

RELIEF IN IGNORANCE, SHATTERED SUBJECTIVITY: A LACANIAN READING OF SUBJECTIVITY IN ANTON CHEKHOV'S "THE BET"

Alireza Kargar

Lorestan University, Lorestan, Iran

Alirezakargar1984@yahoo.com

Mahnoosh Vahdati

Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

mahnooshvahdati@yahoo.com

Hassan Abootalebi

Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

abootalebi2010@yahoo.com

Received: 15 March 2021

Accepted: 13 September 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21071/ltap.v6i6.14042>

Abstract

This paper provides a psychoanalytical account of subjectivity. It engages in a Lacanian reading of subjectivity in Anton Chekhov's "The Bet" (1889), whose protagonist, the lawyer, illustrates Jacques Lacan's ideas about subjectivity and the subject. In the story, the lawyer develops a fragmented sense of subjectivity and experiences alienation from the society and all its allegedly logical and supposedly eternal norms, as well as loss and lack in his very being. The story reveals that subjectivity is unstable and constructed within and through language and that remaining a normal person, from the society's perspective, requires not pondering over and beyond the language, but remaining stuck in it and never suspecting its authenticity and reliability. By contemplating whether the society's ideologies are everlasting and what are or might be over them, the lawyer expects the society's ideologies to bring bliss to human and thereby he develops hatred and despise towards them all. The ideas of Jacques Lacan about the development of subjectivity in the course of the mirror stage and the Oedipal crisis are drawn upon.

Keywords: Subjectivity, Alienation, Anton Chekhov, Lacan, Mirror Stage, “The Bet”

ALIVIO EN LA IGNORANCIA, SUBJETIVIDAD DESTRUIDA: LECTURA LACANIANA DE “LA APUESTA” DE ANTÓN CHÉJOV

Resumen

El presente trabajo ofrece un estudio psicoanalítico sobre la subjetividad, a partir de una lectura lacaniana de la subjetividad en el cuento “La apuesta” (1889) de Antón Chéjov, cuyo protagonista, el abogado, ilustra las ideas de Jacques Lacan sobre la subjetividad y el sujeto. En el cuento, el abogado desarrolla una noción fragmentada de su subjetividad y experimenta alienación de la sociedad, con todas sus normas supuestamente lógicas y eternas, así como pérdida y carencia de su propio ser. El cuento revela que la subjetividad es inestable y construida dentro y a través del lenguaje y que mantenerse como una persona normal, desde la perspectiva de la sociedad, requiere no trascender el lenguaje, sino quedarse aferrado a él, sin cuestionar su autenticidad y fiabilidad. El abogado, al considerar si las ideologías de la sociedad son eternas y qué hay o podría haber sobre ellas, espera que las ideologías de la sociedad aporten dicha a los humanos y, por ello, desarrolla odio y desprecio hacia todas ellas. Se parte de las ideas de Jacques Lacan sobre el desarrollo de la subjetividad en la fase especular y en la crisis edípica. **Palabras clave:** subjetividad, alienación, Antón Chéjov, Lacan, fase especular, “La apuesta”

RELIEF IN IGNORANCE, SHATTERED SUBJECTIVITY: A LACANIAN READING OF SUBJECTIVITY IN ANTON CHEKHOV'S "THE BET"

Alireza Kargar

Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

Alirezakargar1984@yahoo.com

Mahnoosh Vahdati

Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

mahnooshvahdati@yahoo.com

Hassan Abootalebi

Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

abootalebi2010@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

Lacan was an avid follower of Freud. He came to grasp the main ideas of psychoanalysis via Freud's main theories. In some phases of his career, Lacan chose his own way in psychology as he analyzed facts through distinct lenses which provide a psychological typo for each human being from infancy to adulthood. Lacan restudied Freud in his own lenses to shed light on some of his flawed metapsychology. In contrast to Freud's ideas, Lacan's main focus was on language and speech which illuminate most of his theories and specially aiding this essay to unfold theories of subjectivity. In fact, no psychologist other than Lacan can delve into the inner world and dark sides of characters. One can analyze numerous personality elements using psychoanalysis, but it also aids us to pore into different attitudes and personalities of fictional characters. This essay endeavors to put lenses on the two main characters of the short story "The Bet" by Anthon Chekhov applying Lacan's ideas and theories of Other, Subjectivity and his three phases or stages that will be fully discussed during this research. In *A Brief Outline of Psycho-analytic Theory*, it is claimed that the most prominent notion in object relation theory is that human being is the main focus and object of his/her interactions with others that would be their caretakers (Quigley 1998: 8). In fact, from the imaginary stage, the subject loses his own identity when encountering the alienating image of the self. He knows

himself by his mother or the mirror image that could be anyone in his life. Therefore he recognizes himself according to the other.

2. Analyzing Lacan's Theory of Subjectivity, the other and Language in "The Bet"

Deborah Brown argues that Descartes did in fact have a conception of a single, integrated human being and that in his view this conception is crucial to the success of human beings as rational and moral agents and as practitioners of science (Brown 2006: 1). On the contrary, Lacan often insists that his use of the term 'subject' is the very antithesis of the traditional understanding of the subject. He is rather well-known, in fact, for proclaiming a "subversion of the subject" (Lacan 1977: 281–312). By subjectivity, Lacan does not mean a coherent, autonomous and complete being, but quite the contrary, a being disjointed and fragmented to its core, plagued with an unbaiting loss and lack in the heart of its existence, that is, this lack is the expense of its subjectivity. One can easily trace this lack of subjectivity in both the characters of the lawyer and the banker. Whether perusing the wealth or emphasizing on a not so much precious argument about the priority of life imprisonment or death sentence for the criminals, the young lawyer is ready to deprive himself of fifteen years of his life's freedom. On the other hand, the banker is ready to importune on a silly bet that would voluntarily take one third of a man's life and confine him in a cell. Knowing the vanity and disgrace of this terrible bet, the banker's damaged subjectivity could not prevent him from doing that deal.

In Lacanian theory, there are two important moments in the development of the subject: the mirror stage and the oedipal crisis. In the mirror stage, the child gets a first idea of the *I* and enters the imaginary order. With the oedipal crisis, then, the child enters the symbolic order. The Lacanian subject undergoes splitting and alienation and has no stable self. During the years of imprisonment, the lawyer loses his own self and grabs another identity, he delves into numerous personas, sometimes he totally loses himself and sometimes he gains his ego until eventually he gains what he is searching for, and that is the aim of life. As Chekhov presented in the story, the lawyer's self and subjectivity changed during his years of imprisonment:

In the first year the books he sent for were principally of a light character; novels with a complicated love plot, sensational and fantastic stories, and so on. In the second year the piano was silent in the lodge, and the prisoner asked only for the classics. In the fifth year music was audible again, and the

prisoner asked for wine. Those who watched him through the window said that all that year he spent doing nothing but eating and drinking and lying on his bed, frequently yawning and angrily talking to himself. In the second half of the sixth year the prisoner began zealously studying languages, philosophy, and history. He threw himself eagerly into these studies - so much so that the banker had enough to do to get him the books he ordered. In the course of four years some six hundred volumes were procured at his request. (Chekhov 1889: 3)

What can be deduced from this part of story is that the lawyer's unstable *I* or the self, according to Lacan, was pumping out all through these years. This duality of the character and searching for a fixed identity that always encounters with a hole in it disturbs the lawyer more than the banker. Therefore, the more he attempts, the more he encounters the lack in his subjectivity. His accomplishment at the end of the story is the acceptance that this unified whole is always accompanied with a little hole in it. This seclusion was of prime importance in reaching the *I* for the lawyer as he acts as the Other for the banker. The lawyer's desires all through these years, including music, books, and freedom were actually the banker's desires.

According to James Mellard, the genesis of the Lacanian subject "can be outlined best in notions of a pre-mirror phase, a mirror phase, and a post-mirror phase" (1991: 27). Before the mirror stage, the child has no idea of itself as a "separate unit," but still remains undifferentiated from the mother's body and the physical world around it (Williams 1995: 65). The most important function of the mirror stage is the development of a unified body image. However, this experience involves misrecognition and alienation, since the child identifies with an image, or rather with "the very reflection of a reflection" (1995: 66). The child looks at its image in the mirror, ascribes certain characteristics to this image and transfers these characteristics to itself and consequently, considers itself as having those traits: totality and unity. Stin Vanheule and Paul Verhaege, who distinguish between three phases of Lacanian thinking, come to the conclusion that "Lacan qualifies [adult] humans as agents who actively identify with elements from others by considering others as mirrors of themselves. Consequently, the experience of subjective identity is fundamentally alienated, inevitably constituted by alien elements derived from the other" (2009: 402).

In other words, subjectivity emerges and is gained only at the price of recognition of being separate and different from the other, which is the exact meaning of what Lacan calls alienation and lack. In Chekhov's story, the lawyer decides to look at himself in the mirror that there is no other in it, and

as mentioned above, his true subjectivity had been acquired at the expense of observing himself apart and far away from other members of the society. His true other was the books he had been reading all these years and he has been fantasizing himself to be in direct real contact with them. In the letter found by the banker towards the end of the story, the lawyer noted:

For fifteen years I have been intently studying earthly life. It is true I have not seen the earth nor men, but in your books, I have drunk fragrant wine, I have sung songs, I have hunted stags and wild boars in the forests, have loved women ... Beauties as ethereal as clouds, created by the magic of your poets and geniuses, have visited me at night, and have whispered in my ears wonderful tales that have set my brain in a whirl. In your books I have climbed to the peaks of Elburz and Mont Blanc, and from there I have seen the sun rise and have watched it at evening flood the sky, the ocean, and the mountain-tops with gold and crimson. I have watched from there the lightning flashing over my head and cleaving the stormclouds. I have seen green forests, fields, rivers, lakes, towns. I have heard the singing of the sirens, and the strains of the shepherds' pipes; I have touched the wings of comely devils who flew down to converse with me of God ... In your books I have flung myself into the bottomless pit, performed miracles, slain, burned towns, preached new religions, conquered whole kingdoms. (Chekhov 1889: 6-7)

The lawyer discovered his true self in the others which are the books he made no affinity with when he was outside of the cell. Accepting the lack that the other holds, he gained a subjectivity that was not complete but enough to lead him to his knowledge of the self.

Lacan's subject is an aftermath of language, but an aftermath that remains external to, and not reducible to, language. Language is transformed to the subject through the *Other* and the lawyer's other were the books he was reading and finding the meaning of his life in them. Here, it is worthwhile to draw a distinction between Lacan's idea of the *other* spelled with small letter 'o' and the *Other* with a capital 'O'. The *other* is used "to refer to the other . . . of the imaginary dyad" (1977: 568), in that, it refers to the image the subject identifies with, and aspires towards. This small other can be other human beings that the lawyer knew himself with all the years before imprisonment. The concept of the *Other*, however, is much more complex: "The most important usages of the Other are," according to Moi, "those in which the Other represents language, the site of the signifier, the Symbolic Order or any third party in a triangular structure" (Lacan 1988: 98). Broadly speaking, it can be asserted that the mother plays the role of the *other* in mother-child relation in the imaginary phase with whom the child identifies and feels

complete satisfaction since it (mis)recognizes her as its ideal, the first and foremost cause of unification and enjoyment. While this *Other* is a third party, anyone or anything outside the dual mother-child relation, which thrusts the child into the symbolic order, reveals the world of differentiation and separation to the child, inculcates the norms necessary for living, and being accepted to continue living, in the society the child would and has to live, and thereby, much to its chagrin, confronts it with the ruthless fact that there is and will be no complete unification and enjoyment and that whatever he experienced as satisfaction out of being with its mother had been illusion and deception. However, to compensate for laying bare this fact and leaving the subject with a permanent and ever-elusive satisfaction, the symbolic offers numerous substitutes and promises that they will bring joy, comfort and satisfaction to the subject. That would be neither the piano and nor the people, but the lawyer's books.

The child enters into the imaginary order as soon as it develops the capability of identification (Mellard 1991: 59). Mellard quotes Anika Lemaire who explains that according to Lacan the core of the imaginary is a dual relationship, a duplicate in the mirror, a sudden encounter between consciousness and its Other turning into each other and fade into the reflections (16). The imaginary, thus, is an "essentially narcissistic space" (Williams 1995: 59), where the child misrecognizes everyone and everything as an image of itself whereby it experiences unity, unity in its existence and oneness with its world, especially with its mother. Nonetheless, the fact is that the child can differentiate itself, as *I*, from the other, but is unable to distinguish the other from the Other, that is, the mother as its ideal and the mother as a separate being in the outer world. Lacan himself remarks that the imaginary order "is particularly satisfying for the subject, connoted in psycho-analytic experience by the term narcissism" (1988: 74). The development of the subject begins only with the entry into the imaginary world. Now, the child has the first conception of an *I*, but it will experience subjectivity, that is, a sense of identity only when it enters into the symbolic order. This sense of *I* has not yet taken on autonomy, that is, the sense of being a separate *being* from the others. So, it is still bereft of subjectivity. This gradual process happened to both the banker and the lawyer as the years passed, the lawyer would find his subjectivity and his *I* in the books and languages he sinks himself in. They were apart from the real world and the banker comes to the gradual recognition that money is not everything in the world, that human emancipation speaks first. The lawyer was like a mirror for the banker who beholds his own image in it although he couldn't accept

the consequences. Yet at the end the lawyer was more successful in finding his true self apart from the others he desired all through his life.

The child enters the symbolic with the oedipal crisis (Mellard 1991: 16). In doing so, the child must be capable of symbolization. The acquisition of symbolization is bequeathed to the child with language acquisition. Language holds a pivotal role in Lacanian theory, especially when it comes to the unconscious, which, according to Lacan, is structured like a language. As Lacan famously puts it in “The Insistence of the Letter in the Unconscious”, what the psychoanalytic experience discovers in the unconscious is the whole structure of language” (2008: 187). Lacan’s conceptions of language are heavily influenced by the work of Ferdinand de Saussure, the forerunner of structuralism and first to discuss the arbitrariness of the sign. However, while Saussure held that the sign (signifier) is subordinated to the concept (signified), Lacan inverts the relationship and puts the signifier (S) over the signified (s) and draws a fraction between the two (189). This idea of language has been stressed upon in “The Bet” as the lawyer claims that now that he knows different languages, he indeed knows the world better as he states in his first letter:

My dear Jailer, I write you these lines in six languages. Show them to people who know the languages. Let them read them. If they find not one mistake, I implore you to fire a shot in the garden. That shot will show me that my efforts have not been thrown away. The geniuses of all ages and of all lands speak different languages, but the same flame burns in them all. Oh, if you only knew what unearthly happiness my soul feels now from being able to understand them! The prisoner's desire was fulfilled. The banker ordered two shots to be fired in the garden ... (Chekhov 1889: 4)

By acquiring the knowledge of different languages, the lawyer endeavored to manifest his unconscious whether through knowledge or his letters to the banker. In the discussion of the lawyer’s fragmented sense of self, it is interesting to note that even his job– distinguishing the authenticity and fallacy of something – signals pondering which, in this case, leads to split. Hence, he has the schism already in his profession (D’hoker 2004: 224). The lawyer is working on the intricate problem of finding his real self. As this essay will show, he does not go ahead vigorously and effectively, and instead of solving the problem he is rather making it worse, which gives the choice of his job an ironic touch.

Naturally the lawyer’s situation gets worse rather than better. Brendan McNamee explicates that “[s]elf-obsession goes hand in hand with self-

division: a self looking, a self being looked at" (2005: 76). With this, he states nearly the same as Lacan, who claims that "I am not, wherever I am the plaything of my thought" (1977: 200). What McNamee means is that the one who is pondering over himself holds the passive and active role at the same time, and thus the one who is looking at himself is inevitably fragmented. The only possible solution is to resist looking at or thinking about oneself, "[t]he disappearance of the 'I', or better say, the disappearance of the 'I' looking at the 'I', is the dissolving of self-division" (1988: 77). On the contrary, looking at and pondering over himself is exactly what Chekhov's character does. As Izarra puts it, the lawyer's main occupation is searching through his inner self to illustrate the complicatedness of the human subject, and how reason leads to chains of causes and effects" (2006: 182-83). The lawyer, in the first five years, orders neither wine nor tobacco. Instead, he asks voraciously for "novels with a complicated love plot, sensational and fantastic stories, and so on" (Chekhov 1889: 6). In "The Bet", the lawyer thinks endlessly about himself during his incarnation, and thus it is not surprising that he cannot solve his problems of self-division and – consequently – of alienation. It should not go unsaid that the lawyer, by formulating his thoughts about himself, is actively creating his identity, or better say, shattering the constructed identity by language.

The lawyer acquires a *split* personality since he has already detected the hallucinatory nature of social ideologies and whatever they offer as salvation and bliss. This is reflected in his letter to the banker in which he says: "I despise your books, despise all worldly blessings and wisdom. Everything is void, frail, visionary and delusive as a mirage" (6). This letter holds many ideas about the subject, the symbolic and its ramifications of the subject as well as their interaction. Accordingly, the subject is obedient and law-abiding as long as he is constantly subjected to, and under the surveillance of, social ideologies due mainly to two reasons. Firstly, in constant interaction with the society, the subject is always bombarded with the values and doctrines established by social rules and he is made to erroneously take them for bliss and the true goal of life. And secondly, due to this ongoing and unending contact with social rules, the subject is robbed of his thinking. In other words, these rules leave no room for the subject to think, because the subject is highly liable to question their rectitude, as this is the case with the lawyer. Hence, the probability that someone might fall apart grows when (s)he enters the symbolic stage. As a result, when the unconscious comes into existence we are exposed to fragmentation. Given this situation, we can reach the conclusion that we have to restrict ourselves under the yoke of the symbolic,

if we want to experience to be real people since it is only under its influence that the subject is able to, however fallaciously, assume an integrated, whole identity.

However, the banker has long steeped in the labyrinth of the symbolic which is social ideologies. There are a number of instances in which the lawyer distinguishes the fake nature of these ideologies and consequently becomes profoundly a non-believer of the authenticity of these rules, on the one hand, and comes to realize that he has been fooled by these ideologies hitherto. That is why he expresses his unbridled abhorrence to the society, its conventions and its allegedly foremost dominance of human over beast: as the lawyer, in the ending parts of his letter, points clearly out this aversion and writes “and I despise your books, I despise wisdom and the blessings of this world. It is all worthless, fleeting, illusory, and deceptive, like a mirage” (7). Social rules have always indoctrinated him to believe that complying with these rules, firstly, is tantamount to attaining bliss and salvation and, secondly, is the prerequisite of being considered a normal member of the society and transgressing them at any level of severity and under any pretext will not be tolerated and deserves punishment. As a result, the perpetrator is doomed to become a spurned member of the society. Moreover, social ideologies indoctrinate the subject not to question their reliability and authenticity, instead the only thing they require the subject to do is to obey them blindly. So, these rules create a fallacious aura of mystery and holiness around themselves and make the subject give his full confidence and consequently his full allegiance to them.

The character of the lawyer reveals that there is no stable, essentially integrated self or at least none we have access to in reality since we have acquired, as Lacan stipulates, our subjectivity at the cost of losing our unity with the outer world and fragmented from it, and further, from ourselves. The novel proposes that identity is something created through the symbolic which is inaugurated by language acquisition, so it is something unstable and highly capricious. The lawyer creates his identity both in immersing himself in books and also in musing over his relationship with language and the influences it has exerted on him. At the end, of course, it is the reader who creates the lawyer’s identity. If we accept the idea that identity comes into existence through language, then inevitably we must consider identity changeable. Human’s identity is subject to the play of differences. Nevertheless, the lawyer is obsessed with looking for a real self and this obsession is the direct result of overthinking about the authenticity of the doctrines he has acquired through language, but his search only leads him to

new and deeper experiences of fragmentation and alienation. His search to find his supposed integrated self cannot be successful, since a self that is constructed through language by its very nature has already shattered and disjointed and is always elusive.

If we understand the changeability of identity as an expression of postmodernity – which suggests itself, having introduced Lacan's subversion of signified-signifier relation – then the lawyer illustrates that not accepting postmodern reality with its fast changes makes it even more difficult to cope with the situation. However, the lawyer also illustrates human longing for authenticity and stability. This is the last dilemma this essay points out. The lawyer has shown us the way out of this spiral and its ramifications. Thus, if we want to be happy with the situation, we have to eschew pondering over the authenticity of social ideologies.

The lawyer's confusion about, and increasing disbelief in, his self affects his relationships with other people and mars his appreciation of his authentic and autonomous subjectivity. In the same way as he cannot define his self, he cannot rationalize his relations to other people. As a result, he was pleased with his distance from the society since this action serves as a contrast and as a source of identification, a raw material for an ideal ego he was looking for in his interaction with other people. In so doing, he sees through the Other, the social ideologies, with which he, as a member of the society, has brought up and which has taught him how to think, see, feel, and even how to live. This Other, the lawyer comes to understand, is nothing short of some sets of rules and regulations established by human, precisely speaking the rulers, to be able to control the acts and thoughts of the society so as to rule over them. Thus, social ideologies, the lawyer perceives, are not the true and authentic doctrines to bring about salvation to human being, but simply, the tools of restricting people's thoughts. They are after taking their own advantages most. Accordingly, the lawyer loses his confidence in this Other and identifies most with ghosts, beings who simultaneously belong to two different worlds and still to none of them. The lawyer shares the mirage's elusiveness and he experiences situations where he is the signifier and signified at the same time, just like a mirage. Considering himself closer to the ghosts than to human Others, the lawyer is still influenced by other people because it was through the passage of the Other, the symbolic, that he entered into the world of differentiation and attained his subjectivity. Therefore, keeping himself away from the 'Other' leads to a new beginning in the lawyer's life. Nonetheless, there are no true beginnings for the lawyer. He constantly goes on to adapt a new role to play, which again leads to

fragmentation and alienation and thus to the next level in a spiral that leads him away from authentic experiences.

3. Conclusion

The present essay has suggested that the lawyer in Chekhov's "The Bet" illustrates certain of Jacques Lacan's ideas concerning subjectivity and the subject. We have seen that the lawyer's musings lead into a vicious circle. The lawyer is split. His isolation from the society brings about his brooding about himself that in turn exacerbates fragmentation rather than it helps the lawyer to find an answer about his self. Prior to his incarceration by the banker, the lawyer used to pursue a purposeful life and think that this is the outcome of his appreciation of the unanimity of his self. However, during his imprisonment, he comes to realize that he was putting on a masquerade which blurred his vision of the reality and of the true nature of his self. This suggests that there is accumulation at work as well as fragmentation. His different selves, the one during his communication with the society and the one derived from his solitude, are contradictory and he is in high confusion about himself and his self. This confusion and contradiction with his earlier presuppositions about his self and identity exacerbates to his alienation. In order to eschew temptations of alienation and to find authenticity he seeks refuge in indulging himself in his books whose field is extended from philosophy to religion, to art, literature, math, logic and even, to language. Also, he uses his book and his solitude as raw material to create an ideal ego but the outcome is otherwise. Yet, in the long run, reading his books increases his alienation from the society and, above all, from himself and his self. The lawyer cannot come into contact with his self and experiences that he lacks authenticity and instead he is besieged by and suffers from a shattered subjectivity. He is put in darkness in front of his subjectivity, which is *blurred* and *deformed* by his extreme obsession and involvement with his books.

Works Cited

- Benvenuto, Bice, and Roger Kennedy (1986). *The Works of Jacques Lacan: An Introduction*. New York: St Martins Press.
- Brown, Deborah J (2006). *Descartes and the Passionate Mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- D'hoker, Elke (2004). *Visions of Alterity: Representations in the Works of John Banville*. Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V.
- Chekhov, Anton (1889). *The Bet*. Baltimore: Penguin.
- Freud, Sigmund (1984). *The Ego and the Id, in On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis* (Vol. 11). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Homer, Sean (2005). *Jacques Lacan*. USA and Canada: Routledge.
- Izarra, Laura P. Z. (2006). "Disrupting Social and Cultural Identities: A Critique of the Ever-Changing Self". *Irish University Review: A Journal of Irish Studies* 36.1: 182-99.
- Lacan, Jacques (2004). *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Jacques Alain Miller. Trans. A. Sheridan. London: Karnac.
- Lacan, Jacques (1977). "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience". In Jacques Lacan. *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. A. Sheridan. London: Routledge/Tavistock, 1-7.
- Lacan, Jacques (1988). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book II: The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. S. Tomaselli. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lacan, Jacques (2008). *The Insistence of the Letter in the Unconscious.* "Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. Harlow: Pearson/Longman.
- Le Gaufy, Guy (2012). "Looking at the Mirror Image: The Stare and the Glance". In H. De Preester & V. Knockaert (eds.). *Body Image and Body Schema. Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the Body*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 273-282.
- McNamee, Brendan (2005). "The Human Moment: Self, Other and Suspension in John Banville's *Ghosts*". *A Journal of English and American Studies* 32: 66-86.
- Mellard, James M (1991). *Using Lacan, Reading Fiction*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Miller, Jacques Alain (1996). "An Introduction to Seminars I and II". In R. Feldstein, B. Fink and M. Jaanus (eds.). *Reading Seminars I and II: Lacan's Return to Freud*. New York: SUNY Press, 3-35.

- Nobus, Dany (1998). "Life and Death in the Glass: A New Look at the Mirror Stage". In D. Nobus (ed.). *Key Concepts of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London: Rebus Press, 101-138.
- Quigley, Timothy (1998). *A Brief Outline of Psycho-analytic Theory, Freudian, Lacanian and Object Relations Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Thurschwell, Pamela (2000). *Sigmund Freud*. London: Routledge.
- Vanheule, Stin and Paul Verhaege (2009). "Identity through a Psychoanalytic Looking Glass". *Theory & Psychology* 19: 391-411.
- Williams, Linda R (1995). *Critical Desire. Psychoanalysis and the Literary Subject*. London: Edward Arnold.