



Richard Rowan's Search for Other Jouissance in James Joyce's *Exiles*

Saman Zoleikhaei¹

M.A. in English Language and Literature, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

Article ID: CLS-2002-1038

Received: January 8, 2020

Reviewed: February 25, 2020

Accepted: March 10, 2020

Abstract

This paper traces Jacques Lacan's theory of jouissance in James Joyce's *Exiles*. According to Lacan, there are two kinds of jouissance, namely phallic and Other. The former is achievable through desire for different things in the Symbolic order while the latter is beyond the given order and can be attained through particular activities in *sinthome*. All major characters of the play are involved with jouissance in one way or another. Richard Rowan as the major character in the play has got along with phallic jouissance and he is trying to move toward the Other jouissance *via* denial of the Symbolic order and dedication of his time to writing. After living in exile for years and experiencing the pleasures of the phallic jouissance, he is back to find a solution to his problem with the Symbolic order. The jouissance beyond the phallic one for Richard lies in writing which turns out to be his *sinthome*. An untextualized writing is considered to be Richard's *sinthome* that opens up the path toward Other jouissance for him.

Keywords

Desire; Other Jouissance; Phallic Jouissance; *Sinthome*; Writing; *Exiles*

1. Introduction: A Neglected Play by a Well-Known Author

Being titled of one of the most influential writers of all time, James Joyce (1882-1941) was an Irish novelist, poet and playwright who drew from his tumultuous life and

¹ zoleikhaeisaman@gmail.com



moved to extremes in concretizing it through linguistic and thematic complexity in *Chamber Music*, *Dubliners*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, *Exiles*, *Ulysses*, *Poems Penyeach*, *Collected Poems*, and *Finnegans Wake*.

Exiles (1952) is the dramatic representation of Richard Rowan's homecoming from Italy to Ireland. Hugh Kenner states that "Richard rapt himself and Bertha out of a community of paralytics, only to immerse himself and Bertha in a paralysis more naked" (398). The given community is "corrupted by imposture" (DeLanghe 83). In the words of Elizabeth Speight Jenkins, Joyce wrote *Exiles* "to see what life would have been like had the Joyces returned to Ireland" ("'Faithful Departed' ..." 67).

Voelker contends that *Exiles* is "an imaginative space in which issues of marriage and career, exile and return, friendship and betrayal, certitude and doubt" ("The Beastly Incertitudes ..." 500) are dealt with. The mentioned terms form the thematic make-up of Joyce's writings in whole and the play in particular. The play deals with sexual relationship, adultery and love within the boundaries of exile. All the characters in *Exiles* are exiled in one way or another. Being "a microcosm of the Joycean quest for freedom" (Clark 69), *Exiles* casts light on the intellectual and emotional struggles of a series of exiled characters.

In a reading that draws from recent trends in criticism, Ellie Ragland-Sullivan argues that the "questions constituting the play are: what is freedom? truth? trust? adultery? sexual attraction? love? suffering?" ("Lacan's Seminars ..." 49). There are some similarities with Joseph Voelker's analysis; however, Ragland-Sullivan adopts a more technical approach based on *sinthome*, psychosis and jouissance among others. Kristin N Sanner's article entitled "Exchanging Letters and Silence" is very illuminating. It provides a Lacanian reading of the play based on Lacan's "The Purloined Letter." Sanner argues that the letters exchanged in the play refer to phallus as such. Being given freely, the letters define relations of power and desire.

This play which was written in 1914 and published in 1918 is called "a side-step, necessary catharsis, clearance of mind" in the words of Ezra Pound (Read 139) for Joyce. In the same line of thought, Seidel compared *Exiles* with *Ulysses*, "The similarity to the plot of *Ulysses*, on which Joyce was working hard when he paused to write *Exiles*, surely cannot escape an alert reader. In a sense, *Exiles* is *Ulysses* under psychoanalysis" ("*Exiles*" 74). This play enabled Joyce to practice the



characterization of Molly Bloom and shed light on the hidden aspects of adultery on love relationships. Richard Rowan being involved, Theo Q Dombrowski analyzes the play differently, “the central conflict of the play is less between characters than between Richard’s conception of what love should be and his own emotional nature” (“*Exiles*’: The Problem of Love” 118). This makes the play more complicated since only one character is investigated.

However it should be noted that Joyce’s attempt at dramaturgy is not taken seriously because readers and critics expect linguistic intricacy from Joyce. According to Ruth Bauerle, “We have neglected *Exiles*” because we as readers expect something else from Joyce and, as a result, there is a misunderstanding of “what Joyce was doing in the play” (“Dancing a Pas de Deux” 150). He re-reads *Exiles* by drawing from different structures and relationships that govern the play and relates it to other works by Joyce. Carole Brown and Leo Knuth defend the play and elevate its status to that of *Ulysses*. They point out that “*Exiles* challenges the whole moral tradition of fidelity through Richard’s insistence upon freedom of will” (“James Joyce’s *Exiles* ...” 15) and take Richard to be the prophet of freedom.

A rendering of “private experience” (Valente 132), *Exiles* is autobiographical like Joyce’s other works. The dramatic personae of the play, Richard, Robert, Bertha and Beatrice have real counterparts in Joyce’s own life. Richard Rowan is Joyce’s alter ego and he is involved with Robert Hand, a manifestation of Thomas Kettle. As a friend of Joyce, Kettle deals with nationalistic issues of Ireland. Nora appears as Bertha in the play and accompanies Richard in exile. Being taken from Amalia Popper, a student of Joyce, Beatrice plays the role of Richard’s intellectual and inspirational partner. Tanmay Chatterjee argues that “what is more important is that Joyce is externalizing in Richard his own psychological hang-ups” (“Desires and *Exiles*” 2). The existence of such structural affinities makes the play a fertile ground for psychoanalytic readings. Regarding the time during which the play was written, Zack Bowen remarks that Joyce “lived constantly with the torment of his perceived and real personal failures as a human being, common-law husband, lover, and guild-ridden ex-Catholic; and he drained his festering psychic wounds into the characters and structure of his play” (“*Exiles*: Confessional Mode” 581). In what follows, *sinthome* and *jouissance* as two key concepts of Jacques Lacan will be explicated to analyze



Richard Rowan's worldview and behaviors. In section three, the play will be read closely according to the drawn Lacanian framework to unearth the hidden aspects of Richard Rowan's life.

2. 2. Jacques Lacan and Jouissance: Theoretical Framework

Jouissance is a French word that refers to enjoyment with sexual and sensual connotations. Enjoyment has been utilized occasionally as an equivalent for jouissance in Anglophone academia. However, enjoyment contains deriving pleasure and exerting property rights and it does not signify the sexual designations of jouissance; that is why the French word remains untranslatable and preferable in English. Jouissance found its way into the seminars of Jacques Lacan in 1953-4 and 1954-5. In "Exploration of Jouissance", Dylan Evans remarks that "Lacan seems to have imported the term into psychoanalysis from a certain tradition in philosophy, namely the Hegelian tradition as it was developed by Alexander Kojève" ("From Kantian Ethics to ..." 3). Lacan devoted *Seminar VII, The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*, to explore jouissance in more detail. Lacan touched upon the term for highlighting the enjoyment produced out of the work of the slave for the master. The backbone of jouissance is the Hegelian master-slave dialectic. The slave is going to bring about a situation for the jouissance of the master. The sexual tinge was added to jouissance by Lacan.

In order to formulate jouissance, Lacan made use of pleasure principle. Jouissance, according to Lacan, contains a certain amount of pleasure which is mixed with pain. In other words, the antithesis between sexual drive and death drive which was forwarded by Freud came to resolution in Lacan. Lorenzo Chiesa states "the Lacanian name for this 'pleasure in pain,' this 'outer extremity of pleasure [which] is unbearable to us,' is nothing other than jouissance" (*Subjectivity and Otherness* 174). The pleasure and enjoyment derived from pleasure principle lies within a certain limitation. However, if the limitation is transcended, pain and suffering will come into being as a consequence. The subject encounters a variety of problems to have access to the jouissance beyond the pleasure principle. The given prohibitions are imposed in the Symbolic order through language. Therefore, the subject needs to move beyond language.



Everything in the Symbolic order, including *jouissance*, is regulated. In his *Ethics*, Lacan related *jouissance* to law. Pleasure principle is essential to the realm of signification and limits *jouissance* for the subject. In *Écrits*, Lacan remarks that “*jouissance* is prohibited [*interdite*] to whoever speaks” (696). Therefore, speaking imposes law and it limits *jouissance*. Law of desire is the law of signifier which makes *jouissance* limited. Concerning the opposition between desire and *jouissance*, Nestor A. Braustein contends that “If desire is fundamentally lack, lack in being, *jouissance* is positivity, it is a ‘something’ lived by a body when pleasure stops being pleasure. It is a plus, a sensation that is beyond pleasure” (“Desire and *jouissance* ...” 104). Moreover, Braustein notes:

Desire points towards a lost and absent object; it is lack in being, and the craving for fulfillment in the encounter with the lost object. Its concrete expression is the phantasy. *Jouissance*, on the other hand, does not point to anything, nor does it serve any purpose whatsoever; it is an unpredictable experience, beyond the pleasure principle, different from any (mythical) encounter. The subject finds himself split by the polarity *jouissance*/desire. This is why desire, phantasy, and pleasure are barriers on the way to *jouissance*. (106-7)

There are two kinds of *jouissance*, namely phallic and Other. Phallic *jouissance* revolves around the pleasure of organ and $J\phi$ is used to represent it. It should be mentioned that phallic *jouissance* is sexual. This *jouissance* is not limited to either sexes and both of them can experience it. $J\Lambda$ stands for Other *jouissance* which lies beyond the phallic *jouissance*. Mystic and feminine are other terms which are utilized to describe this *jouissance*. Unlike phallic *jouissance*, Other *jouissance* is asexual.

The subject bound by the rules of the Symbolic order touches upon the phallic *jouissance* that comes to be represented in and quenched by body parts. Lacan in his *Encore* comments that “Phallic *jouissance* is the obstacle owing to which man does not come (*n’arrive pas*), I would say, to enjoy woman’s body, precisely because what he enjoys is the *jouissance* of the organ” (7). The limitation of phallic *jouissance* which was mentioned earlier means that there is an end to it. In addition, there are sufficient choices to satisfy it temporarily. Lacan remarks “*Jouissance*, qua sexual, is phallic” (9). The *jouissance* beyond speech, law, and phallus is Other *jouissance*. “Other-*jouissance* seems to indicate the pure *jouissance* of the Real beyond any symbolic contamination” (Chiesa 186). It is located beyond the Symbolic order and



body parts while Other jouissance is closely attached to the ability to adopt a distinct worldview, to act differently and to suffer among others. Chiesa remarks “JA (Other – feminine – *jouissance*) lies outside the ring of the symbolic, but it is *not* outside all the rings” (186). The Other jouissance is achievable beyond the Symbolic order and it transcends pleasures of body parts. Lacan believes,

There is a jouissance that is hers (a elle), that belongs to that ‘she’ (elle) that doesn’t exist and doesn’t signify anything. There is a jouissance that is hers about which she herself perhaps knows nothing if not that she experiences it – that much she knows. She knows it, of course, when it comes (arrive). It doesn’t happen (arrive) to all of them. (*Encore 74*)

The Other jouissance is extra and beyond the phallic jouissance. Human being acquires sense and identity through phallic jouissance, but it is through Other jouissance that one can achieve the beyond and create a particular discursive world. It is additional and supplementary. Following Lacan, Bruce Fink in his groundbreaking book titled *Lacanian Subject* states,

The Other jouissance involves a form of sublimation through love that provides full satisfaction of the drives. The Other jouissance is a jouissance of love, and Lacan relates it to religious ecstasy and to a kind of bodily, corporal jouissance that is not localized in the genitals the way phallic jouissance is...According to Lacan, the Other jouissance is asexual (whereas phallic jouissance is sexual), and yet it is of and in the body. (120)

There is a relationship between *sinthome* and jouissance. Being introduced in 1975, *sinthome* is the archaic spelling of symptom which refers to the fourth knot in the topology of the subject. *Sinthome* is a signification process beyond the Symbolic order which, as a ring, holds the other three together. It is believed to be inscribed in the writing process. *Sinthome* establishes the coherence and cohesion of the subject and precludes psychosis. Moreover, it helps the subject to organize his/her jouissance.

According to Evans, “the pathological mark of the *sinthome* is precisely what can ‘allow the subject to live’ by providing him or her with a unique organization of his or her jouissance” (“From Kantian Ethics to ...” 13). *Sinthome* lies beyond the Symbolic order and resists analysis and signification. It can be argued that it refers to enjoyment out of the Symbolic order. According to Hoens Dominiek and Ed Pluth, “The *sinthome* is an example of just such an enjoyment-in-meaning, an enjoyment



insisting ‘within’ language” (“The *sinthome*” 10). Jouissance makes meaning *via sinthome* for the subject. They add “*sinthome* as *jouis-sens* can be seen, then, as the ultimate support of the subject, and at the same time as the source of the subject’s openness to or production of meanings” (12). The subject’s identity wholly relies on the idiosyncratic method which is adopted to attain enjoyment and, then, one’s own *sinthome*. It is through creating one’s own *sinthome* that the subject can move beyond the psychotic state and achieve Other jouissance.

Sinthome is regarded as something particular for the subject. According to Bernard Nomine, “what almost always has to be done is to tie [the three dimensions] together where a knot has trouble getting tied, to avoid an untying when the subject runs the risk of that happening, or to help retie a knot where the former knot came untied, as in triggered adult psychosis” (qtd. in *Fundamentals of Psychoanalytic Technique* 262). The subject is trying to hold together the knots in order to survive the pangs of the Symbolic order. In *Le Sinthome*, Lacan argues that “starting with three rings a chain is produced, such that a break in any one ring renders the two others free from each other” (Unpublished, 7). Lacan added an interlocking fourth ring to this triadic structure and termed it *sinthome* to prevent their falling apart. The *sinthome* helps the subject to manage the jouissance of the real order, speech and language of the Symbolic order, and body and image of the Imaginary order into a whole package which, all together, enable the subjects to lead their lives.

3. Richard in Search of Other Jouissance

Richard Rowan that serves as Joyce’s alter ego and the protagonist of the play has had an eventful life and, at the time, he is experimenting with the other characters in order to attain a lasting status. Richard did not have a good relationship with his mother; that is why, he “fought against her spirit” throughout his life. Now in Ireland, Richard is not at good terms with the spirit of his mother and remarks that it “fights against me still – in here” (Joyce 9). Apart from his mother, Richard mentions betraying his wife, Bertha, several times, “I remember the first time. I came home. It was night. My house was silent. My little son was sleeping in his cot. She, too, was asleep. I wakened her from sleep and told her” (39). Richard tends to be free in all aspects of his life and, at the same time, preaches freedom for the other characters.



When Bertha asks for his permission to meet Robert, he wants her to act freely and decide for herself:

BERTHA. Am I to go to this place?
RICHARD. Do you want to go?
BERTHA. I want to find out what he means. Am I to go?
RICHARD. Why do you ask me? Decide yourself.
BERTHA. Do you tell me to go?
RICHARD. No.
BERTHA. Do you forbid me to go?
RICHARD. No. (32)

Richard adopts the same approach toward Robert and asks him to do whatever he wants with Bertha. In order to solve the problem, Richard tells Robert: “Free yourself” (43). In another section of the play, Archie, Richard’s son, wants his father to ask his mother grant him permission to go out with the milkman in the morning, Richard does not do so and lies in the sense that he had asked for his permission:

ARCHIE. [Quickly.] Well, did you ask her?
RICHARD. [Starting.] What?
ARCHIE. Can I go?
RICHARD. Yes.
ARCHIE. In the morning? She said yes?
RICHARD. Yes. In the morning. (32)

Richard does not believe in limitations and restrictions. On the contrary, his freedom of mind has given him many chances to experience available pleasures in the Symbolic order. As a result, the tendency to have phallic jouissance in a variety of ways can be considered as the prerequisite for the Other jouissance. The clue that tells us about Richard’s immersion in phallic jouissance is the ‘hearth’ he shared with Robert. It is a place that acted as a substitute where they used to have “wild nights” in their youth,

RICHARD. It was not only a house of revelry; it was to be the hearth of a new life. [Musing.] And in that name all our sins were committed.
ROBERT. Sins! Drinking and blasphemy [he points] by me. And drinking and heresy, much worse [he points again] by you – are those the sins you mean?
RICHARD. And some others. (21)

Richard does not consider those actions as sins and refers to ‘some others’ since they fail to satisfy his desires in that realm. Therefore, he tends toward intellectualism



and favors the relationship with Beatrice. She offers Richard an ideal love different from the one which is sought by Robert and Bertha. It is through the spirit of Beatrice that Richard is able to think of Other *jouissance*. In the opening scene of the play, Richard tells Beatrice about his painting and writing which are about Beatrice. Both activities prioritize the glorification of soul and have little to do with bodily pleasures. Richard says:

RICHARD. If I were a painter and told you I had a book of sketches of you, you would not think it so strange, would you? (5)

Or,

RICHARD. Hard to know me? I sent you from Rome the chapters of my book as I wrote them; and letters for nine long years. Well, eight years. (6)

Even Bertha accuses her husband of arranging a meeting with Beatrice when he lets her to meet Robert,

BERTHA. [Alarmed, rises.] Are you going?

RICHARD. Naturally. My part is ended here.

BERTHA. To her, I suppose?

RICHARD. [Astonished.] Who?

BERTHA. Her ladyship. I suppose it is all planned so that you may have a good opportunity to meet her and have an intellectual conversation! (45)

Richard feels dissatisfied with the rules and orders of the world in which the other characters live. There are traces of change in his attitude and behavior. As a case in point, unlike the other characters, he rejects possession in life and, by extension, in love. He tells Robert that “longing to possess a woman is not love” (37) and elevate it to a higher status as he says that love is to “wish her well” (37). Richard moves further and highlight the opposite of possession with regard to love, *i.e.* giving. He wants his son to think in a similar way and tells him,

RICHARD. But when you give it, you have given it. No robber can take it from you. [He bends his head and presses his son’s hand against his cheek.] It is yours for ever when you have given it. It will be yours always. That is to give. (25)

So far it has been shown that Richard had many problems with his own family and hometown and spent years in exile. He behaves differently with his wife and child. He adopts distinct attitudes toward certain norms and traditions. Even the other characters view him differently. Robert titles him “scholar” and “literary personality”



and the best person for the chair of literature at university. By the same token, Robert regards Bertha as the “work” of Richard as if he is a creator. Richard’s creativity is the most important aspect of the play since it is represented in his ‘writing’ and the ‘study’ about which both the characters and the readers know nothing.

Richard is in his ‘study’ most of the time and seems to be wearying himself with writing. This place is the surrogate or a threshold that paves the ground for defining his *sinthome* and attaining Other jouissance. Bertha believes that her “husband is writing very much” (61) and “passes the greater part of the night in there writing” (61). Richard prefers living in his constructed world because it brings him what he wants. Lacan’s quotation holds true about Richard’s ‘study’: “the subject constructs himself a world and, above all, that he situates himself within it” (*The Psychoses* 83). Richard is writing in order to create a *sinthome* for himself and, as a consequence, he would be able to tolerate the pains of his ‘wound’. According to Lacan, “writing is thus an act [un faire] which provides a support for thinking” (*Le Sinthome* 103). Given the fact that Richard Rowan is Joyce’s alter ego in the play, Ellie Ragland-Sullivan’s remark “Joyce is WRITING” (“Lacan’s Seminars ...” 76) applies to Richard Rowan and, according to Jean-Michel Rabaté, it sets the scene for “the fundamental constitution of the subject” (“Aspace of Dumbillsilly” 39).

Richard’s *sinthome* in the play is writing and gives him a sense of unity and consistency. However it is not understandable for the other characters and the reader. No clues are given about his writing in the text. Bertha admits that as follows:

BERTHA. Happy! When I do not understand anything that he writes, when I cannot help him in any way, when I don’t even understand half of what he says to me sometimes! (Exiles 62)

In another scene, Richard tells Bertha that none of them can understand his writing: “Neither her nor you – nor she either! Not one of you” (31). In the words of Žižek, “Symptoms are meaningless traces, their meaning is not discovered, excavated from the hidden depth of the past, but constructed retroactively” (*The Sublime Object of Ideology* 58). Richard and his writings are not ‘discovered’ by the other characters. He can be viewed as successful in developing his own *sinthome*. Accordingly, writing as *sinthome* enables Richard to experience Other jouissance.



The other point that sheds light on Richard's access to Other jouissance is his 'wound of doubt'. All his being can be summarized in this wound of doubt. It gives an ontological stability to his life. The externalization of this wound is Richard's writing and study the content and essence of both of which permit Richard to move toward Other jouissance. Žižek contends "in so far as it sticks out from the [symbolic and symbolized] reality of the body, the wound is 'a little piece of real', a disgusting protuberance which cannot be integrated into the totality of 'our own body'" (78). Richard achieves the real and, by extension, Other jouissance through his wound of doubt.

RICHARD. [Still gazing at her and speaking as if to an absent person.] I have wounded my soul for you – a deep wound of doubt which can never be healed. I can never know, never in this world. I do not wish to know or to believe. I do not care. It is not in the darkness of belief that I desire you. But in restless living wounding doubt. To hold you by no bonds, eve of love, to be united with you in body and soul in utter nakedness – for this I longed. And now I am tired for a while, Bertha. My wound tires me. (Exiles 73)

Richard mentions 'no bonds' and highlights his freedom from the bounds of the Symbolic order. The wound that Richard suffers from bears traces of masochism. Lacan contends "jouissance which is real comprises masochism. Masochism is the major form of enjoyment given by the real" (*Le Sinthome*, 63). Richard's jouissance is related to masochism as well. Although he has been betrayed by his wife and his friend, he enjoys listening to details of the encounter between them:

RICHARD. Yes. I saw it. What else went on?

BERTHA. He asked me to give him my hand?

RICHARD. [Smiling.] In marriage?

BERTHA. [Smiling.] No, only to hold.

RICHARD. Did you?

BERTHA. Yes. [Tearing off a few petals.] Then he caressed my hand and asked would I let him kiss it. I let him.

RICHARD. Well?

BERTHA. Then he asked could he embrace me – even once? ... and then...

RICHARD. And then? (Exiles 26)

They could stop their give and take since it is clear what has happened between them. But Richard goes on questioning her in order to provide himself with a masochistic suffering. In a similar vein, he enjoys the hardness of his mother's heart.



Talking with Beatrice, Richard says, “I am suffering at this moment! For your case, too. But suffering most of all for my own. [*With bitter force.*] And how I pray that I may be granted again my dead mother’s hardness of heart! For some help, within me or without, I must find” (8). Richard succeeds in finding what he wants.

The pleasures of the body or, more specifically body parts, are considered to be phallic. However, Richard is not interested in the body of Bertha any longer and goes for unification in body and soul together. The ‘utter nakedness’ is beyond body and guides Richard toward Other jouissance which is asexual. Richard leaves Bertha’s request to love her unanswered at the end of the play. Bertha says, “Forget me, Dick. Forget me and love me again as you did the first time. I want my lover. To meet him, to go to him, to give myself to him. You Dick. O, my strange wild lover, come back to me again” (73). Bertha uses ‘Dick’ several times to call Richard throughout the play. This term highlights the bodily aspects of Richard’s character. The play has an open ending which shows Richard’s reluctance to experience phallic jouissance. In other words, Richard rejects the ‘Dick’ side of his character.

To have Richard Rowan at the background, Ragland-Sullivan writes that “*jouissance* is the very principle of symptom formation that appears as the ‘drive not to know’” (84). Richard does not want to know since he has in mind grasping the jouissance out there in doubt. He repeatedly warns and tells Bertha of not being able to know in this world:

RICHARD. That I will never know.

BERTHA. I will tell you if you ask me.

RICHARD. You will tell me. But I will never know. Never in this world.

BERTHA. [*Moving towards him.*] I will tell you the truth, Dick, as I always told you. I never lied to you.

RICHARD. [*Clenching his hands in the air, passionately.*] Yes, yes. The truth! But I will never know, I tell you. (Exiles 65-66)

4. Conclusion

Nestor A. Braustein’s remarks are applied to Richard’s life and actions one by one. He states that “Jouissance appears in guilt, in remorse, in confession, in contrition, more in paying than in being paid, in destroying more than in conserving” (“Desire and jouissance ...” 108). Richard, the major character in Joyce’s *Exiles*, is regarded to be guilty of destroying Bertha’s life and deceiving her nine years ago. Richard feels



remorseful after betraying Bertha and decides to disclose the truth to her. Bertha, his wife, thinks that Richard has given much to other including Beatrice and, in return, he has not received something more or equal. Richard does not conceal his love to Beatrice and his homosexual tendency toward Robert. Furthermore, Richard himself maintains that he has deprived Bertha of life and many ideals. All these are sources of jouissance for Richard in the play, the origin of which relates to the 'wound of doubt' at the core of his life. The direct outcome of such conflicts and the wound is writing that turns out to be his *sinthome* through which Richard embarks his journey to experience Other jouissance. Taking art and writing as the appropriate paths of moving toward *sinthome*, everybody is able to experience jouissance in life despite difficulties. In *Exiles*, it is Richard Rowan only that finds the path correctly. The other characters are still deluded by the worldly affairs of the Symbolic order. It is by reading between the lines and seeing what lies behind Joyce's words that jouissance of reading and understanding Richard's retroactive writing become possible.





References

- Bauerle, Ruth. "Dancing a Pas de Deux in *Exiles's* Ménage a Quatre; or, How Many Triangles Can You Make Out of Four Characters If You Take Them Two at a Time?" *Joyce in Hibernian Metropolis*. Eds. Morris Beja and David Norris. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1996, pp. 150-163.
- Braustein, Nestor A. "Desire and jouissance in the teachings of Lacan." *The Cambridge Companion to Lacan*. Ed. Jean Michel Rabaté. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Bowen, Zack. "Exiles: Confessional Mode." *James Joyce Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1992, pp. 581-586.
- Brown, Carole and Leo Knuth. "James Joyce's *Exiles*: The Ordeal of Richard Rowan." *James Joyce Quarterly* Vol. 17 No. 1 (1979): 7-20.
- Chatterjee, Tanmay. "Desires and Exiles in James Joyce's *Exiles*" . *The Criterion: An International Journal in English* Vol. 4, No. 2, 2013, pp. 1-5.
- Chiesa, Lorenzo. *Subjectivity and Otherness: A Philosophical Reading of Lacan*. Cambridge, Ma: The MIT Press, 2007.
- Clark, Earl John. "James Joyce's *Exiles*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1968, pp. 69-78.
- DeLanghe, Jaime. *Joyce the Playwright*. MA Thesis. Wesleyan University, 2008.
- Dombrowski, Theo Q. "'Exiles': The Problem of Love." *James Joyce Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1978, pp. 118-127.
- Evans, Dylan. "From Kantian Ethics to Mystical Experience: An Exploration of Jouissance." *Key Concepts of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Dany Nobus. New York: Other Press. 1999, pp. 1-29.
- Fink, Bruce. *Fundamentals of Psychoanalytic Technique: A Lacanian Approach for Practitioners*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007.
- . *The Lacanian Subject: Between Language and Jouissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.



- Hoens, Dominiek and Ed Pluth. "The *sinthome*: A New Way of Writing an Old Problem?" *Re-inventing the Symptom: Essays on the Final Lacan*. Ed. Luke Thurston. New York: Other Press, 2002. 1-18.
- Jenkins, Elizabeth Speight. *Faithful Departed': Tracing the Themes of Exile and Betrayal through James Joyce's Dubliners, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, and Exiles*. MA Thesis. North Carolina State University. 2008.
- Joyce, James. *Exiles*. Mineola: Dover Publications Inc., 2002.
- Kenner, Hugh. "Joyce's "Exiles"." *Hudson Review* Vol. 5, No. 3, 1952, pp. 389-403.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. Trans. Bruce Fink. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981.
- . *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book III: The Psychoses 1955-1956*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Russell Grigg. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993.
- . *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis 1959-1960*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Dennis Porter. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1992.
- . *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: W. W. Norton & Company, 1998.
- . *Jacques Lacan's Seminar XXIII: Le Sinthome 1975-1976*. Trans. Luke Thurston. Unpublished Translation.
- Read, Forrest. Ed. *The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essay on Joyce*. New York: New Direction Book, 1967.
- Rabaté, Jean-Michel. "Aspace of Dumbillsilly: When Joyce Translates Lacan." *Critical Quarterly*, Vol. 48, No. 1, 2006, pp. 26-42.
- Ragland-Sullivan, Ellie. "Lacan's Seminars on James Joyce: Writing as Symptom and "Singular Solution"." *Psychoanalysis and...* Eds. Richard Feldstein and Henry Sussman. New York: Routledge, 1990, pp. 67-89.
- . "Psychosis Adumbrated: Lacan and Sublimation of the Sexual Divide in Joyce's *Exiles*," *James Joyce Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1, 1991, pp. 47-62.
- Sanner, Kristin N. "Exchanging Letters and Silence: Moments of Empowerment in *Exiles*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 2002, pp. 275-287.



Seidel, Michael. "Exiles". *James Joyce: A Short Introduction*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2002, pp. 72-80.

Valente, Joseph. "Between/beyond men: male feminism and homosociality in "Exiles"." Valente, Joseph. *James Joyce and the Problem of Justice: Negotiating Sexual and Colonial Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 132-187.

Voelker, Joseph. "The Beastly Incertitudes: Doubt, Difficulty, and Discomfiture in James Joyce's *Exiles*." *Journal of Modern Literature* Vol. 14 No. 4, 1988, pp. 499-516.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso, 2008.

Suggested Citation

Zoleikhaei, Saman. "Richard Rowan's Search for Other Jouissance in James Joyce's *Exiles*." *Critical Literary Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2020, pp. 115-130.

