Introduction

Lacan and Romanticism

Daniela Garofalo and David Sigler

Why *Lacan and Romanticism*? At a time, within Romantic studies, in which the turn to historicism has just begun to loosen its three-decades-long grasp on the field, and in which scholars have meanwhile been variously bemoaning or acclaiming the demise of theory, the study of Lacan with Romanticism might seem like a quixotic enterprise. Confronted by the juggernaut of historicism, theory, some might argue, is dead. Yet some of the richest and most interesting work in literary and cultural studies, all the while, has remained thoroughly informed by theory, and new theoretical praxes have emerged in the last decade or so. As Vincent Leitch writes: "[D]espite all the talk about posttheory and after theory that has been floating around for several decades, there is a theory renaissance underway."[1] Jacques Lacan—engine of the twentieth century's first theory renaissance with his ever-controversial "return to Freud"—has been an important part of that resurgence within the study of Romanticism and within literary studies more broadly.

In particular, Lacanian theory has experienced a wide-ranging revival since the 1990s, especially with the publication of Slavoj Žižek's groundbreaking work. It emphasized (and emphasizes) how and why Lacan matters for a politicized study of culture. Concomitantly, over the last ten years, beginning with Bruce Fink's translation of Lacan's complete *Écrits* and then with the publication of Lacan's other seminars and lectures, scholars have begun to move beyond Lacan's most familiar writings, such as the oft-anthologized essays on "The Mirror Stage" and "The Agency of the Letter in the Unconscious," to explore the many unfamiliar corners of Lacan's thought.

Several books published in the last few decades have been dedicated to the purpose of aligning Lacan with current literary and cultural studies.[2] They have raised the question of what Lacan brings to the study of literature in particular and culture more generally. Although the word "symptom" is often associated with Lacan and psychoanalysis, a Lacanian focus can offer an alternative to symptomatic readings of literary texts, or offer new ways to think about the symptomatic

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

nature of texts. Lacanians are not alone in this effort, but are an important part of a turn away from primarily historicist and new historicist approaches. There was a time when Lacanian studies of Romanticism would face inevitable, and often just, accusations of peddling seemingly timeless myths—and thus ideology. To speak of a psychoanalysis *avant la lettre* was considered anachronistic and thus intolerable. Psychoanalytic work in Romanticism has, in recent decades, taken seriously these concerns, adapted its methodologies, and accordingly upended such conclusions: what is more obvious today is that psychoanalytic ideas emerged as a discursive development of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and that the Romantic focus on the psyche and the unconscious demanded new ways of reading and storytelling. Romanticism, in Britain and throughout Europe, was closely involved in the representation, analysis, and production of human desire—and, as Colin Carman's essay in this volume indicates, desire beyond the boundaries of the human—and thus in many ways inaugurated psychoanalytic discourses.

New historicist approaches to Romanticism, as pioneered by critics such as Jerome McGann and Marjorie Levinson, have tended to see literary texts as reactions to a cultural context that informs them even (or especially) when the writer represses or ignores their political and historical milieu.[3] Thus the critic reads the text suspiciously for what the author would occlude about politics, an evasion that nonetheless thoroughly informs the work. To a text shaped by an evasion of social realities, the critic returns a missing context that illuminates the symptomatic nature of the work. Even when historicist critics are less suspicious of the text and simply want to show the importance of material culture in a work (for example, Napoleon as subtext for Coleridge's "Kubla Khan"),[4] the critic tends to find that the context is more interesting than text. When read as symptoms of their culture, texts indicate aspects of a pervasive, if dynamic, context, which thoroughly shapes them.

Lacanian readings can be just as invested in historical particularity, but typically they focus on the text itself, finding that literature, painting, film, and other art forms importantly intervene in the symbolic order and do not merely reflect and react to it. Sharply breaking from traditions of psychoanalytic literary criticism focused on psychobiography, for Lacan "it is out of the question to analyze dead authors." Instead, he recommends:

> You must start from the text, start by treating it, as Freud does and as he recommends, as Holy Writ. The author, the scribe, is only a pen-pusher[.] . . . Please give more attention to the text than to the psychology of the author—the entire orientation of my teaching is that.[5]

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

Accordingly, Lacanians tend to see the literary and artistic text as a unique expression, as an intervention in the socio-symbolic network that the text interrogates, undermines, and alters. Far from asserting timeless truths of the unconscious, current iterations of Lacanian literary criticism, including the contributors to this volume, critically examine and even vastly destabilize the political uses to which texts might, or might have historically, been put. They do so by attending to, rather than displacing, the aesthetic aspects of texts. As Todd McGowan has written recently in defense of the masterpiece: "We must retain the category of the masterpiece despite the ideological uses that critics have made of it because it provides a name for the power of the literary work to change our symbolic coordinates."[6] Lacanian literary studies, as it is usually practiced now, tends to think about the artwork as an ideological network of signifying systems with potentially subversive implications. Thus we can retain the category of the masterpiece without merely reifying hegemonic structures of canonicity, given how "the majority of masterpieces are the crumbs of other unknown masterpieces."[7] Texts themselves, intentionally or not, have something to teach us, and can remake the world around them. This is a quintessentially Romantic assumption, admittedly. Thus psychoanalysis can be, and has been, an instrument of canon revision and renegotiation, as adaptable for the works of popular writers such as Joanna Southcott and Walter Scott as for masterpiece makers such as Jane Austen, John Keats, and Francisco Goya.

Because of an emphasis on the uniqueness of the text, the way a text works against its own seeming intentions or protrudes in unexpected directions, Lacanian approaches also offer an alternative to certain kinds of approaches in the Digital Humanities (DH). Franco Moretti's "distant reading," which emphasizes a study of archives instead of the single text, sees close reading as an outdated and overused technique.[8] Yet Lacanians tend to address questions of desire, social organization, language, and the unconscious, which manifest differently in each text. They depend on close textual analysis, their capacity for surprise, and a willingness to find what is unspoken—or what really was spoken, despite expectations. Lacan underscored how every patient speaks a different language, how every subject uses language and processes images in their own particular way. One of the ethical commitments of psychoanalysis is to remain true to those differences, not to collapse subjects into types or groups, which allows us to ignore individual uses of language, image, and narrative. In recent literary studies, much has been made of Moretti's "distant reading" and its emphasis on tools that allow the scholar to explore an archive of thousands of works. With its attention to quantity, to being able to extract data from a large number of texts, and the importance of finding

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

patterns across the digital archive in a historical period, Moretti's version of DH has led to a de-emphasis on close reading, the individual text, and even the individual author. Lacanian readings indicate the merits of a different approach. A single text can construct a vision of the world and the mind that are irreducible to historical context or larger cultural tendencies. Lacanian readings emphasize how texts can offer new ways of seeing and knowing. They often focus on formal features of texts and on close readings, emphasizing the crucial differences and details that allow the text to continue to surprise and inform us. Lacanian literary and cultural scholarship, in other words, participates in a recent scholarly reaction against the assumptions of historicism, distant reading, and data collection. Our wager is that Lacanian theory offers a particularly rich and profound approach to textual scholarship that reveals the interactions among psyche, society, and history in ways that will reinvigorate textual study.

Lacanian psychoanalysis offers no roadmap for success, however, and cannot predict in advance the sorts of insights it will generate. In "Variations on the Standard Treatment," Lacan argued that psychoanalysis, if it were to be meaningful, would not concern itself with myth structures. Rather, given the specificity of each analysand and each analyst, and the open-ended, overdetermined contexts for any analysis, it "progresses essentially in non-knowledge." As we learn its techniques, he warns, "its foundations must be laid open to criticism."[9] The tension between this relentless questioning of first principles, and yet the radical fidelity to the text on the page, including Freud's, even when it says something improper or unexpected, represents a tension found everywhere in Lacanian literary criticism.

Certain kinds of texts lend themselves especially well to such approaches, and Romantic-era writing, which responded, often wildly, to a world in which absolutely everything seemed up for grabs or possible to reimagine, makes special demands of the theory, too. Pioneering for their innovative re-renderings of the mind, consciousness, and subjectivity, Romantic literature and art make possible especially innovative Lacanian readings. As Joel Faflak argues in *Romantic Psychoanalysis*, British Romantic writing anticipates the concerns that Freud would address a century later, and can even be said to have been "inventing psychoanalysis."[10] Romanticism was, it would seem, the incubation of psychoanalytic reason, and yet it had to articulate its psychoanalytic insights without recourse to its terminological apparatus, and thus without fixed expectations for what it was encountering. Lacanian approaches to the study of Romanticism tend to work so well because the texts in question have not anticipated the Freudian-Lacanian lexicon or epistemologies. This means that Romantic-era texts tend to be "wild" in the Freudian sense, too—the texts commit errors of psychoanalytic interpretation that challenge and distort psychoanalytic orthodoxies.[11]

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

Lacanian approaches to the study of Romanticism are too numerous and longstanding to recap here. One area that has been particularly indebted to psychoanalytic approaches has been the study of the Gothic, which makes sense given the intense psychic register of that genre.[12] But Lacanian literary scholars have undertaken the study of Romanticism more broadly, including studies of canonical writers such as Jane Austen, John Keats, Lord Byron, and William Wordsworth.[13] The current interest in Lacan among Romanticists brings the theory full circle, given Lacan's own investments in British and Spanish Romanticism. In *Seminar V*, Lacan spoke at some length about wit in English Romanticism, and then he identified Spanish Romanticism as "the main tradition," leaving it aside in his commentary only "because it's too important for us."[14] Two years later, Lacan described psychoanalysis as an elaboration of the idea, from Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," that "the child is father of the man."[15] He variously commented on Romanticism's relation to love, childhood, and wit, supposing that British Romantic writers were "radically different from the poets who preceded them":

> [I]t is no accident that we discover it in that period with its fresh, shattering, and even breathtaking quality, bursting forth at the beginning of the nineteenth century with the industrial revolution, in the country that was most advanced in experiencing its effects, in England. English romanticism has its own special features, which include the value given to childhood memories, to the whole world of childhood, to the ideals and wishes of the child.[16]

British Romanticism was, for Lacan, a privileged literary corpus for understanding psychoanalytic ideas. Lacan tended to see Romantic poetry as the unspoken or hidden part of psychoanalysis, and an important precursor to, and interlocutor for, Freud. Knowledge of Romanticism was valued by Lacan: for instance, he admired the way that Freud was able to read the lacunae in Daniel Paul Schreber's *Memoir* through his familiarity with Byron's *Manfred*.[17] It was Lacan's opinion that true Freudians would need to be Romanticists, in the sense that the thematic preoccupations of the period's literature tend to address the gaps and silences in contemporary psychiatric and psychological discourse. Romantic-era writing makes possible psychoanalytic reason and can align psychoanalysis with "the true, solid backbone of Freud's thought," curbing the discipline's normativity and prescriptiveness.[18]

Yet Lacan, being neither literary scholar nor time traveler, had a typically narrow vision of what Romanticism was and could be. In the 1950s and '60s, it meant insightful male writers reacting to the industrial revolution through acts of imagination. Thus Lacan saw the imaginative encounter with one's childhood as

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

the era's pervasive concern, rather than, say, the abolition of slavery, or rationalizations for empire, or patriarchal oppression. The purview of his British Romanticism extended only so far as Scott, Byron, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Hazlitt. He lived in a world in which Austen was a strangely belated eighteenth-century novelist, Wollstonecraft's posthumous reputation had been obliterated, and Wordsworth had revived the sonnet tradition.

Romanticism as it appears today is more contradictory and multifarious than Lacan could have imagined, and far more Lacanian. The writers and topics that have come into view since Lacan's death in 1981 have vastly expanded our sense of what desire could mean in the period, where the gaze could wander, how the Real could interrupt but also anchor the era's commercial and imperial systems. Since Lacan's death, the period has more widely been acknowledged to have invented psychoanalysis, cognitive science, and the systematized study of perversion;[19] entire branches of psychoanalysis, following Wilfrid Bion, have organized themselves around Keats and negative capability.[20] It falls to today's scholars, then, to make the necessary introductions between Lacan and the multiform Romanticisms that we call Romanticism today.

The reverse is equally the case, however: scholarship on Romanticism has, until recently, had only a very partial and limited access to Lacan. Generally, we might say that Lacan loved Romanticism more than Romanticists have tended to love him back. In that sense, it really was love: he was giving something he didn't have—(i.e., expertise in the period and its literature)—to those who haven't generally wanted it.[21] Greater interest in Lacan within literary studies has tended to follow on the heels of new translations and new editions of his work: the previous big wave of Lacanian literary criticism, in the 1990s, for instance, relied upon the publication of several "new" Lacanian seminars in English: David Collings began analyzing *das Ding* in Wordsworth's poetry shortly after the 1992 publication of Lacan's *Seminar VII*, and Mark Lussier's 2002 analysis of Blake's *The Four Zoas* depended upon the 1998 English publication of *Seminar XX*.[22] Critics in the 1990s, as Laura Claridge explains, were discovering how "Lacan allows readers a certain freedom in letting the literary text speak of its own plurality to us."[23] Still, until as recently as 2006, Romanticists really had access to only six of Lacan's twenty-seven seminars, and only "A Selection" of the *Écrits*.[24] Things began to change significantly, though, with the publication that year of Bruce Fink's translation of the complete *Écrits*. That monumental work, activating concepts like "logical time" for English literary criticism, has instigated an unprecedented era of Lacan translation under the editorial eye of Jacques-Alain Miller. Since 2007, we have seen the English publication of six further seminars (four since 2016 alone!), along with translations of other

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

Lacanian texts such as *My Teaching* (2008) and *The Triumph of Religion* (2013).[25] This means that the number of pages of Lacan's thought available to English-language scholars has more than doubled in the last ten years, with the process still vastly accelerating. Given Lacan's tendency to think out loud, to improvise "live theory" as a kind of performance art, this new material opens the conversation in unexpected directions. To be a Lacanian literary critic today means something very different from what it meant in 1995, or 2006, or even 2015: we have seen Lacan's life's work on a fuller scale, and the available concepts and contexts are often significantly different. It will take some time for literary scholars to work through and learn this fresh material, but there is every reason to believe that it will summon a wave of Lacanian literary analyses in English, ones that will be unfamiliar in their methodologies and perceptions. Our contributors are beginning this process in these pages: Colin Carman and Matt Foley draw upon a range of newly published texts, including *Seminar X* ("Anxiety"), *Seminar XXIII* ("The Sinthome"), and *My Teaching*, and David Sigler draws upon *Seminar V* and other still unpublished materials. In engaging with and working through these ideas, we imagine that our volume might signal several ways forward for Lacanian studies in the field of Romanticism.

This book is significant because our contributors, many of whom have been leaders in this critical conversation so far, often employ concepts that may be less familiar to those who remember Lacan from the 1990s or from Žižek's work. This marks an important turn in the field. Although Romanticists, in recent years, have returned with greater frequency and open-mindedness to Lacan's ideas, they have most frequently done so indirectly, through engagement with Žižek's writings. Forest Pyle notes that "the Lacanian analysis of desire . . . has found its second coming of sorts in the work of Žižek,"[26] and Daniela Garofalo similarly observes that "Lacanian psychoanalysis, particularly as mediated by Slavoj Žižek's politicization of Lacan, has become increasingly interesting to Romanticists" recently.[27] Žižek's ideas have informed the work of a wide and diverse swath of Romanticists, including Mark Sandy, Guinn Batten, our contributor Evan Gottlieb, Neil Fraistat, George Haggerty, Orrin N. C. Wang, and Brian Cooney.[28] Žižek usefully "amplifies" Lacan, as our contributor Paul A. Vatalaro explains elsewhere, to reveal the political and ideological aspects of desire in the period.[29] Yet Lacan's oeuvre is vast and multifaceted, and Žižek's repertoire has tended to "amplify" only a few Lacanian concepts for Romanticism. The challenge today, as Sam Warren Miell has urged, is arguably "to reclaim Lacan on his own terms"—while not forgetting the insights that Žižek-inspired scholarship has developed so far.[30] The aim of our collection is thus to open the study of Romanticism to less familiar Lacanian ideas and methodologies, so they might gain a foothold in the field.

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

Our contributors thus stake out relatively unfamiliar Lacanian territory as a way of reimagining what Lacanian literary studies can mean. They explore topics from Lacan that have been underutilized in literary criticism, such as his interrogations of aesthetics, topology, logical time, and need and demand. Others develop innovative rereadings of Lacan's most familiar texts, such as "The Subversion of the Subject," "The Mirror Stage," or *Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, transforming those texts in the process. In so doing they find themselves frequently contesting critical orthodoxies about the self-making of Frankenstein's Creature, the meaning of the marriage plot, or the political commentary encoded in Goya's dark visions. They artfully import Lacan into discussions in which Lacan has so far had only limited impact, or had seemed *persona non grata*, such as nonhuman animal studies, the politics of aesthetics, the ethics of sublimity, or literature and the environment, and in doing so they invent a contemporary Lacan better adapted for the critical and social preoccupations of the late 2010s. Carman traces in Keats, for instance, a queer critical ecology that resists oppressive models of political sovereignty. Rikitha Ramamurthy sharpens the political edge of Lacan's theory of the gaze even as she finds ways of reading Goya that aren't reducible to political allegory. She reveals how Lacanian models of analysis can, when given the right materials, get beyond the impasses of Foucauldian methodologies—offering, implicitly, a bold challenge to work in Romantic and Gothic studies that has sought to reconcile psychoanalysis with Foucault.[31] Evan Gottlieb even somehow finds a glimmer of utopianism in Lacan, with ramifications for the way that we understand the relation between social justice and science fiction. Our contributors ask political questions such as, What is tyranny? and, What does utopia want?; they trace the sacrifices demanded by global capitalism onto sex and love; they rescue, through their studies of eroticism, alternative ways of political world-building. They resist attempts "to squeeze profits from the Real," as Zak Watson thoughtfully says, as he situates logical time within the unconscious. They show us the forgotten temporal element of the sublime. They show how the quintessentially Romantic project of subject-formation tends to get caught up, irredeemably, in its impasses. They ask aesthetic questions such as, How does writing generate meaning through rupture?, What shapes can literary language take?, What is a genre?, or, How can a fetish lend itself to representation? They theorize the bases of perception. They ask questions of rights, such as, What qualifies as merit?, Why would utopia want to retain oppression?, or, Where does sexual difference appear? They ask questions of affect, such as, What happens when mourning becomes sublime? and, Why go on? How does a psychic economy of profit and loss respond to the capitalist economy, and, knowing that, might we discover how the fusion of love with commodity capitalism could serve a binary system of sexual difference?

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

The questions provoking our contributors, then, are not ones that we would typically associate with Lacan. They are questions much more familiar to Romanticists—and in this sense the collection seeks to bring Romanticism to Lacan rather than the other way around. Yet in pursuing these questions through Lacan, our contributors frequently push against the boundaries of what might be considered Romanticism, opening the conversation to include eighteenth-century predecessors of Romanticism such as Elizabeth Carter, Edward Young, Robert Blair, William Collins, and Sarah Scott. Even Austen, a writer who has seemed, at times, "immune to psychoanalysis" and for whom "the volume and quality of psychological studies . . . lags significantly behind work done from other perspectives," is here shown to be thinking about loss and recovery in a hauntingly psychoanalytic way, as Garofalo reveals in her analysis of *Persuasion*.[32] But our contributors are also returning to authors such as Wordsworth, Horace Walpole, Keats, and Mary Shelley with long and remarkable histories of Lacanian interpretation, using new Lacanian methodologies to rethink desire, subjectivity, and politics in some foundational Romantic texts.

While each of the essays explores different areas of Lacanian theory, they are all concerned, in various ways, with the problem of lack. Lack becomes in these pages the guiding thread that unites the work of these Lacanian Romanticists, who are informed not only by Lacan's emphasis but also by Romanticism's abiding concern with the topic. The first essay in *Lacan and Romanticism*, Paul Vatalaro's "The Gaze of *Frankenstein*," takes up a novel that has frequently been given the Lacanian treatment in influential readings by Mladen Dolar, David Collings, and Denise Gigante. Vatalaro's essay in this collection highlights the significance of the gaze in Mary Shelley's novel and how it compels an encounter with traumatic lack. Rithika Ramamurthy's "Goya's Gaze: Seeing Non-relation in *Los Caprichos*" extends the focus on the gaze but connects it to the problem of sexuation and the lack of the sexual relation in an unexpected political register. Daniela Garofalo's "Abandoned by Providence: Loss in Jane Austen's *Persuasion*" further develops the Lacanian theme of sexuation in order to examine, as do Ramamurthy and Vatalaro, the encounter with a traumatic lack, finding in the novel's discourses of sexual difference a meditation on personal finance and loss in every sense. Colin Carman's "Jacques Lacan and John Keats's 'Noble Animal Man' " analyzes Keats's *Endymion* through the topics of sexuation and lack, but in connection with environmental disaster and questions of political sovereignty. In so doing he finds an ambivalent place for Lacan in ongoing studies of nonhuman subjectivity–a conversation in which Lacan has been presumed, thanks to deconstructive criticism, to be unhelpful. Zak Watson's "Logical Time and the Romantic Sublime"

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

pursues the aesthetic strands of that analysis in relation to William Collins's "Ode on the Poetical Character," a poem which enables Watson to theorize, *contra* dominant models of the sublime from Immanuel Kant and Thomas Weiskel, how the sublime leads to a realization not only of subjective lack but also of the lack in the Other. Ed Cameron, in "The Eros of Thanatos: Eighteenth-Century Graveyard Poetry and Melancholic Sublimation," extends Watson's analysis of the sublime and Garofalo's analysis of loss by considering how a generation of graveyard poets turn to sublimation in order to bring poetry, dwelling in affective loss and the failures of representation, to the dignity of the presymbolic primordial Thing. David Sigler, in "Toric Tropes Are Stolen Boats: Reading Wordsworth's *The Prelude* Topologically, with Lacan," studies *The Prelude*'s stolen boat scene as an encounter with the problem of subjective lack, in order to show how literary language can be a form of topology. Matt Foley's "Tyranny as Demand: Lacan Reading the Dreams of the Gothic Romance," returns us to the Gothic, and especially Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto*, to consider the lack in tyrannical power, which conflates the levels of need, demand, and desire in destabilizing ways—attempting to fill in the gap in the Other and disavowing symbolic structures. Finally, Evan Gottlieb, in "Jouissance, Obscene Undersides and Utopian/Dystopian Formations in Sarah Scott's *Millenium Hall* and Mary Shelley's *The Last Man,* discusses how these utopian/dystopian novels, representing opposite ends of a long Romantic century, reveal a lack in the utopian ideal. Gottlieb examines this lack through the Lacanian concepts of ego ideal and ideal ego—and in doing so highlights an invisible, even seemingly utopian aspect in Lacan's thought and in psychoanalysis more broadly.

We are hopeful that our collection might update Lacan for Romantic studies at a moment when the next surge in Lacanian Romantic scholarship is just beginning, even as it allows Lacan to make contact with a wider range of Romantic-era texts and writers than has yet been attempted. It is the wager of this book that Romantic studies and Lacanian theory share similar preoccupations and concerns; as fellow travelers, navigating the effects of lack both in the subject and in the big Other, these fields are made better, richer, by engagement and interchange. It is our hope, furthermore, that the essays collected here will go a long way to dispel the notion that Lacan is inaccessible because of his notoriously obscure and elliptical style. That fear has perhaps limited the engagement by Romantic scholars with the work of Jacques Lacan. Focused on fundamental Lacanian ideas, the essays here clarify complex terms and model their application, enabling Lacan to make sense for and of Romanticism. Accessible in both style and subject matter, they can speak to the scholar or student coming to Lacan for the first time, as well as the more practiced reader of Lacanian theory.

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

Notes

1. Vincent B. Leitch, *Literary Criticism in the 21st Century: Theory Renaissance* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 8.

2. *Lacan and Literature: Purloined Pretexts*, Ben Stoltzfus, ed. (New York: SUNY Press, 1996); Jeremy Tambling, *Literature and Psychoanalysis* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012) and *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and Psychoanalysis*, edited by Jean-Michel Rabaté (New York: Cambridge, 2014) focus on Lacan as well as other psychoanalytic theorists. Also, monographs focused primarily on Lacan, which address a variety of literary fields, have appeared. Some examples among many: Shoshana Felman, *Jacques Lacan and the Adventure of Insight: Psychoanalysis in Contemporary Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987); James Mellard, *Using Lacan, Reading Fiction* (Bloomington: University of Illinois Press, 1991); Sheldon Brivic, *Joyce through Lacan and Žižek: Explorations* (New York: Palgrave, 2008); Sheldon George, *Trauma and Race: A Lacanian Study of African American Racial Identity* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016).

3. Jerome McGann, *The Romantic Ideology: A Critical Investigation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); Marjorie Levinson, "Insight and Oversight: Reading 'Tintern Abbey,' " in *Wordsworth's Great Period Poems: Four Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 14–57; Marjorie Levinson, "The New Historicism: Back to the Future," in *Rethinking Historicism: Critical Readings in Romantic History*, ed. Marjorie Levinson (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1989), 18–63.

4. Simon Bainridge, *Napoleon and English Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 25.

5. Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book II: The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis, 1954–1955*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Sylvana Tomaselli (New York: Norton, 1988), 152–53.

6. Todd McGowan, "The Bankruptcy of Historicism: Introducing Disruption into Literary Studies," in *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Literature but Were Afraid to Ask Žižek*, ed. Russell Sbriglia (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017), 101.

7. Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XVII: The Other Side of Psychoanalysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Russell Grigg (New York: Norton, 2007), 183.

8. Franco Moretti, *Distant Reading* (New York: Verso, 2013).

9. Jacques Lacan, *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*, trans. Bruce Fink (New York: Norton, 2006), 298–300.

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

10. Joel Faflak, *Romantic Psychoanalysis: The Burden of the Mystery* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008), 15.

11. Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1964), 10:221–27.

12. Terry Castle, "The Spectralization of the Other in The Mysteries of Udolpho," in *The New Eighteenth Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature*, ed. Felicity Nussbaum and Laura Brown (New York: Meuthen, 1987), 231–53; Mladen Dolar, " 'I Shall Be With You On Your Wedding-Night': Lacan and the Uncanny," *October* 58 (1991): 5–23; Joan Copjec, "Vampires, Breast-Feeding, and Anxiety," *October* 58 (1991): 24–43, doi:10.2307/778796; Dale Townshend, *The Orders of Gothic: Foucault, Lacan, and the Subject of Gothic Writing, 1764–1820* (New York: AMS Press, 2007); Ed Cameron, *The Psychopathology of the Gothic Romance: Perversion, Neuroses and Psychosis in Early Works of the Genre* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2010).

13. Robert Young, "The Eye and Progress of His Song: A Lacanian Reading of 'The Prelude,' " *Oxford Literary Review* 3, no. 3 (1979): 78–98; Laura Claridge, *Romantic Potency: The Paradox of Desire* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992); Ghislaine McDayter, *Byromania and the Birth of Celebrity Culture, Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009); David Collings, *Monstrous Society: Reciprocity, Discipline, and the Political Uncanny*, c. 1780–1848 (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2009); Daniela Garofalo, *Women, Love, and Commodity Culture in British Romanticism* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012); David Sigler, *Sexual Enjoyment in British Romanticism: Gender and Psychoanalysis, 1753–1835* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015).

14. Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book V: Formations of the Unconscious*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Russell Grigg (Cambridge: Polity, 2017), 14.

15. Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959–1960*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Dennis Porter (New York: Norton, 1992), 24. See also Lacan, *Seminar XVII*, 124.

16. Lacan, *Seminar VII*, 24–25.

17. Lacan, *Écrits*, 466; Freud, SE, 12:44.

18. Lacan, *Seminar VII*, 25.

19. Faflak, *Romantic Psychoanalysis*; Alan Richardson, *The Neural Sublime: Cognitive Theories and Romantic Texts* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010); Richard C. Sha, *Perverse Romanticism: Aesthetics and Sexuality in Britain, 1750–1832* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008).

20. Wilfred R. Bion, *Attention and Interpretation* (London: Karnac Books, 1984); Richard E. Webb and Michael A. Sells, "Lacan and Bion: Psychoanalysis and the Mystical Language of 'Unsaying,' " *Theory & Psychology* 5, no. 2 (May 1, 1995):

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

195–215; William Betts, "Negative Capability," *Psychoanalysis Downunder*, no. 7B (2007), http://www.psychoanalysisdownunder.com.au/issues/8/papers/106.

21. Jacques Lacan, "The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XII: Crucial Problems for Psychoanalysis, 1964–1965," trans. Cormac Gallagher n.d., 165 (meeting of March 3, 1965).

22. David Collings, *Wordsworthian Errancies: The Poetics of Cultural Dismemberment* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994); Lacan, *Seminar VII*; Mark Lussier, " 'Rest before Labour': The Pre-Text/s of Blake's The Four Zoas," *Romanticism on the Net*, no. 27 (2002); Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XX: Encore: On Feminine Sexuality, the Limits of Love and Knowledge, 1972–1973*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Bruce Fink (New York: Norton, 1998).

23. Claridge, *Romantic Potency*, 4.

24. Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book I: Freud's Papers on Technique, 1953–1954*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. John Forrester (New York: Norton, 1988); Lacan, *Seminar II*; Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book III: The Psychoses*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Russell Grigg (New York: Norton, 1993); Lacan, *Seminar VII*; Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XI: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Norton, 1978); Lacan, *Seminar XX*; Jacques Lacan, *Écrits: A Selection*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Norton, 1977).

25. Lacan, *Seminar V*; Bruce Fink, *Lacan on Love: An Exploration of Lacan's Seminar VIII, Transference* (Malden: Polity Press, 2016); Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book X: Anxiety, 1962–1963*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. A.R. Price (Cambridge: Polity, 2015); Lacan, *Seminar XVII*; Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XIX: . . . Ou Pire, 1971–1972*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. A.R. Price (Cambridge: Polity, 2017); Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXIII: The Sinthome, 1975–1976*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. A.R. Price (Cambridge: Polity, 2016); Jacques Lacan, *My Teaching*, trans. David Macey (New York and London: Verso, 2008); Jacques Lacan, *The Triumph of Religion*, trans. Bruce Fink (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013); Jacques Lacan, "On a Reform in Its Hole," trans. John Holland, S: *Journal of the Circle for Lacanian Ideology Critique* 8 (2015): 14–21.

26. Forest Pyle, *Art's Undoing: In the Wake of a Radical Aestheticism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014), 189.

27. Daniela Garofalo, "The Uses of Lacan in Recent British Romantic Studies," *Literature Compass* 10, no. 7 (2013): 559.

28. Mark Sandy, *Romanticism, Memory, and Mourning* (New York: Ashgate, 2013); Guinn Batten, *The Orphaned Imagination: Melancholy and Commodity*

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany

Culture in English Romanticism (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998); Evan Gottlieb, *Walter Scott and Contemporary Theory* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 11–31; Neil Fraistat, "The Material Shelley: Who Gets the Finger in Queen Mab?," *The Wordsworth Circle* 33, no. 1 (2002): 35–36; George E. Haggerty, *Queer Gothic* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006), 9; Brian C. Cooney, "Rev. of Maximilien Robespierre. Virtue and Terror. Intro. Slavoj Žižek. Ed. Jean Ducange," *Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net*, no. 47 (2007): para. 6, doi:10.7202/016711ar.

29. Paul A. Vatalaro, *Shelley's Music: Fantasy, Authority, and the Object Voice* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 24.

30. Sam Warren Miell, "Slavoj Žižek Is Wrong about Stuff," *Different Coloured Hats*, August 3, 2016, https://differentcolouredhats.wordpress.com/2016/08/03/slavoj-zizek-is-wrong-about-stuff/.

31. Diane Long Hoeveler, *Gothic Feminism: The Professionalization of Gender from Charlotte Smith to the Brontës* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 53; Townshend, *The Orders*.

32. Joel Faflak, "Jane Austen and the Persuasion of Happiness," in *Romanticism and the Emotions*, ed. Joel Faflak and Richard C. Sha (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 100; Laurence W. Mazzeno, *Jane Austen: Two Centuries of Criticism* (Rochester: Camden House, 2011), 202.

© 2019 State University of New York Press, Albany