

The London Consortium
Static. Issue 07 - Catastrophe

Alice Gavin

The Phantom Catastrophe
Hamlet's Rank Inheritance

<http://static.londonconsortium/issue07>

© Alice Gavin / Static / London Consortium / July 2008

Static is the web resource of the London Consortium, a unique collaboration between the Architectural Association, Birkbeck College (University of London), the Institute of Contemporary Arts, The Science Museum, and Tate. Aiming to initiate interdisciplinary intellectual debate about paradoxes of contemporary culture, Static presents contributions from an international team of academics, artists and cultural practitioners.

The London Consortium – <http://www.londonconsortium.com>
Architectural Association – <http://www.aaschool.ac.uk/>
Birkbeck College (University of London) – <http://www.bbk.ac.uk/>
Institute of Contemporary Arts – <http://www.ica.org.uk/>
The Science Museum – <http://www.sciencemuseum.org.uk/>
Tate – <http://www.tate.org.uk/>

If in dramaturgical terms a catastrophe is 'that part of a tragedy which brings the action to its conclusion,' then it is, perhaps, exactly a catastrophe that *Hamlet* lacks.¹ The incapacity of the play's protagonist to take action, the paralysis of praxis that Hamlet encounters in reaction to his dead father's demand, is in fact what causes the play's performance to endure: it is Hamlet's apparent lack of resolve, his 'inhibition' as Freud saw it, which causes all resolution to lag; the gap of action his inertia inserts is the fissure continually circled by his 'Words, words, words' (II.2.193).² But if *Hamlet* does indeed lack catastrophe, in the sense that it misses an impetus towards completion, this is because the catastrophe encountered by its protagonist is, quite specifically, a lack. Hamlet's eye, as his mother observes, is 'ben[t]' – intent – 'on vacancy' (III.4.18): if the Prince is inhibited, it is not for want of what Freud also referred to as *Fixierarbeit*, a 'fixation that persists despite every external attempt to dislodge it'.³ On the contrary, his inhibition is intimately linked with the nature of that fixation. For what Hamlet insists upon is, after all, a particularly demanding absence: it is not simply the phantom presence of a father that Hamlet encounters, but the apparition of the paternal word, the spectral interpolation that commands the son to seek vengeance for the father's murder. The source both of Hamlet's aim and inertia, this locution is thus the locus of that lacking catastrophe, a catastrophe that is, therefore, rankly – overpoweringly – absent. It is the word of the dead father, a word divorced of all corporeal support, that haunts Hamlet, impelling him headlong toward inaction. As 'that part of the play which brings the action to the conclusion', *Hamlet's* catastrophe is, then, not in the action but maddeningly out of it: referring to, but failing for the most part to fulfil, the paternal word, Hamlet's inaction – his lack of a catastrophe; his 'catastrophe of lack' – is an aberrant repetition of the rankly absent law of his rank and absent father. *Hamlet's* catastrophe is, in short, a phantom.

For Jacques Lacan, the transmission of the father's discourse in aberrant form is associated quite precisely with the order of the symbolic: as he states in 'The Circuit', the latter is allied to 'the discourse of my father [...] in so far as my father made mistakes which I am absolutely condemned to reproduce'; it is, moreover, 'my duty to transmit [the chain of discourse] in aberrant form to someone else'.⁴ The law, it might therefore be thought, is possessed of a superfluity: it is its gaps that 'add' to it an aberrancy, deviations in meaning, that act also as our inheritance; but it is, at the same time, exactly such fractures or apparitions of absence that cause us to conceive of a law at once *insistent* and somewhere *else*. As Lacan states in relation to the symbolic, that order is both 'what is most elevated in man and what isn't in man, but elsewhere'.⁵ It is not simply, then, the law that we inherit, but also the law's own haunting, its excess or impossibility: Hamlet in this sense holds firm to a fissure; he grasps not the law in its abstracted totality, but rather his father's 'gap'. Akin perhaps to Lacan's formulation of anorexia nervosa as a condition in which what is eaten is not simply nothing but 'the nothing', the Prince describes himself as gorging on an absence thick with signification: 'I eat the air,' he declares, 'promise-crammed' (III.2.104).⁶ His rank in the royal line having been usurped by a murdering and mother-marrying uncle, his inheritance, the 'promise' to which he here refers, quite literally lacks substance. But if his proper place in the succession has indeed come to naught – to nothing – he is nevertheless fraught with the importance of incorporating that lack, with 'eat[ing] the air' that bears it. What is more, if 'rank' – a word that, along with its attendant variations, features repeatedly in the play;

¹ Harold Jenkins, *The Catastrophe in Shakespearian Tragedy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1969)

² Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, trans. by Joyce Crick (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p. 204n.

³ Joan Copjec, *Imagine There's No Woman: Ethics and Sublimation* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2002), p. 16.

⁴ Jacques Lacan, quoted in Judith Butler, *Antigone's Claim* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 42-43.

⁵ Jacques Lacan, quoted in Judith Butler, *Antigone's Claim*, p. 43.

⁶ Jacques Lacan, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, ed. by Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. by Alan Sheridan (London and New York: Karnac, 2004), p. 104.

by my count ten times, in comparison, for example, to twice in *Macbeth* – is a signifier also of haughty disorder, then Hamlet's inaction, his attachment to an absent catastrophe, is indicative likewise of an interminable disruption, a permanently repeating rupture in the structure of resolution.

What the play stages is thus, it might be suggested, an incurable inheritance. Indeed, what *Hamlet* perhaps bequeaths us is a catastrophe unhinged from its definition, detached from its proper place or appropriate dramatical rank. For Harold Jenkins (from whom we borrowed our opening articulation of the concept) the play in fact contains the most exciting of Shakespeare's catastrophes; it is the contention of this present essay, however, that *Hamlet* does not 'contain' its catastrophe at all. As Jenkin's phrase hints at, a dramatic catastrophe is not exactly equivalent to a conclusion; rather, it is that 'part of the action' which brings the latter about. If this 'part' is that which is played by the father – or, more specifically, by his word – then *Hamlet's* catastrophe is by all means a phantom: neither caught in the play nor contained in it, it on the contrary haunts it; attached to the phantasmal form of a ghost, *Hamlet's* catastrophe is not a part of the action but *apart*. What is more, this outlandish catastrophe – a catastrophe evacuated from the scene of corporeal action; excluded, like Hamlet, from its rank – is severed in turn from itself: if *Hamlet's* catastrophe could in one sense be called incurable because its literary posterity appears interminable, destined to irresolute repetition, it is inoperable also in the sense that it encapsulates the ungrounding of 'catastrophe', the slippage of its signification. For, similar to Prince Hamlet's own usurpation by his uncle, the meaning of 'catastrophe' is split with its etymology; it is, for us, no longer necessarily the bearer of its strictly dramatical heritage. Its signification is irresolute, its application imprecise: our contemporary articulation of 'catastrophe' is, it would seem, an aberrant repetition of its former form. This is not, however, to argue the existence of a particular catastrophic origin, a moment at which 'catastrophe' limited itself to its specific definition: if a 'former form' of catastrophe can be spoken of at all, it is only in the sense that it is irrecoverable; to briefly anticipate a reading of Derrida to which this essay will later turn, the 'original' is, quite literally in the case of catastrophe's dramatical provenance, 'marked with fiction'.⁷ Hamlet's sire, his source of origin, is seen in the form of phantasm; his catastrophe is a phantasy.

But if it is indeed the case that what *Hamlet* confers is a phantom catastrophe, a catastrophe that absents itself and in so doing endures in the form of a haunting, what then should be made of Nicholas Abraham's attempt, in an essay entitled 'The Phantom of Hamlet, or the Sixth Act', to cure the play's protagonist of exactly that "phantom effect"? In the 'Intermission of Truth' that prefaces his rendering of a final resolution for Hamlet – a corrective, therefore, to *Hamlet's* lacking catastrophe – Abraham wonders whether

we the public, now nearly four hundred years old, [are] finally in a position to articulate in words what for our forebears in literary criticism has remained a series of rationalizations[.] Since Freud, the problem at least has been raised. We have come to understand that in his play, Shakespeare bequeathed to us an unstated and unrevealed unconscious process that has endured for centuries. The time has come [...] to investigate a possible outcome of the drama, a conclusion suspended at the final slaughter.⁸

We have all, according to Abraham, inherited *Hamlet* rankly: Hamlet's inheritance of lack – the air he eats, promise-crammed – is in his eyes grossly

⁷ Jacques Derrida, 'Fors: The English Words of Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok,' trans. by Barbara Johnson, in Nicholas Abraham and Maria Torok, *The Wolf Man's Magic Word: A Cyptomymy*, trans. by Nicholas Rand (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), p. xxvi.

⁸ Nicholas Abraham, 'The Phantom of Hamlet, or the Sixth Act: Preceded by the Intermission of "Truth"', *Diacritics*, 18 (Winter, 1998), pp. 2-19, p. 4.

pertinent to the modern psyche *per se*. Interested primarily in the status and place of the family secret – in the transmission of a fissure, or the inheritance of a ‘gap’ and the havoc it wreaks in the recipient’s psychic life – Abraham’s analysis and exorcism of *Hamlet* revolves around an idea elaborated alongside his colleague, Maria Torok. Their thesis is that the ‘buried speech of the parent’, the parent’s space of repression, can become ‘(a) dead (gap), without burial place, in the child’.⁹ Leading to ‘phobias, madness, and obsessions’ the effects of this gap can, they argue, ‘persist through several generations and determine the fate of an entire family line’.¹⁰ But whilst such a formulation bears a resemblance to Lacan’s contention that the discourse of the father is necessarily malformed in its repetitious transmission, Abraham is sure that Hamlet can be cured. The play’s ‘final slaughter’, the scene in which Hamlet himself falls, is for him no conclusion at all: *Hamlet*, for Abraham, exceeds itself; its lack of catastrophe bestows catastrophe on us all.

For what Abraham’s argument supplies is the idea that we are all, in a sense, born of Shakespeare’s brood, of Shakespeare’s wife: the bard bequeaths to each of us – and not merely Anne – his second-best bed, a bed perhaps ‘enseamed’ and ridden with ‘rank sweat’ (III. 4. 93) (as Joyce’s Stephen Dedalus, at least, would like to have us imagine), and it is Abraham’s aim to deliver us of this. If Dedalus revels in the contention that ‘[t]wo deeds are rank in [the ghost of Hamlet’s father’s mind]: a broken vow and the dullbrained yokel on whom her favour has declined’, Abraham’s intention is to change, as it were, the bed.¹¹ ‘Would Hamlet’, this particular psychoanalyst asks,

have been “cured” on Freud’s couch? Nothing permits us to affirm otherwise, nor is this the task I set myself. It is a much more daring one. I seek to “cure” the *public* of the covert neurosis that the Tragedy of Hamlet has, for centuries, inflicted upon it.¹²

Abraham’s analysis is certainly assertive of an abundance of absence in *Hamlet*. His claim that its ‘gaps’ – its phantasmal fissures – inhere in and haunt history is not, however, an uncommon one: as one late nineteenth-century commentator noted in the context of a seemingly scientific discussion of the category of the ‘Posthom Phantom’, the detachable shadow, ‘the strength of the genius of Shakespeare is such that the ancient king and his famous son and namesake have as firm a reality as that of the mediocre flesh and blood people which swarm in modern society’.¹³

Certainly in Abraham’s appendage to the play, his catastrophic ‘Sixth Act’, Hamlet the younger is bestowed a bodily firmness. Reviving both father and son at first, Abraham resurrects and restores only the Prince to his appropriate rank, drawing from his father the secret concealed by the secret of his death, an ‘infamy which the father, unbeknownst to his son, has on his conscience’.¹⁴ In Abraham’s rendering, it is the murdered King who seeks to avert Hamlet’s succession: ‘You must not, come what may, allow the crown to fall to its lawful heir,’ he informs Fortinbras. But as Fortinbras uncovers, the father is in fact guilty of an ‘unmanly victory’ against the former’s predecessor: Claudius, discovering this,

⁹ Nicholas Abraham and Maria Torok, ‘A Poetics of Psychoanalysis: “The Lost Object – Me”’, trans. by Nicholas Rand, *SubStance*, 13 (1984), pp. 3-18, p. 17n.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17n.

¹¹ James Joyce, *Ulysses* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 259.

¹² Nicholas Abraham, ‘The Phantom of Hamlet, or the Sixth Act: Preceded by the Intermission of “Truth”’, p. 4.

¹³ David Starr Jordan, ‘The Posthom Phantom: A Study in the Spontaneous Activity of Shadows’, *Science*, New Series, 9 (May 12, 1899), pp. 674-81, p. 679.

¹⁴ Nicholas Abraham, ‘The Phantom of Hamlet, or the Sixth Act: Preceded by the Intermission of “Truth”’, p. 3.

whispered in [King Hamlet's] ear that he knew the secret of the pearl, the secret behind the Union of our lands; he told him that he knew what hateful weapon he had used [...] When he heard, whispered in his ear, the truth his accomplice should have sealed in eternal silence, when his ears were violated by his secret, his blood ran cold, chilled by his own poison.¹⁵

By means of this expiation, this revelation of the 'naked truth', the ghost of the father is dissolved. His 'gap' is gotten rid of; the 'action' of the play is brought to its conclusion: *Hamlet*, if Abraham's aim here is achieved, is no longer possessed of, nor by, a lacking catastrophe. But is this really the resolution required? Is, indeed, resolution desired at all? For there is a sense in which Abraham's *de-siring* of Prince Hamlet – his loss of the father; his elision, even, of the father's phantasmal absence – in fact deletes the possibility of alteration afforded by the transmission of an aberrant discourse. It is, in effect, a *de-siring* that risks eliminating the rupture wrought by desire: in closing the gap of erroneous repetition, Abraham risks erasing the space of 'rank' rebellion that Hamlet is able to assert. Rather than treating the unconscious as 'irrevocably "alien" and antipathetic to conscious thought' – as Christopher Lane surmises Freud's conception – Abraham appears to argue that it can, in fact, be reconciled with consciousness: speaking the secret gets rid of the spectre that bears it.¹⁶ 'Reducing the "phantom"', he suggests, entails 'reducing the sin attached to someone else's secret and stating it in acceptable terms so as to defy, circumvent, or domesticate the phantom's (and our) resistances, its (and our) refusals'.¹⁷ But the problem with Abraham's expiation, his effort at offering a catastrophe in which closure is substituted for lack, is that in disabling that excessive inheritance – the inheritance of the law's own excess – he inhibits Hamlet's potentially transgressive inhibition. As Joan Copjec argues in the context of a commentary on Sophocles' *Antigone*,

that which the individual inherits from her species, her family, her race cannot be located merely in a stateable law or dictate, but includes also [...] that excess in the law which cannot be articulated within it. Because the law contains this mad excess where it loses its head [...] the subject can carry out the law or carry on the family name without simply repeating in the present what has already been foreseen and dictated in the past.¹⁸

If Shakespeare's *Hamlet* inherits his phantasmal father's word – a headless inheritance, as it were – then his lack of a catastrophe in fact opens up the possibility of rank (as in rebellious) repetition, a repetition that exceeds what it reiterates. Whilst Abraham seeks to deliver a final 'good,' doing damage, it would seem, to his theory of the persistence of gaps in the form of the family secret, the Lacanian analysis reminds us that this 'good' 'cannot reign over all without an excess emerging', an excess whose 'fatal consequences' are revealed to us 'in tragedy'.¹⁹ Hamlet's death, in this sense, does not yet finish off his dearth.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁶ Christopher Lane, 'The Testament of the Other: Abraham and Torok's Failed Expiation of Ghosts', *Diacritics*, 4 (1997), pp. 3-29, p. 9

¹⁷ Nicholas Abraham, 'The Phantom of Hamlet, or the Sixth Act: Preceded by the Intermission of "Truth"', p. 4.

¹⁸ Joan Copjec, *Imagine There's No Woman: Ethics and Sublimation*, p. 45.

¹⁹ Jacques Lacan, 'The Essence of Tragedy: A Commentary on Sophocles's *Antigone*' in Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959-60*, p. 259.

Indeed, as Abraham himself observes, *Hamlet* has bequeathed us a whole host of literary-critical efforts to grapple with its ghost: for T. S. Eliot, for example, what *Hamlet* lacks is the 'objective correlative', the exact matching of the emotion to its object; Hamlet's mental state is for him not explicable in terms of his specific situation. As Jacqueline Rose notes, this 'is where [for Eliot] *Hamlet* fails: Hamlet the man is dominated by an emotion which is inexpressible, because it is in *excess of the facts*'.²⁰ Its catastrophe is inadequate because what it adds is a superfluity, a little dollop of nothing. Eliot's complaint is thus an exemplary enunciation of what Abraham identifies in the history of literary-critical engagements with the play: the former's analysis hinges on a rationalization of the play's excesses; such a focus serves only to further the excessive presence of the gap of action with which we began. But whilst Abraham appears to wish to resolve this, texts can be identified that take great pleasure in playing with the play's failure to end.

In Vladimir Nabokov's *Ada, or Ador*, for example, it is exactly as an aberrant repetition that *Hamlet* rears its head: in a text overtly interested in the deviations of family relations either adulterous or incestuous, it is the hamlet of Gamlet that is continually passed through, in a passing reference, perhaps, to *Hamlet* itself. Van, whose literary pseudonym – 'Voltemand' – recalls the courtier in Shakespeare's play, first 'bounce[s] on the cobblestones of Gamlet' on his way to Ardis Park; later, with his younger cousin's posterior perched pertly on his knee, he is driven through 'Gamlet, a hamlet', in a 'mournful dullness of unconsummated desires'.²¹ The place of 'Gamlet' – a name simultaneously resonant of both a lame or 'gammy' limb and of an attitude of resolution, in the sense that one is 'game' for adventure – is thus located at the outskirts of Ardis, the family pile of the Veens. Ardis, of course, is also the primary scene of Van and Ada's 'secret', their catastrophic – to the degree that a catastrophe can be associated with consummation, that part of the 'play' that brings its action to a conclusion – union. Gamlet's apparition as a kind of adulterated signpost to another scene of literary incest is thus akin to the action wrought by what Abraham and Torok call 'phantom words': these, in their description, are bearers of an inherited secret that 'can be invested with libido' and which 'determine the choice of hobbies, leisure activities, or professional pursuits'.²² Like the word of the father aforementioned, these phantom interpolations thus carry catastrophe with them. But as Abraham and Torok also state,

the words used by the phantom to carry out its return
(and which the child sensed in the parent) do not refer
to a source of speech in the parent. Instead they point to
a gap, they refer to the unspeakable.²³

Though Ardis is described as 'swarm[ing] with ghosts', the haunting of Shakespeare's play goes unspoken. Instead of its proper name, an impropriety is articulated: it is in the guise of Gamlet that *Hamlet* appears. Like 'insect' to 'incest' in the anagram game played at the picnic scene, *Hamlet* here playfully mutates. The 'part' ascribed it by Nabokov is simultaneously lame and game: ambivalently 'scient' concerning the status of their relations, Van and Ada tease pleasure from their inheritance. Their memory of *Hamlet* – which, we are told, Ada has read at a particularly early age – is, indeed, received in the narrative aberrantly: it is its excess, detached from the text's 'body', that is played with; here once again is an example of a headless inheritance.

But where then does this place 'catastrophe'? Is it in action, inaction, or altogether out of it? Does it 'inhere', or is it better expressed as in hiding? If

²⁰ Jacqueline Rose, *Sexuality in the Field of Vision* (London and New York: Verso, 2005), p. 125

²¹ Vladimir Nabokov, *Ada or Ador* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 34; p. 72. See also p. 124 and p. 223.

²² Nicholas Abraham and Maria Torok, *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*, ed. and trans. by Nicholas Rand (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 175.

²³ Nicholas Abraham and Maria Torok, *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*, p. 174.

'Gamlet' and its 'polysemic' parts can be called a 'catastrophic wor[d]' in the aspect invoked by Abraham and Torok in their discussion of Freud's famous case of the Wolf Man – wherein word-objects as opposed to their referent are, as the locus of a taboo desire, themselves the subject of repression – then what does this do the location of the catastrophe? Abraham and Torok's entirely textual re-enactment of Freud's famous case revolves primarily around the concept of the cryptonym, a hidden word which, by means of its exclusion from consciousness, has taken with it the 'very possibility' of recalling the trauma.²⁴ The 'catastrophic situation' created by that cryptonym is in this sense irrecoverable: the action the hidden word engendered is, like Hamlet's, lacking. But it is also, however, locked: for what the cryptonym also carries, of course, is the idea of the crypt. As Jacques Derrida observes in 'Fors: The English Words of Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok' – his preface to *The Wolf Man's Magic Word: A Cryptonymy* – this crypt is linked with incorporation, to the eating of a promise-crammed absence. Incorporation here involves the sealing in of an object that has been lost; linked, therefore, to the refusal to mourn, it entails the creation of a crypt in which it is the lack of the object that is kept and preserved. Indeed, for Derrida, this crypt is 'itself the catastrophe, or rather its monument. In trying to destroy it – this is what is so catastrophic – he can only consolidate it'.²⁵ Catastrophe in this sense, then, admits of no location at all: it is, on the contrary, a signpost to nothing; a signifier – like the *Gamlet* roadsign – that slips, rather than showing us the way to a referent. As Hamlet's exchange with the gravedigger in the first scene of Act Five illustrates, catastrophe is that which ungrounds the action: when the Prince enquires as to the grounds of his own supposed insanity, the reply he receives states 'Denmark'. 'That part of the tragedy which brings the action to its conclusion' is that part of the tragedy that is itself inarticulated in the action; but it is as such, exactly catastrophe – Hamlet's in particular – that insists upon the impossibility of a final signified.

Hamlet's name, he claims in the play's final scene of slaughter, is 'wounded': 'Things standing thus unknown, shall I leave behind me!' (V. 2. 348-39). It is his signifier, his designation, that is injured; it is, moreover, this insertion of nothing (the introduction of a cut) into the word itself that the Prince seems to see himself as bequeathing. If the family catastrophe 'carries' – if the family catastrophe inheres in its posteriors – there is, nevertheless, the possibility of freedom: it is precisely the irresolvable, ineffaceable stain of catastrophe as a phantom that permits, as has been argued, a rupture in the structure of resolution. As Copjec argues with regard to *Antigone* – whose narrative belongs, as Lacan puts it, to 'the catastrophic series of dramas' that begins with Oedipus' 'malediction' addressed to his sons – the character of Antigone is 'fated by her family [...] in this paradoxical sense: she is *destined to overturn her fate through her act*'.²⁶ Or, as Stephen Dedalus might put it: Will's name may be wounded, but his will exceeds his injury. To borrow a word from *Ulysses*, that 'part' of a tragedy that 'brings the action to its conclusion' is a part played by 'Nobodaddy', an ineffaceable inheritance that is nevertheless the space of change. Whilst we should be cautious, of course, before allying Hamlet's fate with Antigone's, it is still perhaps possible to modify an opening assertion and state that he is not simply the possessor of a *Fixierarbeit*, but rather a *Haftbarkeit*, a term overlaid in German with resonances of responsibility. Observing his father's phantom during his visit to the Queen, Hamlet asks, 'Do you see nothing there?' to which the Queen replies: 'Nothing at all. Yet all that is I see' (III. 4. 133-4). What the Queen cannot see is the nothing that is surplus to the 'all that is' she envisions: as we have seen, it is the phantom father's word that Hamlet inherits; this 'surplus' is thus in Copjec's words '*produced by language*'. Rather than referring to a 'true beyond', it is on the contrary 'an opening, a tension, or possible line of flight'.²⁷ Hamlet, as has been argued, does not contain its catastrophe.

²⁴ Nicholas Abraham and Maria Torok, *The Wolf Man's Magic Word: A Cryptonymy*, trans. by Nicholas Rand (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), p. 21.

²⁵ Jacques Derrida, 'Fors: The English Words of Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok,' p. xxii.

²⁶ Joan Copjec, *Imagine There's No Woman: Ethics and Sublimation*, p. 45.

²⁷ Joan Copjec, *Imagine There's No Woman: Ethics and Sublimation*, p. 97.

Works Cited:

- Abraham, Nicolas. 'The Phantom of Hamlet or the Sixth Act: Preceded by the Intermission of "Truth"', *Diacritics*, 18 (1988), pp. 2-19
- Abraham, Nicolas and Maria Torok. 'A Poetics of Psychoanalysis: "The Lost Object: Me"', tr. by Nicholas Rand, *Substance*, 13 (1984), pp. 3-18
- . *The Wolf Man's Magic Word: A Cryptonymy*, tr. by Nicholas Rand, foreword by Jacques Derrida (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986)
- . *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*, trans. and ed. by Nicholas T. Rand (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994)
- Aeschylus. *Oresteia*, tr. by Christopher Collard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Aristotle. *Poetics*, tr. by M. E. Hubbard, in *Classical Literary Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989)
- Copjec, Joan. 'The Tomb of Perseverance: On *Antigone*' in Copjec, *Imagine There's No Woman: Ethics and Sublimation* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2002)
- Ellman, Richard. *The Consciousness of James Joyce* (London: Faber and Faber, 1977)
- Freud, Sigmund. 'History of an Infantile Neurosis [The Wolf-Man]', in *The Penguin Freud Reader*, ed. by Adam Phillips (London: Penguin, 2006), pp. 196 – 309
- . *The Interpretation of Dreams*, trans. by Joyce Crick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- . 'Mourning and Melancholia', in *The Penguin Freud Reader*, ed. by Adam Phillips (London: Penguin, 2006), pp. 310 – 326
- Gardiner, Muriel. *The Wolf-Man and Sigmund Freud* (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1972)
- Gray, Joseph William. *Shakespeare's Marriage: His Departure from Stratford and Other Incidents in his Life* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1905)
- Jenkins, Harold. 'The Catastrophe in Shakespearian Tragedy' *Inaugural Lecture delivered on 3. XI. 1967* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1969)
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses* (London: Penguin, 2000)
- Jones, Ernest. *Hamlet and Oedipus* (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1976)
- Lacan, Jacques, 'The Essence of Tragedy: A Commentary on Sophocles's *Antigone*' in *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959-60*, ed. by Jacques-Alain Miller, tr. by Dennis Potter (New York and London: Norton, 1997)
- . *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis* (London and New York: Karnac, 2004)
- Mitchell, Juliet, *Siblings: Sex and Violence* (Oxford: Polity Press, 2003)
- Schützenberger, Anne Ancelin, *The Ancestor Syndrome: Transgenerational Psychotherapy and the Hidden Links in the Family Tree* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998)
- Shakespeare, William, *Four Tragedies: Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth* (London: Penguin, 1994)
- Sophocles, *The Theban Plays: King Oedipus, Oedipus at Colonus, Antigone*, trans. by E. F. Watling (Bungay, Suffolk: Penguin, 1979)