: *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, p. 87.
 - 53 Bal: *Louise Bourgeois' Spider*, p. 100.

INSIDE-OUT

17

Authors' Queries

Volume: **The Sacred and the Feminine**

Title: ***Inside-Out***

Dear Victoria

During the preparation of your manuscript for publication, the questions listed below have arisen. Please attend to these matters and return this form with your proof. Many thanks for your assistance.

Query Reference	Query	Remarks
1	Page 1: You have not included any references to your illustrations. Please insert throughout proof, as appropriate.	
2	Note 9: URL given refers to Marina Warner, <i>Alone of all her sex</i> , p. 58, not to St John Chrystotom. Please check and update.	
3	Note 45: Please give full reference to Bataille 1939.	
4	Note 46: Please give page numbers for Krauss and Bois.	