

NIDA LACAN STUDY AND READING GROUP: SEPTEMBER SEMINAR

Date: Wednesday 26 September 2018

Time: 6-8 pm

Location: Tutorial Room, No.3, NIDA, 215 Anzac Parade

Derrida, Psychoanalysis, and Lacan: From Resistance to Love

Dr Ehsan Azari Stanizai

The French postwar era in the second half of the twentieth century was like a fairy-tale medieval Sorbonne. This era produced the finest and prolific thinkers who flourished new, diverse, and revolutionary schools of thoughts, which are sometimes identified as the French theory. The French theory still rules almost every intellectual domain and the higher educational scenes in the West, especially in Europe and the USA. The two well-known figures in this tradition no doubt are Lacan and Derrida whose works have been making great impacts across the humanities and social sciences. One thing that is shared by both thinkers is the proverbial ambiguities and impregnability of their hieroglyphic style of writing. The relationship between these two thinkers have been intimate as well as uneasy. In this essay we will endeavor to examine how Derrida reads, criticizes, and interprets Lacan. Such a task is unnerving and daunting, for one might be easily risk entrapment in a double-bind of theories. To make things better, I will discuss Derrida's understanding of Lacan by examining two of his seminal lectures: "Résistances de la Psychanalyse" delivered at Sorbonne on October 1991 and "For the Love of Lacan," also delivered in the same year. By making things better, I mean to have a summary of Derrida's key points in his critique of Lacan, for Derrida directly and indirectly discusses Lacan almost in every single of his major works.

Let's us begin with *resistances*. In his familiar fashion of textual play, Derrida draws the guiding thread of his arguments by introducing and exploring the roots of his key phrases: 'one must', 'there is', 'resistance', and 'analysis'. He is making all attempt to generate a brain-teaser by going deep into the etymology of words and the linguistic logic underlying the statements he develops. In my view this pattern of arranging preambles makes an intimidating effect on the reader and do little to offer an access to his main points. By resistance Derrida has multiple meanings in mind, most of them envisaged by psychoanalysis before him. Resistance as a concept in psychoanalysis denotes, for example, everything visible or hidden in the physical and psychological action on the part of an analysand that shut the window to his unconscious. Such a resistance is "impossible to overcome or interpret...but then he [Freud] realized that resistance was itself a means of reaching the repressed and unveiling the secret of neurosis; in fact, the forces to be seen at work in resistance and in repression were one and the same," (Laplanche and Pontalis, 1973, 395).

Derrida also illustrates resistance as a hostile attitude that appears within the mind of a psychoanalyst when trying to expose the unconscious desire. In Lacan's theory on the other hand, the resistance of the analysand and of the analyst as a whole are inherited in the multiplicity of the imaginary relations of the ego and the psychoanalytic treatment that also incorporates the analysis of this resistance. However, Lacan discusses different kinds of resistances such as inertia, censorship, interpretation, analytic work and so on in his *Seminar II*.

Derrida's sphere of resistances hardly goes beyond psychoanalysis. He uses political resistance instead of censorship. The resistance to psychoanalysis itself and the analysis of this resistance are the heart of Derrida's concern. He begins his discussion by investigating Freud's tales of resistances in one of his dreams—the dream of Irma's Injection that Lacan called the dream of the dreams. This dream was of a colonizing power for Freud on the ground of which he formalized his theory of dream. Freud points out that only this dream empowered him to proclaim that in each dream there is a wish fulfilment. Derrida recounts Freud's revelation about his own 'feeling, a premonition' about the dream of Irma's Injection.

The interpretation, the analytic deciphering, the *Deutung* of a certain fragment did not go far enough: a hidden meaning (*verborgene Sinn*) exceeds the analysis. Let us say for the moment that the meaning *exceeds* and not that it resists analysis: the concept of resistance to analysis. (Derrida, 1998, 4)

Something that escape from analysis is that inaccessible secret, a resistance that Freud wants to expose. Freud writes in *The Interpretation of Dream* that his treatment of patients with hysterical anxiety was often partially successful because their physical symptoms persisted after the termination of the ended. Freud and his patient Irma were both unsatisfied with the treatment. Freud remained unsatisfied about the meaning and the interpretation of his own dream. He saw an unbridgeable gap in this dream. Freud gives the details of his frustration in analyzing this dream when Irma continued to complain about her pain after the treatment ended, "I am not responsible for the persistence of Irma's pains; responsibility lies *either* in her recalcitrance to accepting my solution, *or* in the unfavorable sexual condition [Irma was a young widow] under which she lives which I cannot alter." (Freud, 1991, 427). With the insight of this dream, Freud added the concept of '*either, or*' to his theory of the dream-thought. Freud prophesied a resistance whenever a treatment would end or he himself would find himself stuck in a point in his theorization. "Psychoanalysis is justly suspicious. One of its rules is the *whatever interrupts the progress of analytic work is a resistance*," (Ibid, 661-662).

On the whole, Derrida singles out two 'fascinating' and 'passionate' observations in Freud's interpretation of Irma's Injection: First, Freud in his analysis, identified the figure of Irma with her two friends and even his own wife and daughter as well. For Freud these multiple figures correlated with Irma were recounted as the outcome of the processes of condensation and displacement that always happen in dreams. The real person in a dreamer's dream is often someone else, which function as a substitution.

"Thus I had been comparing my patient Irma with two other people who would also have been recalcitrant to treatment" (186) "the other woman, whom I had as a patient in the dream instead of Irma, was also a young widow." (193) "certain other themes played a part in the dream, which were not so obviously connected with my

exculpation from Irma's illness: my daughter's illness and that of my patient who bore the same name, the injurious effect of cocaine, the disorder of my patient who was travelling in Egypt." (197)

Second, Derrida was concerned with something undecipherable and unresolved part of the dream. Freud recounts that in his dream, Irma looked 'pale and puffy', "My patient (Irma) always had a rosy complexion. I began to suspect that someone else was being substituted for her." (Freud, 1991, 184). Later in the book, Freud clarifies this substitution further, seeing in the image of Irma not one person but a 'collective figure'.

None of these figures whom I lighted upon by following up 'Irma' appeared in the dream in bodily shape. They were concealed behind the dream figure of 'Irma', which was thus turned into a collective image with, it must be admitted, a number of contradictory characteristics. Irma became the representative of all these other figures which had been sacrificed to the work of condensation, since I passed over to *her*, point by point, everything that reminded me of *them*.... the actual features of two or more people into a single dream-image." (Freud, 1991, 399-400)

As Derrida also suspected, Freud was mysteriously ambivalent in his relation to Irma. His dislike of her was apparently stemmed from Irma's rejection of Freud's solution for her pain and her acceptance of another physician's solution. Derrida spells out that Freud's ambivalence might have been another type of a hidden resistance.

At no moment does Freud have even an inkling that a resistance might be, in this context, something other than a resistance to his solution, to his analysis or, beyond this context and in general, that a resistance might be something other than a resistance full of meaning. (Derrida, 2002, 10)

Nevertheless, the center of Derrida's attention in this observation is Freud's insistence on the fact that each dream has a navel, a centre, and that ambiguous part that resists interpretation— *Omphalos* [in ancient Greek, navel of the earth] as he writes, "'inaccessible topos', impenetrable, unfathomable, unanalyzable, like a navel, an *omphalos*, (Derrida, 1991, 11). Derrida identifies this gap in Freud as 'the knotting and less as a hole' and then adds that for Lacan it was a gap and hole to be sutured by psychoanalysis. The gap is inscribed in the unconscious to resist entry into the consciousness. Derrida takes a leap and call this impenetrable gap as the site of fight between two forces, that intellectual curiosity (which is also a force) and the disciplinary psychological knowledge. In order to master these resistances one need to opposing forces, one needs to take a position "by buttressing oneself with an antithesis." (Ibid, 13)

Derrida asserts that resistances are too many and cannot be unified.

If it is true that the concept of *resistance to analysis* cannot unify itself, for nonaccidental or noncontingent reason, then the concept of analysis and psychoanalytic analysis, the very concept of *psychoanalysis* will have known the same fate...if there is *one* resistance, there is not "*la psychoanalyse*"—whether one understands it here as a system of theoretical norms or as a charter of institutional practices. (Derrida, 1998, 20)

Derrida is wandering to find another solution to this resistance would lead back into psychoanalysis. He claims that compulsion to repeat is the strongest of resistances to analysis, where the repetition is in fact the insistence of that gap or navel that all his lecture is grounded in. The compulsion to repeat “is that whose resistance psychoanalysis today represents, in surest form of its ruse: disguised as nonresistance.” (Ibid, 24)

Derrida also refers to Lacan’s insistence on the indestructability of the letter in his *Seminar on the Purloined Letter* calling his stand ‘dogmatic and idealist’. He asserts that the letter is divisible and the fact that the letter restores the lack by its return to its destination—the field of the material and indestructible signifier—as Lacan emphasizes places psychoanalysis within the boundaries of the traditional metaphysics. In other words, for Derrida the arrival of the letter to a specific addressee means restitution of the signified—the common metaphysical strategy. But Lacan replaces the signifier for the letter and reaffirms the primacy and indestructability of the signifier.

For Freud the navel of dream is that knot in dream interpretation that doesn’t lend itself to interpretation, “the tangle of dream thoughts which cannot be unraveled which moreover adds nothing to our knowledge of the content of the dream. This is the dream navel, the spot where it reaches down into the unknown.” (Freud, 1991, 671). And in a footnote, he remarks that in comparison to his other three female patients Irma was recalcitrant and ‘foolish’, but there is a navel in each dream, “There is at least one spot in every dream at which it is unplumbable –that is its point of contact with the unknown, (186). Derrida emphasizes that the resistance to interpretation put restrictions on knowledge, “a resistance to interpretation constitutes a limit to knowledge, an inappropriable otherness that both exhausts and excites thinking.” (Al-Kassim, 2007, 116)

Lacan at the outset of *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, when introduces his theory of the first concept, the unconscious, clearly refers to the unconscious as a gap that Freud identified as the navel of dream, the inaccessible ‘zone of shades’ and indiscernible core and ‘unknown centre’ in the dream. Lacan speaks about this in great detail in *Seminar II*. The removal or ‘stitching up’ of this gap is the focal points of psychoanalysis.

Derrida was very interested to identify at once psychoanalysis and deconstruction as twins but not conjoined. Deconstruction for him functions like a parasite that could harm and heals the body like his concept of *pharmakon* indicates. In the meantime, Derrida affirms affinity between psychoanalysis and deconstruction and finally concludes that both psychoanalysis and deconstruction are, at the final analysis, adherent to a kind of self-resistant analysis.

In *Resistances of Psychoanalysis*, the resistance to psychoanalysis offered by deconstruction (or, for that matter, any other discourse) is to be thought only alongside psychoanalysis’s own conception of ‘resistance-to-analysis’, which implies a resistance internal to psychoanalysis itself. Analysis and resistance are, in other words, intensely knotted together in the very movement or production of psychoanalysis, since each depend on and supplement the other. (Wortham, 2010, 158)

And lastly, Derrida contends that his own deconstruction is an equal and parallel critical methodology as psychoanalysis, but it is not an alternative for it. “What is called “deconstruction” undeniably obeys an analytic exigency, at once critical and analytic. It is

always a matter of *undoing, desedimenting, decomposing, deconstituting sediments, artefacta*, presuppositions, institutions.” (27) Like psychoanalysis, deconstruction represents a desire for “simple and self-present originarity” (29) like *arche-trace* and *arche-writing, pharmakon, supplement*, etc. As such, both psychoanalysis and deconstruction are caught up in a double bind of analyzing resistances. He concludes that “Hyperanalyticism with which I identify “deconstruction” (35), is inspired by the Enlightenment, transcendental phenomenology, and psychoanalytic reason that tirelessly analyzes the resistances.

II

Derrida starts off “For the Love of Lacan,” with two questions or as the author identifies exclamations with intriguing grammatical structure, the first is in future anterior (future perfect) tense and the second in conditional.

What wouldn't Lacan have said!
What will he not have said! (Derrida, 1998, 39)

Derrida pairs the ‘future perfect’ and ‘conditional’ in order to highlight the problem of “archivization, of what remains and what does not remain.” (Ibid, 40). He brings the notion of speech and writing and how they both, with the help of psychoanalysis, especially Lacan, registers and archivize ‘inscription,’ ‘erasure,’ ‘blanks,’ and the non-said. Derrida argues that in this archivization things ‘micrological’ and microscopic and things in themselves always escape observation. Instead of this, positioning and theses persist. Derrida introduces all these points in relation to Lacan’s tryst with philosophers and philosophy. Derrida recalls Lacan’s *Seminar XXIV: 1976-1977, L’insu que sait de l’une bevue’ aile a mourre*, a seminar that he introduces the unknown known beyond knowledge by which the subject produces a signifier that has no meaning. “The desire remained to discover a new signifier on the basis of the researches on the symptom... A signifier that, like the Real, would not have any kind of meaning,” (Marini, 1992, 247). Derrida then contradicts Lacan’s maxim in his seminar on Poe’s “Purloined Letter”: the letter always arrives at its destination. Derrida states that the letter might not arrive and go astray. Derrida goes further that in psychoanalysis and in Lacan’s discourse too, the archivization of the memories and what is repressed become problematic because they are subject to “efface (the destructibility of the letter or the name.” (44)

Like the linguistic references in every page of Freud’s writing, every page of Lacan’s discourse is colored with myriad of direct or indirect references to philosophy. Derrida is cognizant of this as he says, “Lacan’s refinement and competence, his philosophical originality, have no precedent in the tradition of psychoanalysis...Lacan is so much more aware as a philosopher than Freud, so much more a philosopher than Freud!” (47).

Derrida summarizes his arguments in “For the Love...” into the following three points by reaffirming and reappropriating his positions in his text on Poe’s short fiction, “The purloined Letter”. His arguments on the whole could be characterized as *either* drawing parallels to Lacan, *or* his rephrasing.

1. Derrida states that his reading Freud is non-Lacanian, which means that he deconstructs the privilege of the presence and the presence of the ego drawing on ideas of Heidegger and Husserl. Lacan’s discourse was the most deconstructable of texts for Derrida who “accuses Lacan of framing Poe’s story to produce his own

meaning: by omitting from his triangular structure the fourth voice which narrates, and which has another vision from the ones already discussed,” (Tambling, 2012, 150). On the whole, Derrida distinguishes the following eight motifs in his comments on Lacan’s seminar on Poe. (1) Lacan appropriates a circular trajectory for the letter that arises from the lack and return to the place of the lack from where it was detached. (2) In this ‘straight’ circular route of the letter, Lacan seeks the truth of the ‘origin’ and the ‘end’ for the trajectory of the signifier rises from the origin and return to the same location. The analyst in his role as the one who unveil the truth pursues the truth as the object of his unveiling. (3) For Lacan the imaginary dimension of speech was called ‘empty speech’ and the symbolic dimension ‘full speech’. The truth, according to Lacan, has to be derived from the full speech because this speech transforms the structure of the language where the subject has less or no control over this speech. (4) The analytical process falls into the turf of phono-phallogo-centrism, because it always favors speech in its immediacy. This attitude ignores ‘archiving apparatus of repetition’, something that was present from Plato to Heidegger in the history of metaphysics. (5) Lacan furnishes a transcendental position for the phallus from where it gives rise to desire. This links the truth with castration complex. This was the position that the feminists also accused Lacan. However, Lacan in the late phase of his teaching revised his theory of the phallus. (6) The language of dreams as far as it is readable subsists symbolically and is phono-centric even if it is articulated ‘phonematically’ or ‘phonetically’. (7) Lacan ignores or misrecognizes in his reading of Poe’s short fiction, the ‘literary structure of narration’. Along this path, he also drops off the narrator from his calculus. This misrecognition, for Derrida is part of Lacanian ‘psychoanalytic hermeneutics. (8) Overlooking of the outcome of the ‘double in Poe’s story’ scars the boundaries of the imaginary and the symbolic.

Derrida repeatedly confirms his statement that contrary to Lacan’s claim, the letter doesn’t necessarily arrive at its destination. Lacan insists on the contrary, for in his theoretical parlance, it is in the nature of signifier to arrive in its movement back to its empty place or destination. To put it another way, Lacan emphasizes on the insistence of the unconscious residues. In *The Post Card*, Derrida states that Lacan return to himself by his persistence on the inevitable arrival of the letter, “that is, the whole: a dogma of unity,” (Derrida cited in Roudinesco, 2014, 75). Roudinesco argues that Derrida take a different road on this for Lacan himself stated in his essay “Lituraterre” that, “My own text would no more resolve itself by me.” (Lacan cited in Roudinesco, 74).

2. In Derrida’s assessments, Lacan needed to rearticulate and ‘recast’ the conceptual meaning of his own theories. He claims that after 1969, Lacan was influenced by his *Of Grammatology* (1967), for Lacan’s discourse become more ‘grammatologically’ after this influence, since then. Derrida also conveys his skepticism about the future rendering of Lacan’s oral seminars since the publication of *Écrits*. He suggests that inconvenience would arise from that fact that Lacan’s discourse was kept in the tape-recorders and the existence of the copyright. Contrary to this incredulity, Lacan’s seminars have been published in French and in its English translation smoothly.

On Lacan’s camp, there was a counter narrative to this. Jacques-Alain Miller reveals that Lacan believed that Derrida was persuaded in inventing grammatology and his notion of the *arche-writing* by his conference essay, *Psychoanalysis: Reason for a Failure*, delivered in December 1967 at Rome University.

Lacan judged that Derrida had neglected to acknowledge what the invention of 'grammatology' and *archi-écriture* owed to the circulation of terms that came from his teaching (La Psychanalyse, Raison d'n échec', December 1967, in *Autres écrits*, p. 346, and the invention was itself an academic counterfeit of the teaching. (Miller, 2016, 206-207)

3. Derrida refers to Freud's theory of the *libido* and its masculine nature, the idea that Lacan also condoned. After enumerating his direct encounters with Lacan, Derrida claims that in the 1970s until his death, Lacan revised his ideas about writing and gives it its more prominent place. Derrida probably refers here to Lacan's seminar on Joyce where writing was postulated as the *sinthom* by which Joyce salvaged himself. This indicates that Derrida senses affinities with his deconstruction and his theory of the writing as the origin.

Thus, Derrida and Lacan are related to each other in so far as the gap of impossibility is concerned. But in the meantime, it is a relation of non-relation and non-relation of a relation at the same time. With Derrida we are experiencing the gap and with Lacan going beyond to do something about it. This signals a lesson that we might draw from Lacanian literary theory where the ultimate purpose is to reach the gap and textual blind spots in a literary discourse where language doesn't lend itself to signification. The moments the signification reach a deadlock, we are in the unconscious. The same happens in Lacan clinic. Lacan analysis, "refers us to in every turn to the verbal rough-and-tumble that takes place between analyst and analysand. Indeed, we could go further than this and say that spoken speech enjoys a special advantage over the extenuated language of 'theory', and continue to enjoy it even when the theories seasons his writing with the vernacular," (Bowie, 1991, 159). By seeking such redundancies and linguistic plays that Lacan terms *la linguisterie* (linguistricks) he finds himself in the middle of desire as desire also plays in the similar way. But desire is something that Derrida would always like to sidestep. Derrida had difficulties in Lacan enticing definition of desire, as he said in an interview, "What bothers me with the use of the word 'desire', and I have often tried to avoid it, is that where the word appears in writers such as Lacan, and well before him too, it tends to be defined as part of the structure of the subject: of the soul, the psychological and psychoanalytic subject as we have it in Freud and Lacan," (Derrida, 1991, 101). Derrida has thus a non-psychoanalytic understanding of the concept of desire for, as he admits "it's not tied to consciousness nor the unconscious nor to the psyche..." (Ibid). Derrida's unconscious is not the unconscious of Freud or Lacan, it is closer to the understanding of Deleuze and Foucault. Here, Derrida himself unveils his own resistance that arises from his own disciplinary knowledge of deconstruction. This might be the reason that the idea of irremediable 'loss' and 'lack' that Lacan defines as the source of desire don't have significance for Derrida.

For Derrida, the unconscious should be understood as exemplary of the excesses of the dichotomy of either present or absent. It is other to consciousness, neither there as lost or as found. Thus in Derrida, unlike in Lacan, there is no such "thing" as an absolutely lost object that can be known in its very loss. (Cornell, 1998, 176)

What is perhaps striking here is the existence of a hidden and interminable game of love and rivalry behind theories of the two French giants. Derrida in his address to psychoanalysts in 1981 identified his presence in psychoanalysis as a 'foreign body' which neither can be debarred from it nor it can be incorporated into the larger body of psychoanalysis. Lacan

claimed that he showed Monsieur Derrida a ‘talented young man’ the way. Derrida, I have no doubt, uses and plays with Lacanian concepts, arguments, and even his literary and philosophical examples and references freely and, on occasion, leaves them unacknowledged.

Regarding contemporaries, Lacan often felt he had been “plagiarized,”... Let’s take as an example [sic] his relations with Jacques Derrida, who was an attentive, scrupulous, and uncompromising reader of Lacan’s work. Well, Lacan could not stand him: he claimed that Derrida stole his ideas. (Roudinesco, 2014, 48)

Deconstruction for Derrida was essentially the experience of the impossible whereas Lacan goes beyond the experience and vigorously want to suture the gap created by this impossibility. This suture signals Lacan’s ability to get ahead of the deconstruction. For instance, psychoanalysis suture the gap of the real, which marks the heart of anxiety by making efforts to detach the anxious analysand from traumatic real and the depressing lack, both of which are located in the area of impossibility.

From clinical point of view, when it becomes pathological, anxiety can be overcome if the subject manages to turn away from this traumatic real and distance itself from a dread of lack, source of disappointment. It can then grasp its signification. (Roudinesco, 2014, 77)

However, Lacan is openly in disagreement with Derrida’s radicalization of the concept of the real that he radically tries to bury in the textual mesh as his famous maxim, *Il n’y a pas de hors-texte* (There is nothing outside the text) suggest. Lacan has this in mind when he says in *My Teaching*.

“Monsieur Derrida has invented grammatology to entice people who are partial to such things, the ones who at the moment think that, just because linguistics has flung everything out, it’s been a failure.” (Lacan, 2008, 18).

As discussed earlier, the real as gaps and textual *aporias* (blind spots) are not merely linguistic or textual ornaments. When one reads in a text ‘the pain in my neck’, it should be analyzed in and beyond the text as a textual and representational entity. But the very name of representation would sound erratic to Derrida’s ears. Moreover, this is something that Derrida wouldn’t accept, because for him there is no beyond the text anything that then psychoanalysis would claim accountability for its exploration. Thus, “Derrida purportedly denies the beyond of the real.” (Cornell, 1998, 171)

In *Read My Desire*, Joan Copjec criticizes Derrida on behalf of Lacan on two counts. (1) She criticizes Derrida’s concept of difference, which for her sustains “in support of an apolitical (naïve) optimism regarding the inevitability of change,” (Copjec, 2015, 58). Copjec claims that nothing repeat itself in order to reappear as before. It is because, the context that produces meaning is always changing. (2) Lacan shows us that Derrida’s deconstruction “of the subject errs by conflating the infinity of the subject’s desire with the subject itself.” (59). In addition, she proposes that Lacan’s subject is not infinite, but its desire is infinite, and the subject’s drawback brings about “the infinity, or unsatisfiability, of its desire,” (61). The constriction of the subject arises from the fact that subject is expurgated from the origin that makes it a whole. Derrida’s non-psychoanalytic reading of Freud’s essay “Mystic Writing Pad,” is the ground he overturns the idea that the *logos* or speech was anterior to writing. He also introduces this essay as an evidence to the resistance of psychoanalysis to phono-

centrism. In such a non-psychoanalytic articulation, Derrida investigates the psyche as a writing machine. As it was stated earlier, Lacan reaffirms time and again that speech is closer to the truth of the subject and its desire.

In *Without Alibi*, Derrida claims that psychoanalysis is like a civilization which is not dead yet, but it is mortal, but its 'revolution' is indestructible. The very foundation of psychoanalysis bears evidence that it has existed as a non-articulated knowledge even before the arrival of Freud. Like the truth of life, it existed invariably in all civilization. Looking retrospectively at the human history we find the origin of psychoanalysis in the earliest periods, in the age of the production of myths. Its existence, therefore, would not be contingent on any particular civilization. Perhaps for the similar reasons, Derrida argues that psychoanalysis remains foreigner in the Arabic, Islamic and East Asian cultures, "why does psychoanalysis never get a foothold in the vast territory of the Arabo-Islamic culture? Not to mention East Asia," (Derrida, 2002, 255). This, however, seems to be an exaggeration. Jung made enormous attempts to validate his theory of archetypes on the basis of Koran, Sufism and Buddhism. Even Freud has flirted with *nirvana*. Lacan has gone even further, when he urged his 900-page *Écrits* should be read as a mystical work.

In conclusion, Lacan and Derrida represents two school of thoughts that are as much closer as are distanced from each other. The manifestoes of these thoughts came out simultaneously in France when Lacan published collection of his writings and Derrida deconstruction. Derrida often repeated an expression from *The Republic*, *epekeina tes ousias*—moving beyond being (presence) and placed it at the heart of his deconstruction. This expression, "from Plato's *Republic* though Plotinus to a certain Heidegger, this whole tradition lies behind the notion of deconstruction though it is not absolutely coextensive with it," (Derrida, 1991, 97). This expression also is true for the depiction of relations between Lacan and Derrida. The frontier between both thinkers and their disciplines is porous and un-demarcated. The debate between the two thinkers on Poe's stolen letter bears evidence to this claim. To be honest, the discovery of this text is indebted to Lacan that goes beyond being or presence and Derrida's role is that of a critic. As discussed above, the striking issue in his critique is that it calls into question Lacan's understanding of the letter and its return to its sender as something that would require a fixed structure with a totality and above all a fixed meaning. Such a meaning for Derrida was nothing more than an illusion. Derrida also attacks Lacan insistence on the place of the letter, the queen, the woman. He developed his notion of *dissemination* that reject any formalization of a fixed meaning. According to Derrida, this fixed meaning and fixed destination were the primary concern in Western metaphysic, since Plato.

Derrida maintains that if the letter is indestructible than in fact it is being elevated to the 'ideality of meaning and if it comes back after each detour from its proper trajectory (or 'itinerary'), it is because this is actually 'transcendentally reappropriation and readequation'. (Miller, 2016, 208)

Derrida once said in an interview to Roudinesco that in comparison to her, he is less Lacanian. He is Lacanian in a sense that he is endlessly moving ahead to analyze everything to the last atom. Derrida liked Lacan first of all for as he hinted in *Resistances to Psychoanalysis*, that his theories sustains to the end irresistibly critical of the contemporary social, cultural, and media discourses, because they all are validating a 'normalizing' and 'reductive' demonstration of the metaphysics. It is curious enough that deconstruction and psychoanalysis both have potential to disassemble some of the key theoretical notions in their disciplinary fields. To take an example, Derridean are keen to demonstrate the underlying

nuances of phallogocentrism in Lacan's discourse, whereas Lacanians would find it so easy to unveil Derrida's acephalic subject and radicalization of his rejection of the real beyond the text. If we want to think Lacan and Derrida together, one may easily observe a ceaseless propensity for intellectual rivalry and cross-fertilization in both remarkable thinkers. Derrida points to this in his last words in "For the love..."

We loved each other so much, Lacan and I, and thus we promised each other very much, and that this was for me a good thing in this life, would I have been in the truth? Stephen Melville said that the promise always risked being also a threat. That's true. But I would always prefer to prefer the promise. (Derrida, 1998, 69)

Notes:

Al-Kassim, Dina, "Resistance, Terminable and Interminable," *Derrida, Deleuze, Psychoanalysis*, edit. Gabriel Schwab, Columbia University Press, New York.

Badiou & Roudinesco, (2014), *Jacques Lacan, Past and Present: A dialogue*, trans. Jason E. Smith, Columbia University Press, New York.

Bowie, Malcolm, *Lacan: Fontana Modern Masters*, Fontana Press: An imprint of HarperCollins Publishers, London.

Copjec, Joan, (2015), *Read My Desire: Lacan Against the Historicist*, Verso, London.

Cornell, Drucilla, "Rethinking the Beyond of the Real," *Levinas and Lacan: The Missed Encounter*, edit. Sara Harasym, The State University of New York Press, Albany.

Derrida, Jacques, (1991), "Jacques Derrida: Selected Bibliography," *French Philosophers in Conversation, Levinas, Schneider, Serres, Irigaray, Le Doeuff, Derrida, Raoul Mortley*, Routledge, London.

—(1998), *Resistances of Psychoanalysis*, trans. Peggy Kamuf, et al, edit., Werner Hamacher & David Wellbery, Stanford University Press, California.

—(2002), *Without Alibi*, translated, edited, and an introduction by Peggy Kamuf, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Freud, Sigmund, (1991), *The interpretation of Dreams*, trans. James Strachey, edit. Angela Richard, Penguin Books, London.

Lacan, Jacques, (1988), *Seminar II: The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Techniques of Psychoanalysis (1954-1955)*, trans. Sylvana Tomaselli, edit. Jacques-Alain Miller, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

—(1994), *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, trans. Alan Sheridan, edit. Jacques-Alain Miller, Penguin Books, London.

—(2008), *My Teaching* with a preface by Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. David Macey, Verso, London.

Laplanche and Pontalis, (1973), *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, intro. Daniel Lagache, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith, Karnac Books, London.

Marini, Marcelle, (1992), *Jacques Lacan: The French Context*, trans. Anne Tomiche, Rutgers University Press, New Jersey.

Miller, Jacques-Alain, (2016), "A Note Threaded Stich by Stich," *The Sinthome: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXIII*, trans. A R Price, edit. J A Miller, polity press, Cambridge.

Roudinesco, Élisabeth, (2014), *Lacan: In Spite of Everything*, trans. Gregory Elliot, Verso, London.

Tambling, Jeremy, (2012), *Literature and Psychoanalysis*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Wortham, Simon Morgan, (2010), *The Derrida Dictionary*, Continuum international Publishing Group, New York.