



We have asked: what is the compound of **philosophy** and its **materials**? Here we are asking: what is the compound of **psychoanalysis** and **something else** (for instance **philosophy**)? Can we even consider this compound without heeding Spinoza's call for **1-in-1** unity of essence and existence in **substance**?

That is, the **in-one** requirement to define 'substance' as an ethical method to maintain relationships **not** based on isolation, but on **individuation**: that is a relationship which has to be maintained **within** each one of us, to feature aesthetico-epistemic interaction **between** us, that is **actually** operational.

I am not sure whether anyone really has succeeded at this—because how exactly would we know?—but my feeling is that just as the **unity** between essence and existence is **haptic** (even if **infinite**), the finite terms of the **situational** is **contingent** to **substance**, once it has become **individuated**.



What has been established **up to this point** is a possible approach to the book **and its materials**: that is, the book's **multiple** references and the **context** of Spinoza's **life**: how he made a **living** and how **is life** went. Which means that we need some materials of our own, to avoid **merely** expanding the isolate.

Since the same problem that we encountered with the **exegetic** method can easily be expanded and **invented** as we include the context and the materials for the book. The only way to **break** with the **premise** of the **isolate** is to think and act **relationally**, which means that we need a material & context.

So, let us think of this scenario. We have a **material** composed of **two** different **subsections**. Both are conceived as **isolates**. But whereas one corpus **claims** essence but **lacks** existence (it claims to be a book to come), the other corpus **exists** but makes no claims (it is only made up of **diaries**).

Being part of the **same** archive—by the decision of the **two people** who produced and owned them—the isolate can be **broken** by deciding that they should be submitted **jointly** to the **readability** of a **book**. The readability of a book is **not** the same as reading written words and sentences in a text.

The book **contains** writing, but it also contains elements—such as images, charts, case, boxes, references and chapters—characterised by the fact that they can be **listed** and **numbered**: so the book includes this sort of **inventory** defining the **book** as such. It also contains elements that can be **told**: stories.

Of course, any text can be analysed in these terms, but then we are analysing it as a book. More importantly, the outline of constituent elements of a book—outlined above—is relevant in the context of **publication**. Just by creating such inventories for the above archive, we are **already** working on a book.

Archives are defined by **provenance**—the acts of legal/regular deposit—and **not** by structures of this kind, in which we are interested in here because they are **not only** structures, but **structuring** structures: in the concrete sense that the **character** of the material—hidden in its isolation—will **reveal** itself.

Which means that the **book-making** process—initiated by working on archive materials with the scope of a book—will initiate a kind of character-analysis of the materials: that is a process similar to a **psychoanalytic** labour, but carried on **something else** than a psyche: something potentially a **cultural** material.

In other words, we are approaching something articulating at the crossroads **between** a psychology of culture—a character-analysis at the level of a life-situation involving relationships (e.g. **wife** and **husband**)—and that thing Spinoza termed **substance**: e.g., the outlook from their **domestic** unit.

To make psychoanalysis to work in this way—to avoid the problem of the isolate—the psychoanalyst would, in this case, be in **professional collaboration** with e.g. an anthropologist. The work of Deleuze and Guattari on Kafka—on the topic of 'minor literature'—could be forerunner of **such** an attempt.