

**Egyetemi doktori (PhD) értekezés tézisei**

**AFTER DE MAN: TRANSFORMATIONS OF DECONSTRUCTION  
IN CONTEMPORARY LITERARY THEORY**

Somogyi Gyula

Témavezető: Dr. Bényei Tamás

Dr. Kalmár György



**DEBRECENI EGYETEM**

**Irodalomtudományok Doktori Iskola**

Debrecen, 2011.

## **The Purpose and Subject of the Dissertation:**

The title of the dissertation deliberately evokes the brief, yet all the more revealing closing chapter of Martin McQuillan's monograph about Paul de Man's contributions to literary theory and critical thinking. In this chapter, McQuillan delineates three possible interpretations of the word "after": coming after de Man in a historical sense; influenced by de Man's way of thinking; and "going in search of" the meaning of de Man's texts." My dissertation proposes to analyze the ramifications of all these three aspects of "after," what it means to "come after" de Man, whose texts now seem unavoidable for critics dealing with contemporary literary theory. He had a considerable impact on the ongoing theoretical debates about literature, philosophy, rhetoric, textuality and even history. Many think that the most important significance of his oeuvre lies in pointing out how the ambivalent structures of rhetoric operate in every act of language, not only in literary texts. However, as there are many excellent monographs written about the topic, the dissertation does not want to give an extensive analysis of de Man's texts, instead it wants to read different theoretical texts driven by the aim of inflecting rhetorical deconstruction with other trends in contemporary literary theory, for instance psychoanalysis, feminism, trauma-, or legal studies. I am convinced that these encounters can be best examined in the texts of some of de Man's former colleagues and students: Shoshana Felman, Barbara Johnson and Cathy Caruth. All of these thinkers demonstrate different paths of how we can reread de Man's notion of rhetoric, all of their texts are trying inventively to transform his approach with other fields and discourses.

Tracing the kinds of permutations de Man's strain of deconstruction went through in these texts, the dissertation revolves around the encounter of four different theoretical and critical discourses: deconstruction and psychoanalysis, deconstruction and feminism, deconstruction and trauma studies, deconstruction and legal studies. My thesis is that through certain crucial notions, Felman, Johnson and Caruth are trying to create a dialogue between different theoretical positions that, as Johnson suggests, "remain skeptical of each other." Their rethinking of transference, female desire, the figure of apostrophe and prosopopeia, the notion of trauma and justice can all be read as examples of this effort. The dissertation also aims to show that these "hybrid" discourses (I am using Homi K. Bhabha's term here) are not mere revisions (that is, corrections) of de Man's theory of language and rhetoric, but different ways of explicating and interrogating certain key notions and problems within deconstruction.

My use of the term "deconstruction" in the title and throughout the dissertation could suggest that the thesis treats deconstruction as a unified set of theories about philosophy,

rhetoric or literature, in this way reducing the various differences between philosophers and critics associated with this movement. It could even evoke an expectation that Jacques Derrida's texts will also be kept in the foreground, only to fail to keep such a promise. It should be better named, following Jeffrey Nealon and Robert Eaglestone, "deconstructive criticism," thus when I write "deconstruction" it is to be understood as a shorthand for "deconstructive criticism," narrowed mostly to de Man's "rhetorical deconstructive criticism." This clearly indicates that the dissertation would only like to formulate valid claims about the afterlife of this branch of deconstruction, and at least partly explains why I had to leave out an extensive treatment of Derrida's oeuvre, whose fields of interest since de Man's death often overlapped with the three critics studied in the dissertation.

After recognizing such a plurality within deconstruction itself, we must also note that the relationship of deconstructive criticism to each of these other discourses is rather different, and is not without peculiar controversies and fundamental disagreements. Thus, the dialogue that is going on in the texts I am going to analyze always presupposes an interpretive effort. Sometimes de Man's texts and notions lend themselves more easily to these encounters, establishing this dialogue sometimes requires a more dynamic approach.

I am well aware of the fact that each one of these or interfaces studied in the thesis demands to be examined in a separate work, given the vast theoretical and critical complexities involved in them. Yet, by focusing mostly on the texts of Felman, Johnson and Caruth, I will be able to point out several important aspects of the ambiguous afterlife or "haunting" of deconstruction.

## **Methods of Research**

While the dissertation demonstrates a series of encounters between five different theoretical discourses (deconstruction, psychoanalysis, feminism, trauma and legal studies), its method is mainly influenced by the close-reading strategies of deconstruction. I am writing here about texts that claim to be deconstructive, but the thesis will also try to apply the lessons gained from them to pinpoint not only their crucial insights, but their possible blind spots as well. The close-reading of literary (or philosophical) texts will follow the same logic: the readings are not meant to be illustrations or mere examples of the theoretical assumptions delineated in the individual chapters, but a way of thinking them over again from a different point of view (the perspective of literature). Thus the literary texts will be read as concrete historical counterpoints to the abstractions of theory. With some exceptions, these texts come

from 19<sup>th</sup>-century American literature: in the case of deconstruction and psychoanalysis, I will analyze Edgar Allan Poe's "The Man of the Crowd"; in the chapter about deconstruction and feminism, Poe's treatment of "the most poetical topic" will be my subject; two pieces, Ralph Waldo Emerson's texts about the death of his son, Waldo, and the parable of Tancred and Clorinda from Torquato Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered* will illuminate the encounter between deconstruction and trauma studies; and last, but not least Herman Melville's "Bartleby the Scrivener" will illuminate the encounter between deconstruction and the law.

The table of contents might suggest that these encounters I am writing about constitute distinct fields of inquiry that influenced deconstruction in a temporal succession, the material seems to resist such clear-cut linear structure. This becomes most apparent in the chapter on trauma, but it is palpable elsewhere too. For example, some texts of Felman dealing with feminist issues were already published in her first book, most of which I read in the chapter on psychoanalysis. These feminist texts were published as a separate volume only later, when Felman's theoretical frame for trauma was already established. Or another example might be Johnson's rereading of the relationship between feminism and deconstruction, which takes place through a figure (apostrophe) that is negotiated between law and literature. These examples suggest that there is a complex interrelationship or dialogue going on between deconstruction, psychoanalysis, feminism, trauma and legal studies.

## **Results**

In the first chapter of the dissertation that tries to unravel the intricacies of the dialogue between deconstructive and psychoanalysis, I argue that the meeting point between these two discourses is the concept of *transference*, the key metaphor of psychoanalytic reading, the examination of which enables us to displace the conventional, hierarchical relationship between psychoanalysis and literature as well. In my reading of the psychoanalytic notion of transference, I will point out its double structure, revealing it as a process that partakes in the contingent rhetorical operations at work in any given text (the transference of the text), and also as a process that tries to resist this former recognition in order to bring the process of reading to a close (the transference of the reader). As the texts of Felman point out, this second process creates an illusion which is necessary for reading, yet, the meaning of the text being read can never be fully grasped. Hence a reading governed by the structure of transference can never be a definitive one as it always participates in, and is a reading-effect of, the rhetorical operations at work within the text. The first literary text being

read through these axioms is Poe's "The Man of the Crowd." The analysis follows the short story's struggle with the notion of unreadability as it passes through various kinds of transferences (both within the text and in the critical reception) to arrive at a historical-ideological understanding of the deconstructive / psychoanalytic notion of unreadability.

The second chapter explores the interface between deconstruction and feminist theory in the texts of Felman and Johnson, proceeding from an examination of the theoretical position Felman embraces in *What Does a Woman Want?* in which she visualizes the female reader and female desire as a deconstructive force which can reveal the internal ambiguities and incongruities that reside within a (male) text, be it a literary or a philosophical one. I suggest that reading this concept together with Luce Irigaray's notion of mimicry [*mimétisme*] can offer us a way to critically analyze the performance of Felman's texts, as her view seems only to "rename" and appropriate the effects of rhetoric in the guise of "female desire." The second part of the chapter focuses mostly on Johnson's essay entitled "Apostrophe, Animation, and Abortion," where the author examines a subject which seems to promise the convergence between politics and rhetoric, and with the help of which she can rethink the reductive view of the relationship between feminism and deconstruction. This subject, which is profoundly ethical in its nature, is the problem of *abortion*, the meaning of which is negotiated between the discourses of law and literature (in this case, more precisely, lyric). Johnson suggests that these debates surrounding abortion seem to hinge on the structure of a figure, *apostrophe*, which is precisely the trope of giving (figural) life, animation and presence to something dead, inanimate, or not present. As opposed to the seemingly straightforward (and reassuring) structures of apostrophical address she encounters in male writers' texts (Baudelaire and Shelley), Johnson shows that the poems of Gwendolyn Brooks, Anne Sexton, Lucille Clifton, and Adrienne Rich reveal a rather unstable structure of address. However, this claim is problematic in a way similar to Felman's proposal about female desire: the stability and instability of apostrophical address here seems to be in one to one correspondence to the binary structure of sexual difference, even though the structure of address can be shown to be similarly unstable in the texts of male writers as well. Through the reading of Poe's poem entitled "The Sleeper," his "The Philosophy of Composition," and two short stories, "The Fall of the House of Usher," and "Ligeia," the next sub-chapter tries to think through the ambivalences of rhetoric and gender pointed out at the end of the main chapter. It analyzes the encounter between feminist and deconstructive critical approaches to Poe's theory of aesthetics and his literary practice. While both Felman and Johnson seem to appropriate the ambivalences found in rhetoric to the feminine, Poe's texts demonstrate that

the ambiguities involved in the rhetorical figures of apostrophe and prosopopeia are no less problematic in the case of a “male author.” In a rhetorical reading, it can be shown that the death of the other (the “beautiful woman”) does not stabilize the discourse of the self and that a “purely” deconstructive reading runs the risk of reinforcing the traditional separation between aesthetics and politics, the problematic nature of which feminist theory have often pointed out.

In the third chapter of the dissertation, I illuminate how the oeuvres of Felman, Johnson and Caruth can be regarded as substantially contributing to an “ethical turn” of deconstructive criticism, which, through trauma theory, emphatically foregrounded questions of reference, history, politics and responsibility. In the light of recent discussions of de Man’s texts (for example Zoltán Kulcsár-Szabó’s monograph), these issues have always been in the center of his attention and it is in terms of his rhetorical theory that Caruth and Felman grasped the experience of trauma and the Holocaust, demonstrating a continuity in the history of deconstructive criticism. Trauma theory invented and conceptualized itself through the double perspective of deconstruction and psychoanalysis in the early 1990s and took both of these theories “beyond themselves”: it is precisely because of this profound ethical involvement that I chose to deal with trauma studies in a separate chapter from psychoanalysis. After contextualizing trauma theory within the framework opened up by the ethical turn, I am examining three problems: the role of literature and art in trauma theory, deconstruction’s conceptualization of history as trauma, and trauma theory’s implicit doubleness; then supplement these theoretical issues with the reading of literary and philosophical texts. I argue that Felman’s concept of literature, or the “literary thing,” has a crucial place in trauma theory: the literary imagination provides us a way of relating to another’s suffering; literature as a testimony counteracts forgetting; through prosopopeia, it gives a face to the other disfigured by history; and through apostrophe lets the other address us and remind us about the ethical obligations of reading. Trauma theory also constituted deconstruction’s return to history, reconceptualized through the notion of trauma which subverts the intuitive relationship between consciousness and history. In this chapter I read “history” as a traumatic return of the real that inevitably shapes the texts and oeuvres of Walter Benjamin, Sigmund Freud, or de Man. To open up trauma theory to recent critiques, I return briefly to the relationship between feminism and trauma theory in Felman’s two books about these topics, to point out how they write two parallel narratives about trauma, which can be regarded both as its “monumental history” and its “critical history” understood in a Nietzschean sense. In the last section of the chapter I am tracing the relationship between

recognition and foreclosure through reading Emerson's mourning for his son, Waldo. Emerson's journal entries and letters testify to both a profoundly felt pain over his loss, as well as the impossibility of mourning. His philosophical essay "Experience" talks about his inability to mourn, revealing a distance between the pain he felt over his loss and the antebellum ideological constructions of mourning. As a counterpoint to the philosophical, the literary—his poem "Threnody"—acknowledges pain and becomes an attempt at mourning. Yet the elegy shows consolation as dependent upon a phenomenalization of voice (the "deep Heart"), which proves to be hollow, leaving the pain of loss unresolved, in excess of Transcendentalist philosophy. Nowadays many critics also draw attention to the fact that trauma theory with all its ethical potential might itself be haunted by the foreclosure of gender, class, or racial traumas, so this chapter ends with reading the parable of Tancred and Clorinda in Tasso's epic *Jerusalem Delivered* in order to reveal how the blind spots of trauma theory can be pointed out from a complex gender / postcolonial perspective.

The fourth chapter of the dissertation revolves around the notion of law and justice as it was traditionally conceptualized as a suturing of the wounds of symbolic or real violence. The texts of Felman reveal different models of the relationship between law and literature, namely literature as a supplement to the law, or literature being a rupture of the legal framework. Johnson's texts focus on the relationship between sexual politics and the law, and the notion of legal personhood, similar to the one that can be shown to inform Caruth's texts about law and literature as well. The reading attached to this chapter proposes to examine Melville's "Bartleby the Scrivener," which seems to involve many of the concepts that I write about earlier: the notion of unreadability and transference; the ethical question; literature as a rupture of the legal framework; literature as a supplement to law; and the notion of legal personhood.

The closing chapter tries to sum up the most important aspects of the critical oeuvres being read throughout the dissertation, pointing out their contribution to, and significance within contemporary literary theory, addressing how they can reinvigorate deconstructive practice. However, I also suggest that the real stakes of these critical concepts are only revealed in the process of reading: if read in conjunction with literary texts, these theoretical concepts also reveal an unexpected historical dimension that also needs to be addressed, providing more lessons to be learnt. The editors of the *Yale French Studies* special issue devoted to "The Lesson of Paul de Man" predicted that from this unique lesson "new directions for literary study will continue to emerge." Given the examples of Felman, Johnson and Caruth, I believe they were absolutely right.

## Conclusions:

Much has happened in literary theory and literary criticism in the thirty years that the trajectory of the dissertation is about. If we would like to give a rough—and therefore oversimplifying—sketch of this itinerary, the story began with a reinterpretation of the relationship between deconstruction and psychoanalysis in the second half of the 1970s. It continued with the encounter between deconstruction and feminism in the 1980s, then went on to examine deconstruction and trauma theory within the ethical turn taking place in the 1990s, to conclude with the interface between deconstruction and law at the end of the 1990s and the beginning of the new millennium. Felman, Johnson and Caruth were active participants in these theoretical debates that helped to create critical positions in place today. They came up with various theoretical constructions for the study of literature: unreadability and transference; the performance of mimicry; apostrophe as an intermediary between rhetoric and politics; the relationship between trauma and testimony; prosopopeia as a reclaiming of the other from forgetting; apostrophe conceptualized as an address to and as a call from the other; literature as a rupture of the legal framework and as a supplement to law; or the juxtaposition of legal and literary personhood. Some of these notions find their roots in de Man's texts, but many others are conceptualized through an extended dialogue or a quarrel with discourses other than deconstruction. Despite their possible errors and occasional blindness, these concepts revolutionized literary theory and literary criticism. Reading their texts I always have the impression that if deconstruction is "dead," its afterlife, or haunting, looks all the more fascinating.

For Felman transference became a mastertrope of reading, which testifies to the rhetorical mechanisms of the text as well as to the various misreadings of criticism. Mimicry emerges in her oeuvre as a crucial strategy of interrogating patriarchal texts, but which nevertheless runs the risk of appropriating rhetorical ambiguities in a text for the feminine. In Johnson's texts, apostrophe, the rhetorical figure giving personhood, becomes a nodal point around which rhetoric, politics, law, feminism, legal studies and deconstruction can converge, while Caruth and Felman reconceptualized the figure as an address to and a call from the other that enacts the advent of the ethical. Felman's notion of literature as a testimony to trauma inserts the literary into a historical and a legal framework, which position is explored fully in *The Juridical Unconscious*, a book outlining different approaches to the question of law and literature. In her reading of the Eichmann trial justice was conceptualized as a suturing of the wounds of symbolic or real violence, giving hope for recuperation and healing

in contrast to the endless repetitions of trauma. Yet the law sometimes fails to fulfill this role, and it becomes the burden of literature to emerge as a supplement to what the law was not able to recognize and resolve.

In the dissertation I tried to juxtapose the examination of these theoretical figures with the reading of texts coming (with some exceptions) from 19<sup>th</sup> century American literature. I am aware that the literary texts I read in the thesis are all Western, white, male fantasies about otherness. Still, I think that through the blind spots uncovered in the process of reading, they can tell us a different story than the ideologies that they emerged from. The lesson I gained from these readings was that the real theoretical force of the notion of unreadability that de Man and deconstructive criticism came up with can be shown when dealing with concrete literary texts. However, these texts also transform the deconstructive concepts by juxtaposing their historical testimony to the universalizing tendency of theory. As the texts of Poe, Honoré de Balzac, Leo Tolstoy, Emerson, or Melville suggest, there is a growing need of reading and interpretation in the 19<sup>th</sup> century: signs appear in the city streets, newspapers, books enter mass-publication, and with this proliferation of language, comes the haunting notion of unreadability, too. These stories stage unreadability as a historically determined phenomenon pertaining to, among other things, class, gender, or race, rather than as an abstract category of interpretation. The enigmatic or the unreadable usually appears in them through liminal figures or experiences.

For contemporary criticism death is the unrepresentable par excellence, it is unavailable as a “lived experience,” it can only be mediated through representation, which inevitably prove to be misrepresentations. Emerson’s ambivalence towards grief revolves around the recognition and the foreclosure of the other’s death, which ultimately destabilizes his texts; Poe’s aesthetics is based precisely on the death of the other, the death of a beautiful woman. However his aesthetics is haunted by the return of these women, leading to a deconstruction of his aesthetic theory. While the violence towards the other is only implicit in Emerson and Poe, Tasso’s parable of Clorinda and Tancred struggles with death as the result of the violence inflicted by the subject.

Poe’s “The Man of the Crowd” posits the flaneur as a “natural reader” of the city crowd, and the unreadable figure is a social outcast who roams the streets endlessly, in a repetitive and meaningless itinerary that is nevertheless made meaningful through a strong misinterpretation. Such a misreading or “fiction”—as a reduction of unreadability to sense—condemns both Balzac’s Colonel Chabert and Melville’s Bartleby to die in an almshouse, revealing an uncanniness of “downward mobility” between the classes.

Johnson's reading of Balzac's *Sarrasine* encounters the unreadable in the figure of La Zambinella, the castrato, who is "simultaneously outside the difference between the sexes as well as representing the literalization of its illusory symmetry. He subverts the desire for symmetrical, binary difference by fulfilling it." Felman interprets Paquita in "The Girl with the Golden Eyes" as unreadable because she "resists sexual appropriation" due to her bisexuality. Stéphanie in "Adieu" is the victim of the trauma of parting, which madness Philippe misreads and "mistreats," leading to her death.

Given the cultural significance of the "peculiar institution" of slavery in antebellum American literature, the issue of race also proves to be involved with unreadability. For example in Melville's "Benito Cereno," Babo orchestrates an elaborate play to mislead the helpful but ignorant Captain Amasa Delano, who is unable to understand the mimicry he sees, because, as Zsolt Virágos writes, "he is a prisoner of his inherited and axiomatic cultural stereotypes." Even though the mutiny on the ship is resolved by a legal trial at the end of the story, there remains an unreadable residue that is inextricably involved with the heritage of racial violence. Even though many of Johnson's texts engage seriously with the question of race, this dimension is probably the most important lack in the dissertation, as it is only touched upon in my reading of *Jerusalem Delivered*. Just like in the oeuvres of Felman and Caruth, it constitutes a not yet fully explored theoretical position within the thesis, which, as the chapter on Tasso suggests, might prove very effective in displacing the hegemony of deconstructive criticism and its heirs. It is possible to briefly sketch the outline of such inquiry by looking at the texts of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, whose thesis about W. B. Yeats was also supervised by de Man in the 1970s, and who, just like Johnson, entered the critical scene as the translator of Derrida to become one of the most eminent postcolonial critics today. The reason I could not include her texts in the dissertation is that I feel that the discourse her books speak is very much unlike de Man's, and owes much more to Derrida.

I see the most important contribution of the critics studied in the dissertation to literary theory and literary criticism in inflecting these notions of rhetoric and unreadability familiar from deconstructive texts with historically determined issues, like that of class, gender, race, or ethics, which were never denied, but neither were they fully explored in de Man's writings. If these are misreadings of de Man, then so be it; according to some critics, like Rodolphe Gasché, or Jeffrey Nealon, it was precisely this kind of misreading that produced "American deconstruction," or "deconstructive criticism" in the first place.

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS OF THE AUTHOR

### Publications Related to the Thesis:

- “Poe and the Aporia of Mourning: ‘The Sleeper,’ the Tales, and ‘The Most Poetical Topic’.” *HUSSE Papers* 2005 (158-165).
- “Poe és a gyász apóriája.” Bényei Tamás, ed. *Átjárások: Fiatal anglisták és amerikanisták tanulmányai*. FISZ, 2005. 212-227.
- “Két mimikri között: A mimikri Luce Irigaray és Homi Bhabha szövegeiben.” *Filológiai Közöny* 2003.1-4. 70-78.
- “Pszichoanalízis és retorikai olvasás: Felman, Lacan, de Man.” *Alföld* 2003/6. 65-72.
- “»The Space In Between«: Barbara Johnson’s Dislocations of Feminism and Deconstruction.” (Review Essay) Accepted for publication by the *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*.
- “Személyesség és kritika. Menyhért Anna *Elmondani az elmondhatatlant* című kötetéről.” (Review) *Alföld* 2009.9. 114-118.
- “A tetten érhetetlen »másik«. Kulcsár-Szabó Zoltán Paul de Man-könyvéről.” (Review) *Debreceni Disputa* 2008.11-12. 100-102.
- “Ellentétek metszéspontjában. Sári B. László *A hattyú és a görény: Kritikai vázlatok irodalomra és politikára* című könyvéről.” (Review) *Debreceni Disputa* 2008.6. 40-42.
- “Psychoanalysis, Deconstruction and Ethics: The Theoretical Stakes of Shoshana Felman’s Writings.” (Review Essay) *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 2008 (Spring): 159-169.
- “Barbara Johnson *Mother Tongues: Sexuality, Trials, Motherhood, Translation* című könyvéről.” (Review) *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 2005 (Fall): 243-245.
- “Félkomoly Apák: Kalmár György *Szöveg és vágy* című könyvéről.” (Review) *Alföld* 2004.6. 99-103.
- “A trauma és a törvény: Shoshana Felman *The Juridical Unconscious* című könyvéről.” (Review) *Filológiai Közöny* 2004.1-2. 137-142.

### Other Publications:

- “Saját és idegen viszonya a vámpírtörténetek tükrében: Az *Alkonyat* példája.” *Debreceni Disputa* 2010.7-8. 83-88.
- “»Képmások.« Test és textualitás Paul Verhoeven *Elemi ösztön* című filmjében.” Fodor Péter, Szirák Péter, eds. *Szótér: Az Alföld Stúdió antológiája*. Debrecen: Alföld Alapítvány, 2008. 143-152.
- “Semblances: Textuality and the Body in Paul Verhoeven’s *Basic Instinct*.” *Gender Studies* (Universitatii de Vest, Timisoara) 2005.4. 89-96.
- “A *Traumnovelle* és Kubrick visszatérése Schnitzlerhez.” *Kalligram* 2004.1. 85-92.
- “Az olvasás mint átrajzolás: Szilágyi Zsófia *A féllábú ólomkatona* című könyvéről.” (Review) *Alföld* 2006.11. 97-102.
- “Hagyomány, ideológia, kritika: Margócsy István *Hajóvonták találkozása* című könyvéről.” (Review) *Alföld* 2005.6. 92-96.
- “Kritika és elfedés: Odorics Ferenc *A disszemináció ábrándja* és Milbacher Róbert, Z. Kovács Zoltán *A maradék öröme* című könyvéről.” (Review) *Alföld* 2003.10. 95-102.
- “Steven Serafin, ed. *Dictionary of Literary Biography* Vol. 215, 220, 232: *Twentieth Century Eastern European Writers*.” (Review) *Hungarian Studies* 2003.2. 314-318.

### **Conference Papers Related to the Thesis:**

*HUSSE Conference*, Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Piliscsaba, 2011: “Representing the Trauma of Parting: Mourning Emerson’s Hyacinthine Boy.”

*HUSSE Conference*, Veszprémi Egyetem, Veszprém, 2005: “Poe and the Aporia of Mourning: ‘The Sleeper,’ the Tales, and ‘The Most Poetical Topic’.”

*OTDK Conference*, Veszprém, 2003: “Pszichoanalízis és retorikai olvasás: Felman, Lacan, de Man.”

*OTDK Conference*, Veszprém, 2003: “Mimicry and the Discourses of Race / Sexuality.”

*Nő és férfi, férfi és nő*, TársadalmiNem- és Kultúrakutatóközpont, Budapest, 2002: “A mimikri Luce Irigaray és Homi Bhabha írásaiban.”

*Fiatalok a lélekgyógyászatban, fiatalok a lélekgyógyászatról*, DE OEC Magatartástudományi Intézet, Debrecen, 2001: “Változó nézőpontok a pszichoanalitikus irodalomkritikában.”

### **Other Conference Papers:**

*British and American Studies Conference*, University of West Timisoara, Timisoara, 2004: “Semblances: Textuality and the Body in Paul Verhoeven’s *Basic Instinct*.”

*Erőszak és nemek*, TársadalmiNem- és Kultúrakutatóközpont, Budapest 2003: “Schnitzler és Kubrick: *Tágra zárt szemek*.”

*OTDK Conference*, Szeged, 2001: “A nő rejtélye: Olvasás és ismétlés Kemény Zsigmond *Ködképek a kedély láthatárán* című regényében.”