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What is important to me is not to pastiche *Finnegans Wake*—one will always be inferior to the task—but to say how I give to Joyce, in formulating this title, *Joyce-the-Symptom*, nothing less than his proper name, a name in which, I believe, he would have recognized himself in the dimension of nomination (Lacan 1987a: 22, my translation).

'We have learned to see Joyce as Lacan's own symptom,' writes Jean-Michel Rabaté, 'and as the Sinthome par excellence' (2006: 26). This duality of Joyce as an unreadable text permeated with enjoyment and, at the same time, as an enigma that Lacan wants to decipher supplies the key to an understanding of *Le Séminaire. Livre XXIII. Le Sinthome, 1975–76* (2005). Lacan's addition of a fourth term, the *sinthome* (Σ), to the triad of the real, the symbolic and the imaginary strengthens his late shift from the 'speakingbeing' (parlettre, a Lacanian neologism that indicates the insertion of the human being into the signifying chain) to *MAN* (*LOM*, a Lacanian play on l'homme). Instead of the human being as inserted into the symbolic order, this seminar presents Joyce as inserting himself into language, tying the signifier to the body in a special, unique way: For Lacan, the *sinthome* is eccentric to the registers of the real, symbolic and imaginary, yet, paradoxically, it links them when the Name-of-the-Father fails. The implication is carried in the concept of nomination, which means the construction of a replacement for the paternal function, that the Name-of-the-Father (or its structural equivalents, such as Woman, God, and Joyce) makes language possible for the individual.

---

1 A version of this essay has appeared in 2011 as "'The Compositor of the Farce of Dustiny": Lacan Reading, and Being Read By, Joyce'. *Analysis* 16 (October): 99–118.—Ed.
Lacan's final complete seminar on Joyce represents a last, convulsive revision of the entire corpus of Lacanian psychoanalysis. Prompted by an invitation to speak at an international Joyce conference by leading French Joyce scholar, Jacques Aubert, Lacan turned the seminar of 1975–76 into an exploration of the questions raised by the paper delivered the previous year. Rabaté's comment sums up the findings of a torrent of recent scholarship on what is perhaps Lacan's most perplexing seminar.² Thanks to this material, we can now draw some conclusions about the status and implications of Joyce-the-Symptom, both regarding psychoanalytic theory and his reading of Joyce. But there are two main unresolved problems in the current debate on this seminar—whether Lacan regarded Joyce as a psychotic (stabilized or otherwise)³ and the degree to which Lacan's final seminar represents a belated rapprochement (reconciliation) with Jacques Derrida on the question of 'generalized writing'.⁴ This essay provides a brief overview of the major discussions of Lacan's intervention and then probes some of the findings, especially regarding the Joycean text.

I will position Lacan's enquiry in the context of his research into the unconscious, centred on the objet petit a as the epistemological object of psychoanalysis and then bring out the opposed character of the psychoanalytic and deconstructive readings of Joyce. While highlighting the insights that Lacan's reading of Joyce enables, I will question Lacan's basic strategy, namely, to interpret not the unconscious in the text but the activity of writing as a symptom. This commits Lacan to a biographical approach about which he is sceptical elsewhere, with the consequence that he is forced to regard the Joycean text itself as situated in the dimension of unreadability.⁵ A perhaps overlooked

⁴ This position is best stated in Rabaté 2001: 154–82.
result of this is that not only does Joyce become Lacan's symptom, but also that the Lacanian seminar becomes dominated by a literary trope—that of inversion and reversal in the mirror of the doppelgänger. Lacan locates Joyce as both a saint of letters and a literary Sphinx, declaring him unanalyzable on the basis that he enjoys without suffering, because Joyce believes in his Thing, the *sinthome* of his work. Lacan thinks that the Joycean riddle can be solved with a fourth loop in the notorious Borromean knot. But, of course, with truly Sophoclean irony, it is Lacan who is the riddle. As Lacan's theoretical prose becomes increasingly Joycean, the Joycean relation to the literary father is transposed onto Lacan's relation to Freudian psychoanalysis.

**THE JOYCEAN SINTHOME**

Certainly, the seminar on Joyce is remarkable for its intellectual energy. Although the seminar is interrupted by Lacan's trip to America, it is clear that he reread the central works by Joyce during the year—*A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916), *Ulysses* (1922) and *Finnegans Wake* (1939)—in their entirety. Lacan had also clearly read *Exiles* (1918), *Dubliners* (1914) and *Stephen Hero* (1944). He also made his way through the scholarly volumes populating Aubert's extensive library, where caches of books were delivered weekly. He made regular midnight visits to Aubert to question him on recondite points of Joyce interpretation. At one point, Lacan declares to his audience: '[Y]ou must be thinking that when it comes to Joyce, I'm a fish out of water.' And he explains: '[H]e writes with such peculiar subtlety in English that he disarticulates it' (1976–77a: Session 5, p. 23). That Lacan was defeated by Joyce's language seems unlikely—this is the same Lacan who, a few weeks before this mock admission, declares to his American audience that he has been practising his English by reading Joyce in the original (see Rabaté 2000). Lacan dives into the wonderland of Joyce's works, principally concerned with its implications for psychoanalytic research and clinical practice. If he is finally defeated by what we might call Joycean *lalangue*, it is not a consequence of English but of the peculiar structure of these riddling texts.

In the process, Lacan produces an enigmatic series of new concepts within a completely fresh 'turn' in his thinking. If Lacan's trajectory is characterized by the progression through the imaginary (from "The Discourse of Rome" to
The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book II. The Ego in Freud’s Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis, 1954–55 [1978; here 1988], the symbolic (the ‘structuralist’ Lacan of The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book III. The Psychoses, 1955–56 [1981; here 1993] to The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XI. The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis, 1964 [1973; here 1998a]) and the real (the ‘post-structuralist’ Lacan of ‘Le Séminaire. Livre XII. Problèmes cruciaux pour la psychanalyse, 1964–65’ [Critical issues for Psychoanalysis; unpublished], to The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XX. Encore: On Feminine Sexuality, The Limits of Love and Knowledge, 1972–73 [1975; here 1998b]), then Le Sinthome cements a fourth and final Lacan—the Lacan of ‘nomination’ and the sinthome, the fourth loop in the Borromean knot; of the sinthome and MAN (Žižek 1989: 132–3); of the Joycean ego as alternative to psychosis; and, of the radically individual character of the unconscious and the replacement of Lacanian linguistrickery by a new faunetics. Now, the loops of the real, symbolic and imaginary cannot be knotted together without the intervention of the sinthome, which, more than simply an archaic spelling of symptom, is the centre of gravity of the human being, the kernel of enjoyment sustaining the individual. For Lacan, the sinthome is ‘the most proper element of the human dimension’ (Rabaté 2001: 165) and the referent or result of nomination. The sinthome connects the real, symbolic and imaginary through the nomination (in the sense of election) of a functional equivalent for the Name-of-the-Father. Nomination involves both the election by the human being of their singular insertion into language and the process whereby the subject ‘makes a name for himself’, up to and including Joyce’s evasion of psychosis, despite the absence of the paternal function, through his nomination of his own ego as the functional equivalent of the Name-of-the-Father. Joyce-the-Symptom in the first place signifies that the


7 Already in ‘Le Séminaire. Livre XXI. Les non-dupes errrent/Les noms-du-père, 1973–74’ (The Non-dupes Err/ The Names-of-the-Father; unpublished), Lacan had proposed that the Name-of-the-Father was the fourth loop in the knot. Le Sinthome complements this conjecture and fleshes it out as a theoretical innovation.
proper name nominated by James and made through the literary works of Joyce is coextensive with the *sinthome* of a radically private use of language: Joyce (the literary name) is the symptom of Joyce (the man); the works of Joyce are the replacement for a radically deficient paternal signifier that keeps Joyce the man sane. Who can doubt Lacan’s intellectual courage? Can there be any real uncertainty about this being a fundamental revision of the conceptual armature of the previous decade? Surely, this is a last, catastrophic rupture with everything that had been established in so-called ‘Lacanianism’—almost, one might say, a handful of suggestive brushstrokes on a fresh canvas.

Along the way there are also the opaque topological ruminations, Duchampian wordplays and intellectual meanderings that characterize the final period. Lacan regrets that he has nothing to say and wonders whether Joyce was mad. He wonders with strategic naivety why Joyce bothered to publish *Scribbledehobble* (1961). Gone are the dazzling insights into the texts of William Shakespeare and Paul Claudel, Sophocles and André Gide. Instead of textual commentary that suddenly blazes into the heart of a new understanding of the literary work, we have pages and pages of multicoloured diagrams, word salads, neo-Dadaesque provocations to the audience, numerological speculations and diagrammatic conjectures. It is not simply that Lacan cannot absorb the entire library of Joyce scholarship in a hectic year of teaching. In place of a new reading, the biographical interpretation of the Joycean work becomes more insistent as Lacan’s perplexity at the texts increases. At the same time, Lacan’s own text becomes ever more openly Joycean: acrostic rather than aphoristic, inscrutable rather than enigmatic, hermetic rather than hermeneutic. Joyce-the-Symptom—who is Joyce that seems forced on Lacan? If Lacan baptizes Joyce with his proper name—as he claims to do—then who prepares the way for whom? Joyce might indeed have had, as Lacan suspects, a redeemer delusion. But the redeemer’s mission is primed by comparatives—‘one will always be inferior to the task’—if not superlatives. This is Lacan’s position of enunciation throughout the seminar: ‘I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?’ (Matthew 3:14).

It is not that Lacan lacked intellectual power in his final seminar, but that his theoretical position lacked penetration—at least, into Joyce’s texts. I do not accept the condescending theory of the advancing senility of the final years.
JOYCE: LACAN'S SPHINX

(Roudinesco 1997). The reduction of language to its letters, the condensation of complex discursive motifs into a series of deceptively simple sigla—these I would describe as perfectly Joycean, rather than intellectually enfeebled. I completely discount the theories of 'Lacanian delusion' and the master's sterility returning with a vengeance at the end of his life, offered to account for the cryptic nature of 'Joyce-the-Symptom'. These notions of a deficiency in Lacan's intellectual energies are contradicted by the text of the seminar at every point. Rabaté's reading of Joyce as Lacan's symptom has immense potential. It highlights the relative difference in their respective powers of insight—where Lacan's interpretation of Joyce remains within the ambit of biographical criticism and traditional scholarship, the encounter with Joyce provokes one last cataclysmic revision of Lacanian psychoanalysis.

As Rabaté observes, throughout the seminar, Lacan's concern is not to position Joyce's work within the discourse of the university, as the object of a scholarly knowledge that barely conceals its will to mastery even as it puts the intimidated clerks to work (2001: 160). Instead, Lacan operates within analytical discourse, where the analyst positions himself or herself as the 'trash' (the trashitas rather than the pious caritas), the remainder of enjoyment left over from the signifying operations of the subject. Lacan identifies the objet petit a, the sinthome, with the saintly man (saint-homme) who has renounced mastery, and then with St Thomas Aquinas (sinthomaquinas) who is just as crazy as Joyce—and Lacan ('Joyce displaces the saint homme from my madaquinisme').

Employing only such mythical knowledge, the analyst, as the agent within an

---

8 For a fascinating introduction to these in Joyce, see McHugh (1976).
9 See Jacques Derrida's introduction to the Joyce symposium for an example of how an admission of intimidation and incompetence, that is, of the impotence of the clerical as a declaration of membership within the university discourse, functions as a password (1988: 42).
11 Lacan (erroneously) claims that by substituting the 'splendour of Being', which Lacan does 'not find very striking', Joyce removes the sinthome from the Thomist doctrine of claritas (a doctrine of the radiance of the aesthetic object):
analytical discourse, is positioned in dialogue with the divided subject of the unconscious, and by insisting on the place of the symptom—the objet petit a—the analyst allows the subject to produce those master signifiers that are, rather than its symptom, the course of its suffering. Yet, the twist is that in Le Sinthome, it is Joyce who occupies the place of the sinthomaquinas, whose language is the madaquinisme of acrostic re-combinations, trans-linguistic homophonies and untranslatable puns. Joyce is Lacan’s literary saint, whose letters reduce the English language to litter even as they generate a ‘Joyce’ who is entirely distributed across the ruins of the signifier. In the faunetics of Lacan’s version of Finnegans Wake, the text is traversed by a major movement whose tropology is highly literary: ironic reversal and the chiasmatic exchange of properties. As Lacan becomes ever more Joycean—moving, indeed, towards what some have called a post-Joycean conception of the end of analysis (Harari 2002: 359)—Joyce increasingly occupies the position of Lacan’s divine trashitas.

A focus on language and the operations of literary irony in the seminar implies acceptance of the position of, for instance, Philippe Julien, that the Borromean knots are a distraction, a lure for the desire to directly comprehend the transmitted message in the form of a spatialized schema. Indeed, I consider the entire departure into the Borromean topology—Lacan admits to being ‘the prey of the knot’—to exhibit an imaginary captivation. Along these lines, Julien proposes that these diagrams, initially introduced as mnemonic devices to support a uniform pedagogy, usurp their cognitively subordinate status and posture as non-symbolizable mathematical objects (see Julien 1994). Yet, they are used by Lacan everywhere as visual representations for linguistically conveyed concepts. Accordingly, their topological value is nil, because they

One should state things clearly: as far as philosophy goes, it has never been bettered. That is not even the whole truth [. . .]. In sinthomadaquin there is something termed claritas, for which Joyce substitutes something like the splendour of Being—this is the weak point in issue. Is this a personal weakness? I do not find the splendour of Being very striking (Lacan 1976-77a: Session 1, p. 3).

12 For a study on Joyce and Aquinas see Noon (1957).

13 And should we also mention, as a literary trope in the seminar, the gigantic vanitas grinning out of the hole in LOM, Lacan’s final play on l’homme (MAN)?
are not generated by formal mathematical reasoning but through the symbolic postulation of analogies, although as images of theoretical positions their utility is unquestionable. Lacan's fundamental insight is that the unconscious is structured like a language, not like a mathematical surface. That Lacan decided to express this deep theoretical insight through quasi-mathematical diagrams is potentially unfortunate. Instead of his mathematical reflections, we can interpret the ruination of the signifier and the endlessly suggestive enjoyment of the recombination of letters into portmanteau words and polyvocal, multilingual jokes, that characterize *Finnegans Wake* as a final model for the operations of the unconscious.

**Lacan's Encounter with Joyce**

In his lecture to Aubert's symposium, Lacan stresses that the encounter between him and Joyce happened in reality—in 1921, they met in a Paris bookstore—as well as in a certain relation to language, one that ruptures the everyday pragmatics of what Lacan calls the chatterbox, and which instead facilitates the emergence of equivocation and polyvocality. We can specify that this encounter with Joyce involves both subjective identification and theoretical revision.

In *Le Sinthome*—although not for the first time—Lacan stages a profound identification with Joyce. According to Néstor Braunstein, Joyce is Lacan's literary alter ego. Yet, perhaps, this formulation is not quite accurate. Lacan maintains that Joyce is indifferent to his reception yet highly narcissistic. Despite his lack of human sympathy for Joyce, in the Joyce seminar, Lacan highlights a cluster of shared symbolic traits—their rejection of Catholicism, their style in language, their reduction of labyrinthine signifying complexity to a series of elementary diagrams. In other words, Joyce functions here for Lacan not as the imaginary other but as the bearer of a symbolic identification. Joyce, Lacan declares, 'is like me: a heretic' (1976-77a: Session 1, p. 3). But the Lacanian heresy (*heresie*—Lacan's pun on R. S. L., the real, symbolic and imaginary) is to be supplemented by the Joycean apostasy.

---

Lacan's identification with Joyce determines the transposition of this relation into the text, with frequent elision of the distinction between Joyce and his characters. 'Stephen,' Lacan announces, 'is in other words, Joyce as he imagines himself'; and again: 'Stephen is Joyce as he solves his own riddle' through the search for an absent/lacking father in the progress of *Ulysses*. 'Ulysses bears witness to the way in which Joyce remains rooted in his father, even as he denies him—and this is exactly his symptom' (ibid.: Session 4, pp. 20–1). Yet, strangely, at the same time, Lacan announces his intention to interpret the symptom of the work rather than the unconscious within the text. His question is not about the meaning of these texts but the function of his art for Joyce. If the fertility of a Lacanian approach has been abundantly demonstrated by Rabaté, Lacan's own strategy is based on a frankly biographical approach.15

Guided by an attentive reading of Richard Ellmann (1983) and Aubert's patient scholarship and close analysis of Joyce's letters, Lacan's thesis, based on the crucial datum of failure of the paternal function on the part of John Joyce, is that Joyce's writing supplements the deficient Name-of-the-Father. Lacan appears to have interpreted both *Portrait* and *Ulysses* as autobiographical. Joyce, as the thesis goes, 'makes a [N]ame (of the Father) for himself through his endless writing, thus fathering himself. The Lacanian discourse on Joycean 'original sin' interprets this motif in terms of the failure of the R. S. I. to knot together round the Name-of-the-Father, so that writing acts as a prosthetic paternity, a rejoining of the sundered links. Joyce's literary career is interpreted externally as the symptom of a compensation for the paternal deficiency, based in a wish for a real father.

In the field of Joyce studies, at least, Lacan's theoretical compass is determined by his respect for traditional literary scholarship, especially that of Robert M. Adams and Clive Hart. Lacan also makes use of Aubert's edition of *Ulysses*. Adams proposes in *Surface and Symbol* (1962) that most of the texture that provides narrative verisimilitude in the novel is superficial detail (some of it factually wrong) rather than 'luminous symbol' (1962: xvii). Accordingly,

the 'meaningless is deeply interwoven with the meaningful' (ibid.: 245) and the novel 'does not make a neat allegorical pattern' (ibid.: 256). Lacan's interpretation of this is that Adams has identified the distinction between the imaginary consistency of the diegetic world formulated in the symbolic medium of the narration, and the Joycean epiphanies that appear at right angles to the symbolic texture as interruptions where meaning and meaninglessness interpenetrate. But like Adams, Lacan does not fully take up the implications of Stephen's (highly Lacanian) equation of William Shakespeare with the ghost in *Hamlet*. One result is that the Oedipal dynamics of the struggle over literary progenitors for Joyce (the name, not the man) are missed by Lacan and consequently, *Ulysses* begins to seem like a text transitional towards psychosis. Hart uses the motif of the crossed circle in *Structure and Motif in Finnegans Wake* (1962) to describe the cosmological structure of *Finnegans Wake*. The quartered circle symbolizes the Viconian division of history into four ages (including the *ricorso* as an age as Joyce does), while the cyclical structure adumbrates the narrative circle of *Finnegans Wake* itself. All of this thematizes the circularity of a text that returns on itself in the first and last lines, yet constantly generates new interpretations with every traversal of the textual surface. Finally, the motif of the crossed circle indicates the problem of squaring the circle, that is, a mathematical problem involving infinite recursion, which adequately summarizes the generative matrix of this most important Joycean work. But for Lacan, the elaborate manipulation of rings of string and quasi-geometrical figures is not intended to summon up the 'bad infinity' of deconstructive dissemination. Instead, the act of abstraction from the textual surface to its generative problematic discloses the mechanism by which the whole work forms a 'consistency without unity'—that is, a style of the subject.

Lacan is wary of what we might call 'psychoanalysis and other ruses'—depth hermeneutics, father-son patterns and the collective unconscious. He excoriates Mark Shechner's *Joyce in Nighttown* (1974), on the basis that it trivializes the actual text, reducing it to a schema external to the significations of the nighttown sequence. Shechner is taken as illustrative of 'applied psychoanalysis' which involves not an encounter with the text with the potential to transform theory, but the application of an interpretive grid to the text so as to validate a hermeneutic result determined outside the work itself. Lacan is
also highly suspicious of the psychoanalytic motifs nested within the text. He rejects the conception of Bloom as father to Stephen and dismisses Joyce’s dalliance with occultism and obscurantism (Blavatsky). His comment on the relation between *Finnegans Wake* and the collective unconscious is profound and damning: the idiosyncrasy of the text is a precise refutation of the speculations of Jungian psychoanalysis, which itself stands unveiled as a symptomatic defense against the unconscious. Finally, and perhaps too definitively, Lacan rejects the mythological structuration of *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* (Homer and Vico).

Lacan’s intuition is that Joyce is a literary saint—on the one hand, meaningless trash, an objectival remainder of the signification process; on the other hand, a figure who ‘is’ only as text, that is, who dissolves into the Joycean writing. According to Lacan, ‘in his art, Joyce, in a privileged manner, aimed at the fourth term of the knot’ (1976–77a: Session 2, p. 10). At one level, what this means is fairly clear: ‘Joyce compensated for the lacking father.’ Lacan writes: ‘what I proposed very gently last time was that Joyce has a symptom whose origin is this: that his father was lacking, radically lacking—he speaks of nothing but this’ (ibid.: Session 7, p. 42); and again: ‘it turns out in *Ulysses* that Joyce has to support the father’s subsistence’ (ibid.: Session 1, p. 6).

Yet, before we conclude with Catherine Millot that the opposition between analysts and critics entails a division in the reception of Joyce between the meaninglessness and the meaningfulness of the texts, we need to consider Lacan’s interpretation of the enigma of Joyce’s work (Millot 1988: 207–9). Again, Lacan does not fully observe his own stricture regarding the distinction between an external approach (the enigma of Joyce’s work; art as symptom) and an internal hermeneutic (the enigmas in Joyce’s work; the textual unconscious). The acrostics of the Joycean text fascinate Lacan as a new riddle of the Sphinx—that is, Joyce is an anti-Oedipus for Lacanian psychoanalysis. Aubert’s reading of the Stephen–Bloom relation as a puzzle whose solution is ‘the Name-of-the-Father’ is indicative of the fascination, as is Lacan’s own interpretation of the moment in *Portrait* where Stephen is beaten by his friends in terms of the bodily ego as a detachable envelope.

Lacan is interested, for instance, in the riddle that Stephen tells his class (Lacan 1976–77a: Session 4, p. 22):
The cock crew
The sky was blue:
The bells in heaven
Were striking eleven.
Tis time for this poor soul
To go to heaven (Joyce 2000: 32; italics in the original).

The 'solution' to the riddle is 'the fox burying his grandmother under a hollybush'. But as Roberto Harari notes, this riddle is preceded by another that has a clearer bearing on psychoanalysis (2002: 134–6):

Riddle me, riddle me, randy row.
My father gave me seeds to sow (Joyce 2000: 31; italics in the original).

The rest of the riddle (not supplied) is: 'the seed was black and the ground was white/ Riddle me that and I'll give you a pipe.' The solution to this riddle is 'writing a letter'. The paternal seed only germinates in the form of letters. According to Lacan, the distinction between Joyce and Oedipus is that because Joyce believes in his sinthome, he does not desire to solve the riddle of himself (see Harari 2002: 135). But it is not clear that Lacan can entirely resist the temptation.

LACAN'S CONFRONTATION WITH DECONSTRUCTION

Perhaps for this reason, at the moment of the turn in avant-garde theory, during the mid-1970s, to textual formalism and 'revolutions of the word', Lacan is not interested in the liberation of the signifier. Unimpressed by the ruptures with the dominant ideology said to spring from the dissolution of the subject into the textual network, Lacan's objective is exactly the opposite of the literary experimentalism of Philippe Sollers and the critical vanguardism of Roland Barthes.\textsuperscript{16} Lacan's question is: given the generation of the identity of the speaking subject in the anonymity of the signifying chain, through a contingent series of identifications, how can we account for the evident style of

\textsuperscript{16} In English, this tendency is adequately represented in MacCabe (2003).
the subject, its idiosyncratic adoption of language, expressive of a unique subjectivity? Such a question means that Lacan is ineluctably involved in a theoretical confrontation with Derrida. Indeed, the various 'revolutions of the word' supposedly heralded by the Joycean text, although often enlisting Lacan as a theoretical authority, in actuality employ deconstructive rather than psychoanalytic insights.

One dimension of this confrontation dates from *Encore* and the reading of Lacan by deconstructionists Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy (1992). The basic accusation made in that text is that Lacan reinstates the unitary subject of the Cartesian *cogito* by means of the ruse of placing it 'under the bar' of signification, that is, in the unconscious. The elementary Lacanian rejoinder to this frank misreading is that the subject of the unconscious is eccentric to itself—its substance is external to its existence as a product of the chain of signification, lying as it does in the *objet petit a*. Hence the Lacanian subject cannot be conceptualized as a Cartesian unity of thinking and being—however disguised, buried or repressed—because it is by definition divided between these alternatives. This is the entire meaning of Lacan's tortuous excursions into the topic of the forced choice and his restatement of the Cartesian *cogito* as a disjunctive syllogism, from *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis* onwards. According to Lacan, the *cogito* does not run: I am thinking, therefore I am; but—where I am thinking, there I am not, and where I am, there I am not thinking (1998a: 224–5). This rejoinder is not explicitly provided in *Encore*—Lacan has other things on his mind and only says that although Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy read 'with the worst of intentions', they are effectively addressing a love letter to him by assuming that he has full knowledge of the unconscious (1998b: 65). Yet, it is easy to see how *Le Sinthome* completes a Lacanian rejoinder: Joyce, the subject, as Joyce-the-Symptom, has all of his being, his substance, outside him, in the *sinthome* of the Joycean work.

The apparent *rapprochement* with Derrida in *Le Sinthome*—Lacan declares that some of their insights are in accord, on the basis of Lacan's prior demonstration of the existence of the bar of signification—therefore conceals a deep underlying difference. Derrida reads Joyce as an instance of the dissemination generated by the 'infrastructures', deep textual quasi-structures supporting and subverting the signifier with their limitless and anarchic play
Accordingly, Derrida positions Joyce in the lineage of textual experimentation running through Antonin Artaud, Stéphane Mallarmé and Paul Celan. Indeed, from his opening work on Edmund Husserl onwards, Derrida steadfastly maintains that Joyce’s project was the opposite of the Husserlian reduction of multiplicity to univocal self-presence—the Joycean work is taken to represent a dispersion of the self-present intentionality of the ego into the textual network that supports and subverts consciousness (1978: 102).

In grouping Derrida’s interpretive strategy with his own insights, Lacan is probably rather generous—just as he had previously recommended to his audience that they all read Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy, despite the hostility of these authors. For in actuality, Lacan is highly sceptical of the deconstructive effort to demonstrate that the dissemination of the textual infrastructures explains the Joycean text, that is, to claim Joyce as the broadcast mechanism for a grammatological demonstration. While the Derridean record tends to grind out the same threnody irrespective of the literary author in question, it is manifestly evident that Joyce is exactly the opposite of what he should be for deconstruction—a signature. 18

That the Joycean liberation of the signifier brings the unconscious into play is not for a moment questioned by Lacan but his interest lies in the proper name of the author, that is, in the emergence of a distinctive style of the subject despite the ‘subversion of the subject in the dialectic of desire’. The limitations of the deconstructive position, by contrast with Lacanian psychoanalysis, have been explored in detail by Peter Dews in *Logics of Disintegration* (1987). According to Dews, the problem faced by Derrida is that the endless dissemination of the textual infrastructures prevents the emergence of meaning and therefore blocks the identity of the subject. By contrast, Lacan can explain the emergence of meaning without reverting to the fiction of the self-present intentionality of the speaking subject, because Lacan proposes that the objet

17 For an exposition of the relation between the deconstruction of signifying binaries and the dissemination of the infrastructures, see Gasché (1986).
18 See for example the eerie resemblance that emerges between Mallarmé and Artaud in Derrida’s treatment of them (Derrida 1978).
petit a is a non-specular double for the subject. In the ‘lost’ object, the divided subject can unconsciously recognize themselves without involving a transparent, Cartesian ego.

Lacan’s theorization of the objet petit a happens in relation to the concepts of alienation and separation. Conceptually, the entry of the ‘speakingbeing’ into language requires the transformation of the linearity of instincts into the circularity of the drives, through the cutting out of any determined object of the instincts and its replacement by a signifier that acts as the ideational representative of the drives. But this logically requires two steps (although simultaneous): the creation of a ‘hole in the real’ and the emplacement of a signifier in that hole. We can relate these two steps to alienation and separation, as well as to Lacan’s earlier schema of the metaphor of the Name-of-the-Father, developed in 1959 in ‘On a Question Preliminary to any Possible Treatment of Psychosis’ (here 2001b), where Lacan proposed that ‘the metaphor of the Name-of-the-Father [. . .] is the metaphor that substitutes this Name in the place first symbolised by the operation of the absence of the mother’ (2001b: 152). This process can be schematized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name-of-the-Father</th>
<th>Desire of the Mother</th>
<th>Name-of-the-Father</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desire of the Mother</td>
<td>Signified to the Subject</td>
<td>Phallus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But Lacan continues:

Let us now try to conceive of a circumstance of the subjective position in which, to the appeal of the Name-of-the-Father responds, not the absence of the real father [. . .] but the inadequacy of the signifier itself. [. . .] The presence of the signifier in the Other is, in effect, a presence usually closed to the subject, because it usually persists in a state of repression [. . .]. [But, for the psychotic,] [t]o the point at
which the Name-of-the-Father is called [. . .] may correspond in the Other, then, a mere hole, which, by the inadequacy of the metaphoric effect, will provoke a corresponding hole at the place of phallic signification (ibid.: 153).

The paternal 'No!' has not repressed the mother as enjoyment, and so the Name-of-the-Father cannot operate as a phallic signification. Instead, it is foreclosed. The consequences of this are familiar to us from The Psychoses: the imaginary status of the phallic signifier, the degeneration of language into reified objects and sentence fragments of a Grundsprache ('basic language' or 'mother tongue') profoundly permeated with enjoyment, the invasion of the real in the form of hallucinations and a paranoiac relation to the Other.

But in his subsequent considerations of the dialectic of desire, in ‘Le Séminaire. Livre VI. Le désir et son interprétation, 1958–59’ (Desire and its Interpretation), Lacan appears to develop this notion of a paternal 'No!' in the form of the unary trait, the mark of lack in the Other, symbolized as $S(\emptyset)$. The initial mark that occupies the place of the hole in the real created by the absence of the mother as enjoyment cannot be a signifier, because it is itself the condition for entry into language. This implies that the $S(\emptyset)$ is neither articulable nor differential: it is non-fungible and silent, yet it marks the place of the infant's entry into language. We can conjecture that the objet petit $a$, the object of the drive and also the object of desire, is the phantasmatic 'referent' of this impossible, primordial 'ur-signifier', $S(\emptyset)$. Like $S(\emptyset)$, the objet petit $a$ is non-symbolizable, yet always returns to the same place and, unlike it, the objet petit $a$ has an imaginary component, appearing as it does foremost in the other.

The non-fungible mark that creates a hole in the real and makes it possible for the infant to enter the symbolic order occupies the position of the objet petit $a$—the ideational representative of the drives—only to be displaced by the object signified by the paternal signifier, is also not a part of the real (it makes a hole in the real). Nor is it a part of the imaginary order, although it has an imaginary aspect in so far as it appears through the other. Otherwise expressed, the unique entry point of the human being into the field of the signifier happens—right from the beginning of Lacan’s thinking—through the intervention of something that is not imaginary, symbolic or real.
In other words, alongside the cataclysmic revision of Lacanian psychoanalysis, there is a return to the concepts elaborated in The Psychoses. Here, Lacan sees Joyce as a proof a contrario of the hypothesis that the Name-of-the-Father is the key to the entry into the symbolic order.

LACAN’S INSIGHTS INTO THE JOYCEAN TEXT

For Lacan, the foreclosure of the Name-of-the-Father is the basic key to the Joycean text—with the difference, compared to the figure of Daniel Paul Schreber investigated in The Psychoses, that Joyce engages in nomination. The liberation of the signifier in Joyce’s work is accomplished through an aberrant relation to the paternal function, so that art is the process by which Joyce ‘makes his name’. The ‘original sin’ in Joyce is therefore interpreted as a sign of paternal failure and, in particular, paternal perversion, which describes the father-son relation in terms of a turn to the father, as a defense against the mother that generates filial masochism. In particular, the deficiency of the real father leads James Joyce to seek replacement paternal figures with sufficient gravity to supplement the lack in the Name-of-the-Father.19 This leads Lacan to interpret Bloom and Stephen as sons rather than as father-son figures, with the consequence that the literary fathers (Homer, Dante and especially Shakespeare) are the problem posed by the Joycean text.

Yet, paradoxically, Lacan does not fully follow up this insight into Portrait, Ulysses and Finnegans Wake, perhaps because of his determination to interpret art as symptom rather than the unconscious in art. Instead, the accent in his reading falls on the fabrication of a paternal signifier through the artifice of ‘making a name’.

Lacan’s reading of the transition from Portrait to Ulysses demonstrates that the Name-of-the-Father and the lack of a sexual relation are correlates, just as the lack of the Name-of-the-Father can be correlated with the existence of a sexual relation. Joyce forges a Name-of-the-Father for himself and consequently, there is a sexual relation between James Joyce and Nora Joyce (née Barnacle).

19 The key index of this is HCE’s sexual misdemeanour in Phoenix Park (Joyce 1964: 008.08–010.23).
Roberto Harari summarizes this economically in the chapter 'Eve in the Labyrinth of Daedalus' in his How James Joyce Made His Name (2002: 37–70), which sets itself the task of interpreting the 'beginnings of Joyce's literary project' in *Stephen Hero* and *Portrait*. In *Portrait*, the accent falls on the 'artificer' whose artisanal production is aestheticized through Joyce's 'Thomist' aesthetics. Stephen Dedalus is linked through naming to artifice in a lineage that connects him to Daedalus (an inventor) and then Hephaestus (the artificer). These inventive artificers fatally father their own sons as extensions of their creativity, just as, Stephen Dedalus argues in *Ulysses*, Shakespeare fathered himself to protect himself from his own cuckolding at the hands of his wife. The father is the fiction of the son. The idea that paternity is artificial, together with the possibility that the son might therefore father himself, is prolonged into *Ulysses* as the notion that 'fatherhood [. . .] is unknown to man. It is a mystic state [. . .] founded [. . .] upon the void' (Joyce 2000: 266). Dedalus concludes that 'Amor matris: subjective and objective genitive, may be the only true thing in life' (ibid.). The notion that the love of the mother enjoys the ambivalence of the genitive (love of and love for) is reminiscent of the desire of the Other, as is Joyce's conclusion that '[p]aternity may be a legal fiction' (ibid.). But in the section on Shakespeare, Stephen elaborates that Shakespeare, in writing the character Hamlet, 'was not the father of his own son merely but, being no more a son, he was and felt himself the father of all his race, the father of his own grandfather, the father of his unborn grandson [. . .]' (ibid.: 267). What is at stake here is the fabrication of an Other of the Other, expressed in terms of a fantasy of auto-genesis. The father begins when and where the son ends. Correlative, to become a father the son must destroy his own father, and father himself, as the only possible way to be son and father at once.

For Lacan, the Name-of-the-Father is located in the place of lack. But Joyce does not really lack. Evidence for this comes from his relationship to Nora with whom there exists a sexual relationship. For Joyce, Lacan stresses, Nora is the Woman: she 'fitted' him like a glove—that is, there is nothing contingent about their encounter (1976–77a: Session 6, p. 38).\(^{20}\) In the letters pointed to by Harari

---

20 Harari notes that the probable source for this observation is the letter in Joyce (1975: 176 [1 November 1909]).
we find some bizarre sexual practices that highlight this fitting—Joyce wants to savour 'every secret and shameful part of [Nora’s body], every odour and act of it' (Joyce 1975: 181)—and when children intrude into the relationship, there is trouble, because there is no space in the glove for three (Harari 2002: 167–9).

So, the existence of a sexual relation means that there is a necessary rather than contingent connection between real and symbolic, drive and desire.21 Lacan diagnoses the existence of a sexual relation in Nora/Molly and uses this as the key to understanding Joyce’s women, including Eve/Issy. The presence of a sexual relation in the absence of a paternal function means that a scission opens between Joycean enjoyment and the enjoyment of Woman.

**JOYCE’S CHALLENGE TO LACAN**

The problem for the Lacanian reading of *Portrait*, *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* is that according to the considerations outlined so far, Joyce should be psychotic. Yet, as Rabaté stresses, Joyce scholars are reluctant to consider these works as productions of a psychosis (2006: 26–42). Indeed, Lacan himself has serious reservations as to whether the texts are authentic productions of a psychotic state—he considers most of it to engage in a sort of mimicry of schizophrenic discourse.

Before examining the implications of this, I want to simply gather the evidence that this is indeed, and despite strong reservations, the overall direction of Lacan’s thinking. Lacan regards Joyce as the author of a progression of documents—*Stephen Hero*, *Portrait*, *Ulysses*, *Finnegans Wake*—that testify to a struggle against psychosis. ‘In fact,’ Lacan maintains:

[1]n the continuing progress of his art—namely that speech (*parole*) which comes to be written, to be broken, to be dislocated, so that in the end to read him seems an encounter with a continuing progress, from his first efforts in the critical essays, then in *Portrait of the Artist* and again in *Ulysses*, concluding with *Finnegans Wake*—it is hard not

---

21 For instance, Bloomsday, the day of *Ulysses*, that is, the temporal space of a universal and necessary moment, is the day of Joyce and Nora’s first sexual union (16 June 1904).
to see that a certain relation to language is increasingly imposed on him, to the point where he ends up breaking or dissolving language itself, by decomposing it, going beyond phonetic identity (1976–77a: Session 7, p. 43).

I have already mentioned the deficiency of the paternal name and the existence of a sexual relation. Lacan also mentions three other decisive symptoms of psychotic process in Joyce: hallucinations (imposed voices and a redeemer delusion), the disintegration of language into letters and the irruption of the real in the form of epiphanies. Finally, implied in Lacan’s discourse and supported by Joyce’s biography, there are strong actiological indications of a schizophrenic situation in the family background, which, taken together with Lucia’s schizophrenic break, appear to ground Lacan’s position in a clinically solid diagnostic supposition.

Hallucinations: Lacau seems convinced that Joyce suffered from a redeemer delusion—not to redeem God, but to redeem the father at God’s behest. Indeed, the ‘barmy idea’ of redemption happens in so far as ‘there is a relation of the son to the father’ (ibid.: Session 6, p. 39). Lacan proposes that this results in Joyce’s language (or lalangue, pre-symbolic babble) that he calls jouis-sens (enjoy-meant) and links this to ‘imposed speech’—the voice of ‘Them’ in paranoid hallucination as well as the inspired wordplays of Joycean artifice. The real—the register of the Thing (la Chose)—is ab-sens (absent meaning), present in Joycean lalangue. According to Lacan, Joyce accepted the ‘calling’ (by God) to break up the English language and eliminate mindless routinization from it.

Lacan also considers that Joyce transposed his own symptom of imposed voices onto Lucia when he maintained that she was capable of marvellous forms of communication. Lacan interprets this as a claim about telepathy and understands that Joyce thereby implicates himself in his daughter’s symptom. For Lacan, Lucia is an extension of Joyce’s symptom/sinthisme. Joyce believed in Lucia as in his writing: for him, she was more intelligent than others, capable of miraculously informing him about others’ fate; she is merely eccentric, she does not hear voices but is capable of telepathy (ibid.: Session 7, p. 42).

Language: According to Lacan, Joyce allows himself to be ‘invaded by the phonemic qualities, by the polyphony of language (la parole)’ (ibid.: Session 7,
The implication is that in Joycean portmanteau words and linguistic puns, we are dealing not with metaphors but with moments where the 'knot' of the *sinthome* momentarily fails. The implication is that in the place of metaphor, Joyce maintains endless chains of metonymic equivocation which are punctuated, not by metaphors, but by moments where the meaningless real discloses itself. Accordingly, his text is an archipelago of epiphanies in a sea of metonymy, which Lacan understands to consist of moments of the 'splendour of Being' or irruption of the real, into the banality of corrupted speech or everyday experience. In this sense, the Joycean practice of annihilating English with a fundamentally Other language that would make way for these isolated moments of radiance is not unlike Schreber's *Grundsprache* in *The Psychoses*.

Epiphanies: Indeed, the epiphanies are interrupted moments of speech reminiscent of the fragmented discourse of Schreber's rays. Epiphany must be rigorously opposed to equivocation, where (especially in punning) the meaning emerges only with a saturation of context; in epiphanies, the radiance emerges as a rupture with a context defined in advance as meaningless (banal). As Harari observes:

> The extasis that comes over being at the moment of the epiphany does not generate meaning. This would also imply—as we have observed in Joyce's work—a failure of metaphorical production. [...] The evacuation of phallic signification from what surges up in the epiphany, touching on mysticism and devoid of all meaning, means that it can be categorised [...] as being in contact with the Thing (2002: 173 and 77).

Aetiology: In aetiological terms, there is plenty of evidence to support Lacan's contention of Joyce's lifelong struggle against psychosis. There appears to be a crisis between *Portrait* and *Ulysses* in so far as Joyce's conviction that 'one great part of every human existence is passed in a state which cannot be rendered sensible by the use of wideawake language, cutanddry grammar and goahead plot' represents a radical departure from the aesthetics of *Portrait* (1975: 318). Between *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* a fresh crisis intervenes: the death of Joyce's father and Lucia's collapse into schizophrenia. It is reasonable
to suppose that the radical derangement of the signifier into constituent letters in *Finnegans Wake* bears some relation to these events.

If *Ulysses* stages an abortive return to the father, then *Finnegans Wake* is an exploration of the ‘original sin’ of his lack. The riddle Joyce poses throughout is that of writing a letter (as a result of a mandate from his father). In psychotic style, this writing a letter becomes a writing of letters, (de-)composed of letters and decomposed into letters. Hence the portmanteau words, the bilingual puns, the acrostic character of the Joycean text. Joycean ambition—summarized as the creation of the uncreated conscience of his race (genealogical not ethnic)—is immortality, the destiny of a unique writing, which Lacan finally identifies with the role of the Joycean ego in tying together the real, the symbolic and the imaginary. To summarize: the Joycean *sinthome* is his own ego, considered in its almost megalomaniacal character as the bearer of a special destiny.

Now we come, though, to the crucial interpretive decision. A basic question facing anyone confronting *Le Sinthome* is whether the *sinthome* appears when the standard Name-of-the-Father is lacking (that is, when an individual might otherwise slide into psychosis), or whether every person has a *sinthome*. We can say that Lacan prefers the second option—he talks of the *sinthome* as the elementary human dimension and the psychotic kernel of every individual—and that the commentators have followed Lacan in this. From this perspective, Lacan performs on his own work the same conceptual operation of abstraction and generalization that he had previously performed on the Freudian father in the Oedipus complex. Lacan, from at least *The Psychoses* onwards, maintains that it is not the empirical father who is decisive, but the signifier representing the paternal function. This means that the Oedipus complex, with its requirement of identification with the imago of a specific individual, is a myth, a spurious generalization of a particular instance, but one that nonetheless accurately reflects something important about the underlying universal process.

The fourth knot is originally the Name-of-the-Father (but no longer considered as an element of the symbolic order. See Lacan 1973–74). Reconceptualizing it outside the symbolic order as the *sinthome*, the fourth loop of the quadruple Borromean knot, implies a new generalization, of which the
Name-of-the-Father is but one specification (others include Woman, God and Joyce). Hence, Lacan asks: 'was it not in compensation for this paternal abdication, this Verwerfung [foreclosure] in fact, that Joyce felt himself imperiously called—this is the very word, resulting from a mass of things in his text—to valorise his proper name at the father’s expense?' (1976–77a: Session 6, pp. 40–1). Joyce writes to compensate for the lacking Name-of-the-Father, to make himself a proper name as well as to make a name for himself; and, 'Joyce’s art is so particular that the term *sinthome* is very fitting for it' (ibid.: Session 7, p. 42). *Sinthome*, the concept, is a high-level generalization, a functional element that knots together the real, the symbolic and the imaginary. *Sinthome*, the particular thing that every individual clings to, is something absolutely singular, that functions as or in the place of the Name-of-the-Father. Does not nomination (of a *sinthome*) perform the same operation of abstraction and generalization on the paternal function?

Elegant as this might seem, we should sound a note of caution. Lacan says explicitly that the *sinthome* in Joyce emerges through nomination, a peculiar operation that happens because of the failure of the Name-of-the-Father. Lacan is then consistent when he characterizes Joyce’s condition as a de facto foreclosure—that is, not *de jure*, according to the Law. Joyce mimics the Law in his practice of nomination, thus operating so deep within the standard coordinates of the Oedipus complex that it is quite possible to read *Finnegans Wake* in terms of an Oedipal address to the father and as an Oedipal staging in relation to the literary father, Shakespeare (see Cheng 1984). At the same time, Joyce is ‘disinvested from the unconscious’, according to Lacan. He is not, in other words, a divided subject. For Lacan, because Joyce believed in his *sinthome*, he is not analyzable—he does not suffer from his symptom, rather, it cures him (or keeps him sane).

All of this suggests that rather than looking for a fourth and final Lacan, we should warily regard Joyce as a proof *a contrario* of Lacan’s earlier theses on psychosis and the phallus.

One reason for this interpretive strategy is supplied by efforts to do otherwise. In so far as commentators such as Harari accept the notion of a fourth register as something that applies to every individual, they begin to adopt anti-Freudian positions. Harari notes that:
The splendour of the *Wake* has to do, not with metaphor, but with *jouissance*. This is the fundamental point about Joyce: he managed to work on his own *jouissance*, all the while convinced that what he was producing was something exceptional and deserving of being recognised by the whole world. This amounts to a complete reversal of the Freudian view of art (2002: 82).

But other, larger reversals loom into view with this. The unconscious becomes radically individual, rather than formed in the intersubjective space of the discourse of the Other. The faunetics of language implies mimicry, rather than entry into a web of differential relations. Individuals with a complementary *sinthome* can enjoy a sexual relationship. *MAN* does not lack. These entirely reasonable propositions when applied to the individual Joyce, become rather suspect (at a minimum, they are radically under-motivated by the clinical data) when applied to everyone. Along this radical path, finally, the global effectiveness of psychoanalysis is questioned, and with the real, according to Harari, 'Lacan sought to distance himself from what Freud dreamt up' (ibid.: 295).

In so far as such a catastrophic position is motivated by Lacan's own remarks—and I have said that they are hedged with qualifications and conjectures, representing a work in progress rather than a 'final state'—I want to draw attention to how this is in actuality a Joycean anti-psychoanalysis. For these positions—suspicion towards both Carl Jung and Freud, rejection of the unconscious as operating at any level other than the collective/mythical, the radical individual ability to transcend linguistic determinations, insistence on the possibility of a harmonious sexual relation, the belief that it is possible after all to fabricate a paternal signifier and thereby choose one's own destiny—are Joyce's positions first and foremost.

I suggest that this ironic reversal, where Joyce acts as a literary Sphinx that Lacan believes he solves, only to end up as the riddle himself, is generated by means of his own strategy. Adopting a biographical approach, Lacan trembles on the threshold of declaring the Joycean text psychotic. He runs from this oracular determination, determined to find the text unreadable rather than to declare the author insane. Then he hesitates, not only because he is impressed by Joyce, but also because he is unsure how authentic this text actually is in
terms of its testamentary value. But this is of course to state both the dilemma and its solution at the same time, for literary texts are not literal, no matter how much they might approach the status of letters. There is no contradiction between Joyce's lifelong struggle against psychosis and literary genius, not just because there is no a priori opposition between these terms, but also for the more straightforward reason that a literary work is not entirely the product of authorial intentions. The entire dimension of mythological structuration and references to literary father figures—Homer, Dante and Shakespeare foremost—is overlooked by Lacan, who then ends up with something perilously close to a Joycean reading of Joyce, rather than a Lacanian interpretation of *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. We should be careful, I think, before we ascribe to this interplay of misreadings and reversals the status of a wholly new psychoanalytic theory.
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