

Translated by Philip Dravers

Elisabeth Roudinesco, Self-Plagiarist

Nathalie Jaudel

*“With these Écrits I needed to erect a barrier
against the covetousness, now set in motion,
of forgers always ready to serve
under the banner of the intellectual spirit”*
Jacques Lacan, “Discourse at the ORTF”

Elisabeth Roudinesco loves Lacan.

She loves him “In spite of everything”, as Charlene Wittstock loves Prince Albert of Monaco.¹

As she declares as early as the epigraph of her last work, she loves him in spite of the fact that he was a “clown” who readily assumed that role.²

She loves him in spite of his “excesses” (*LECT*, p.13), his “mania for neologisms” (*LECT*, p.13), his “attacks of rage and pique, his hermeticism (*LECT*, p.26), his unacknowledged conceptual borrowing (*LECT*, p. 31), his “cult of not keeping records” paradoxically correlated with an obsession for leaving a trace for posterity (*LECT*, p.66-67), his “having lost sight, over the years, of the confrontational essence of dialogue” (*LECT*, p.86) unless it was simply a question of his innate “inability (...) to hold a dialogue with anyone”, his blunders (*LECT*, p.86), his resemblance to Charcot’s hysterics (*LECT*, p.74), his submission, “beyond what was reasonable, to the ritual of patient presentations” (*LECT*, p.21), his extravagant shirts (*LECT*, p.74), his adoration for the *One Hundred and Twenty Days of Sodom* (*LECT*, p.119), his transgressions (*LECT*, p.171), his “jealousy” and his “rather ridiculous allusions” (*LECT*, p.162) and the risk he took of “becoming one of the henchmen of obscurantism and anti-enlightenment thought” (*LECT*, p.20).

What a devout love to be able to overcome all this unpleasantness!

She loved him so much that she wanted, she tells us in this last *opus*, so serendipitously in sync. with the commemorative events of the media calendar (and which, doubt it not, like the preceding works of the most eminent historian of psychoanalysis in France, “will constitute a milestone”³), “to speak *differently* and in a *more personal* way this time, about the fate of this last great thinker in an intellectual adventure that began to make its effects felt at the end of the nineteenth century [...]”

And she adds: “I would like this book to be read as the bringing to light of a *secret part* of Lacan’s life and work, roaming down *lesser known paths*. Through scraps I wanted to evoke *another* Lacan...” (*LECT* p.13)

Something new on Lacan then, the reader says to herself with joy – and something secret, something unknown. How naïve to think she will say anything *different* from what she has already said in her previous books on him, notably her *Jacques Lacan, Esquisse d’une vie, Histoire d’un système de pensée*, which came out in 1993 and was then reedited for a pocket edition in 2009,⁴ her *Généalogies*,⁵ an attempt to write an “ego-history” in part aimed at responding to the detractors of her earlier work, her book on the family,⁶ her articles and lectures on the mirror stage,⁷ the archives,⁸ and first among equals, the high point entitled “La liste de Lacan”.⁹

Yet in the course of reading, the said reader finds, to her no great surprise, thanks to the little she knows of the works of Elisabeth Roudinesco... Instead of anything new, secret or unknown, Elisabeth Roudinesco serves up vast swathes of repetitions (most often word for word repetitions) of entire sections from her previous writing. And the more the work progresses, the more numerous these borrowings become, increasing in number and in volume.

A digest.

A patchwork of copy and paste.

An auto-plagiarist.

Of course, she planes away at the excesses of the previous *opus*, and the number of rash formulas, virulent attacks, over-blown turns of phrase and bitter reproaches has been abraded.

Thus Elisabeth Roudinesco says no more than that in 1963, “Lacan was out of breath” and that he had “elaborated the main part of his doctrine”.¹⁰

She then goes on to write: “it was between 1953 and 1963 that he laid out the main part of his system of thought (...) over a period of ten years, he offered those around him the best part of himself” (*LECT*, p.77-78).

She says no more than that Lacan passed from “The Power and the Glory”¹¹ to a “Psychoanalysis Reduced to Zero”,¹² which was itself the prelude to the erection of a “Tomb for a Pharaoh”.¹³ She is content only to discretely refer to an “apotheosis *immediately* followed by dusk” (*LECT*, p.71).

She no longer reproached him for being a “plagiarist”,¹⁴ but “of being always quick to efface the original reference” (*LECT*, p.31).

There was no longer, “the box of miracles for a messianic sect”,¹⁵ gone too “the dissolution of his teaching in a bucket of formulas;¹⁶ still less the “slide into a psychotic linguistic practice” that ends up “dissolving his teaching in a language made almost exclusively of puns, allography, portmanteau words and neologisms which were not without reference to the fundamental signifiers of his doctrine and of his history.¹⁷ From now on the tone will be more measured: it will be enough to say “mania [or obsession] for neologisms” (*LECT*, p.13 and 84), “topological mania” (*LECT*, p.84), “auto-annihilation of language” *LECT*, p.88, “frenzy for knots and interweaving” (*LECT*, p.122). Understand what you will.

The times no longer demand that he be made into the “double” of his patient Marguerite Anzieu (this patient from the Hospital of Sainte-Anne that Lacan renamed *Aimée* and whose clinical case formed the centre of his medical thesis on paranoia in 1932) this “lonely self-educated woman whose fate might have been his if instead of pursuing a career in medicine he had lapsed into wandering and delusion. It was probably necessary that Lacan’s paranoid patient be a woman for him to be able to see, in the mirror she held out to him, a reverse image of his own family universe: a normal enough universe, but one in which the extravagances of madness might exist for years disguised as ordinary love” (*JL*, 1564, [trans. Barbara Bray, (New York, Columbia University Press, 1997) p.47].

The commentary given today is gentler, like the soft illumination provided by those “dimmed lights” that she is so fond of (*LECT*, p.19): “Like [Louis Lambert], Lacan could have faded into obscurity if he had not, through his entry into psychiatric knowledge, known how to confront certifiable madness [*la follie asilaire*], in other words this part of himself that went back to a tormented family background: a brother, Mark-François, having chosen the seclusion of the monastery, a mother, Emilie, who would never know the man that he would become, a father Alfred, who wanted to turn him into a mustard seller...” (*LECT*, p.24).

Didn’t you know, dear reader? If your brother has answered a religious calling, if your mother has died too young to have known your success [Emilie Lacan died when her son was 47 years old] and if your father wanted to make you his successor in business, you are only a stone’s throw away from madness!

Or, again in relation to Marguerite Anzieu (enough with the stylistics): “He filched all Marguerite’s writings, her photographs, her whole life history; and he never gave any of it back. This meant a constant distortion of their relationship, a coldness and hostility between them that nothing could remove. Lacan was interested in the woman only in order to illustrate his ideas on paranoia and write a theoretical work that would

make him the founder of a new school of Freudian discourse. But she steadfastly refused to fill the role he wanted to force on her”.¹⁸

In 2011, Elisabeth Roudinesco has played the card of moderation. After long, new and unprecedented developments on the contemporary difficulties involved in writing up large case histories, with reference to the cult of *autofiction* which would make patients “confessors of their own neuroses”, the passage mentioned above was reworked in the following terms: “There was never the slightest understanding between the psychiatrist and Marguerite. She never sought to be cured or taken into care, and he didn’t try to convince her to regard herself as a patient. He was only interested in this woman as a means of illustrating his theory on paranoia. As for her, always the rebel, she refused to be a “case” and she reproached him her whole life for having wanted to make her into something that she was not. He only managed to ensure that the interviews she had with him were not negative. And when she came out of psychiatric incarceration she not only stopped her delusions, she also stopped committing acts that could have been harmful to her.¹⁹ (*LECT*, p.61). In fact, she reproached Lacan for having treated her like a “case” and not like a human being, and for never having returned the manuscripts that she had given to him at the time of her internment in Saint Anne’s. In her eyes, Lacan had become what she had dreamed of becoming and, to this end, he had stripped her of her most precious possession, her writing (*LECT*, p.63).

No more grandiose antonomasia (His Majesty, The Great Helmsman) or comparisons with the Devil, Faust, and Ubu; less mentions of his appetite for power and recognition; no more (or much less) of Lacan obsessed with plagiarism, seeing plots everywhere, mad from 1970 onwards, manipulated by those around him at the time of the dissolution, having fallen “into the mute stupor of a great Nietzschean aphasia (*JL*, p.1930) or “in the infinite demonstrations of planet Borromeo” (*JL*, p.1980); no more denigration of the “short session” transformed into a “non-session” and whose principle motivation was apparently the accumulation of an immense fortune.

Jacques-Alain Miller, violently repudiated in *JL* and not only accused of having betrayed his father-in-law’s wishes as far as the establishment of the Seminar is concerned, but also of having obtained “a considerable *hold* on the Lacanian oeuvre: both legally and as far as its interpretation is concerned” (*JL*, p.1998-99; *Genealogies*, p.111) sees himself from now on favoured with a reward: his name, as “transcriber of the seminar, by right and rightly alongside that of Lacan” (*LECT*, p.112).

But one does find the habitual *dadas* of Elisabeth Roudinesco, (and this inimitable style in which the most thunderous superlatives –

magisterial interpretation, *luxurious* work, *dazzling* commentary, *luxuriant* terminology) are set alongside the most denigrating allusions.

Lacan, a Balzacian character, whose history was supposedly that of Louis Lambert's youth, Horace Bianchon's maturity, and Blathazar Claës' old age (*LECT*, p.23-24, *JL*, p.11); Lacan who experienced "horror at his origins" (*LECT*, p. 22, *JL*, p.1528) and was his own father and mother (*LECT* p.22, *JL*, p.1787; p.1864; p.1899); Lacan who had an appetite to possess people and things, "devouring" them even (*LECT*, p.22 and 73, *JL*, p.1929); Lacan who advocated a "revalorisation" of the father (*LECT*, p.22, p.43, *JL*, p.1944), rooted in his own family problems (*LECT*, p.48-49), *JL*, p.1522, p.1843, p.1850) and particularly in the difficulty he had in being a father (*LECT*, p.22, *JL*, p.1844); the fact that he had only narrowly escaped the supposed madness of his family (*LECT*, p.24, *JL*, p.1565); his interest in the topology of knots at the end of his teaching which was indexed on an "attempt to construct an absolute knowledge" (*LECT*, p.25, *JL*, p.1930;p.1940). Her fascination for extremes (especially for Joyce, Maurras, Bloy, Nietzsche: *LECT*, p.22 and *JL*, p.1528; p.1579; p.1589; p.1629-30; p.1946-50) and for madness (*LECT*, p.22, *JL*, p.1630), particularly feminine madness.

The greatest of all these *dadas*, the historian's passion, is that of signalling that she has discovered new and previously unpublished sources, bringing fragments of truth to light which have previously been kept secret. That these sources either don't exist or are of dubious historical value and lead her to make slanderous allegation even though they have, contrary to what she affirms, already been disseminated, is of no importance to her.

For example the discovery (through her efforts) of a manuscript by Marguerite Anzieu from 21 November 1931, "unpublished until now", which was part of Rene Allendy's collection and which, according to her, reveals that Lacan's patient could have benefited only very little from her interviews with Lacan, because five months after her hospitalisation she was still delusional. This manuscript, we learn in a footnote, having been "confided" to Elisabeth Rodinesco by Julien Bougosslavsky, was warmly received.

What an extraordinary discovery! A previously unpublished manuscript by Marguerite Anzieu that miraculously came into the hands of Elisabeth Roudinesco! The only problem with this version of events is that this letter had already notoriously come to light, fifteen months before the appearance of *Lacan, envers et contre tout*. In fact it was sold at Artcurial on the 14th of June 2010 by the auctioneers Briest-Poulain-F. Tajan;²⁰ an entire reproduction of it figured in the sales catalogue which was itself widely downloadable...

Alongside a taste for such previously unpublished sources, Elisabeth Roudinesco also has a taste for incongruity. She doesn't hesitate to write that, “eager to return to the scene of the IPA and to avenge himself for the humiliation he had suffered, Lacan gave a second lecture on the Mirror Stage in Zurich in 1949.” But, when did that “humiliation”, which Lacan was supposedly so eager to avenge and which consisted in his conference at Marienbad being interrupted by Ernest Jones, actually take place? It was in 1936, in other words, thirteen years earlier. Very eager, indeed!

There are also some new elements here. Some of these are not without a relation to recent work by other authors. A new interest for Lacan's voice – a whole chapter is devoted to it, a few months after the publication of Claude Jaeglé's *Portrait silencieux de Jacques Lacan*,²¹ mentioned incidentally. And again, a new interest for Lacan's relation to Mallarmé, after *Mallarmé le livre*,²² by Joseph Attié (with a preface by Francois Regnault), which she does not refer to, but no doubt because he is one of those “epigones” for whom she feels the most profound contempt. Lacan suddenly becomes a “thinker of anxiety” after the publication of *Seminar X*, even though the historian had shown very little interest in this topic before. We also find a few quotations from Seminar XVIII, *D'un discours qui ne serait pas du semblant*, recently established by Jacques-Alain Miller and which has not drawn her attention 'till now.

A few of the comparisons she has such a predilection for are also new: Lacan who would have liked to be Solomon, son of David (*LECT*, p.23); Lacan compared to old Oedipus, a fallen tyrant with eyes destroyed, exiled to Colonus and cursing upon his descendants” (*LECT*, p.25) or to “Aramis admirer of Fouquet” (*LECT*, p.122); Lacan “between Max Ernst and La Fontaine” (*LECT*, p.119); the interest he took in the Borromeo family's coat of arms is interpreted as an attempt to divert attention away from his own genealogy (*LECT*, p.76).

There are also reflections, which are also new and bear the stamp of common sense, about the fact that speech “can also become an instrument of destruction when it serves to support rumour, plotting and anathematisation” (*LECT*, p.72).

There is also the idea of an “already Lacanian twenty-first century”, to be understood as making Lacan responsible for all the turpitudes of the contemporary discontents of civilisation. Hence, “the current fascination [...] for exhibitionism, feminine in general, of objects issuing from the human body [...] right up to the most perverse practices – necrophilia, coprophilia” appear as “the unexpected legacy of this politics of jouissance and of feminine sexuality established by Lacan [...]” (*LECT*, p.107-108).

As for the confidences – they constitute the “most personal” side. Elisabeth Roudinesco was struck, each time she met Lacan, by his capacity to do several things at the same time (*LECT*, p.83); it was Lacan himself, we learn, who “urged” her to become a member of the EFP in 1969 (*LECT*, p.86) – though, curiously, she didn’t give this version of her joining the EFP in one of her previous works, *Genealogies*, which was already “very personal” as she qualified it as an “ego history” and in it recounted “[her] origins, [her] childhood and [her] intellectual formation”²³ and notably Lacan’s appearance at her parent’s house when she was a child.²⁴ She also notes that she saw “the secret ‘thing’” [Courbet’s *L’Origine du monde*] on a visit to Lacan’s country house around 1970; and also that at the end of 1979, she had “the chance to speak to him. His face had already turned towards a world of infinite silence and his gaze remained elusive, as if drawn by this immemorial elsewhere” (*LECT*, p.175).

Let’s come to the self-plagiarist.

On the Mirror Stage (chapter III): pages 31, 32, 33 are partly composed of passages from pages 1632; 1640 and 1641 of *JL*.

On the subject (chapter IV): page 35 is composed of extracts from pages 1646 and 1648 of *JL*. Pages 36, 37, 38, 39 are identical to pages 52 and 53 of Elisabeth Roudinesco’s contribution to *Lacan* by Jean Michel Rabate.²⁵ The whole chapter is thus almost entirely made up of the author’s previous texts.

On the family (chapter V): with the exception of the introductory paragraph, pages 41 to 44 are composed of extracts from another work by Elisabeth Roudinesco, *La famille en desordre*.²⁶ Pages 48 and 49 summarise by taking up pages 1695-1685 of *JL* on Lacan’s family affairs during the Occupation.

On *Aimee* (chapter VI): we are provided with a slightly slimmed down version of the account given in *JL*, as we have seen.

On the archives (chapter VII): if the two first pages take up themes that are dear to Elisabeth Roudinesco, already evoked in *Genealogies*, the following pages (p.66-69) constitute a word for word copy of pages 23 to 25 of a lecture that she gave at the BNF in 2000 under the title “The power of the archive” which appeared the following year in a collection entitled *L’analyse, l’archive*.²⁷

On Lacan’s Seminar (chapter IX): pages 84-85, devoted to Lacan’s commentary of Plato’s *Symposium*, copy out several paragraphs from pages 1884 and 1885 of *JL*.

On love and women (chapter X): pages 96-97, on Françoise Dolto, are identical copies of passages from pages 1803-1804 of *JL*; pages 104

and 105, devoted to *The Origin of the World*, copy out word for word pages 1732 of *JL*, then, still word for word and on the same subject, pages 187 to 188 from “La liste de Lacan”.²⁸

On the *Écrits* (chapter XI): pages 121, 113, 114 copy out pages 1929 and 1930 of *JL*. Page 115 summarises 1896 of *JL*.

On The Thing (chapter XII): page 121 partially takes up 1822 of *JL*.

Chapter XIII, at 24 pages the longest chapter in *Lacan, Envers et contre tout*, breaks all records. It is a line by line copy of almost the whole article “La liste de Lacan”.²⁹

Chapter XIV, on Antigone, uses short extracts from *La famille en desordre*; finally, chapter XV, on “Kant avec Sade”, is almost previously unpublished, although it concerns a text that Elisabeth Roudinesco has already approached many times.

What a fitting homage for someone who, once a week, for thirty years, took the utmost care not to repeat himself.

All this would be anecdotal if Elisabeth Roudinesco did not persist, in spite of everything [*envers et contre tout*], in misjudging not only the meaning but also the progression of Lacan’s teaching; multiplying approximations which, at best blunt and at worst radically distort its import and its cutting edge; reducing it to a few aphorisms that have passed into current discourse – not without leading to multiple effects of misreading; endlessly stringing together an interminable series of neologisms, like pearls strung together one after the other, without commenting upon them or explaining them at all;³⁰ to refer over and over again, for over twenty years, to the same few texts, always in an approximate, summary and erroneous way. “The Mirror Stage”, “The Family Complexes”; “Kant avec Sade”; Seminar VII, *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*; Seminar VIII, *Transference...*

The following extracts, which are supposedly intended to explain Lacan’s thought to the reader, are not only incomprehensible, they are also never accompanied by any footnotes, and for good reason. One never knows where they’ve been drawn from. Lacan never pronounced these phrases; most often the terms used are those that he rejected with the radicalism that characterised him and demonstrate a profound lack of understanding of what he was trying to transmit.

- “Precarious and toreutic, his prose interrogates the gap between the object and its representation, while reducing reality to a wild irruption traversed by formulas and arabesques. According to Lacan, every reality must be said in an objectal way, without the

least lyricism, for the whole of reality is first of all a real, in other words a delusion” (*LECT*, p.30)

- Nomination by the father “allows the subject to acquire an identity” (*LECT*, p.49)
- Lacan forged the neologism “*lalangue* in order to define the articulation between desire and language [*langue*]” (*LECT*, p.73).
- The dialectic of desire and demand is “a symptom of the irregularities of the heart and love” (*LECT*, p.80)
- “*Lituraterre*” seems to make a mockery of “The Seminar on the Purloined Letter” (*LECT*, p.89).
- In relation to anxiety: “this “lack of lack” stuffs desire and translates itself into fantasies of auto-destruction; chaos, imaginary fusion with the maternal body, hallucinations, ghosts of insects, images of dislocation or castration (???) [...] From the clinical perspective, when it becomes pathological, anxiety can be overcome if the subject manages to turn away from the traumatising real and distance himself from fright of lack, the source of deception.” (*LECT*, p.92)
- On love: “[Lacan] is not far from regarding love as an assault on the part of a dark star on a persecutory object that slips away in every encounter” (*LECT*, p.92).
- The terms *hommelle* and *hommelette* were coined “to define modern man robbed of his former virility” (*LECT*, p.96).
- “the woman *is* a supplement” (*LECT*, p.99);
- “the *aphorism* ‘there is no sexual relation’ signifies that the love relation is not a relationship but rather a struggle between two opposites” (*idem*); the expression “love is giving what one does not have” is translated as being “a gift that cannot be given” (*LECT*, p.103);
- *jouissance* is “a possession without mastery, a domination without a dominant or dominated party (*LECT*, p.104).
- “Lacan will transform “the Thing” into a pure lack, into a *jouissance*, through which the subject enters into fusion with the object: paradise lost, a body reduced to its excrements as exposed by Sade”.

In short, a back-to-front version of Lacan – and without any [un Lacan à *l’envers* – et *contre tout*] sense of finesse or rigour of thought.

What is left of him after she has sunk her teeth into him and fed him through the roudinette-blender? A more or less grandiose libertine (mentioned three times: p.15, p.95, p.165); a thinker focused on the *Shoah* (mentioned five times: p.16; p.24; p.120; p.152; p.168-169); a “sensual spectator of the world’s disorder” (*LECT*, P.77); A “surrealist painter” (mentioned twice: *LECT*: p.30; p.32); a fine food aficionado [*amateur d’ortolans*] (two occurrences, p.72 and 96); a friend of animals (*LECT*, p.29-30) and 119), in love with his dog, who served him well (two mentions: 29 and 171); a man for whom “thinking against himself” is referred not to an enquiry which lead him endlessly to take up the same concepts in order to tighten them up each time, but to contradictions between his life and his work (*LECT*, p.22; p.49); a partisan of progress (*LECT*, p.15), who “brought back the desire for Revolution” (*LECT*, p.52) – besides, was he not, along with those who accompanied him on his journey, an exponent of the common good and of public service” (*LECT*, p.21 and 173)? But a psychoanalyst? Certainly not, except for the short session to excess (*LECT*, p.31, p.111; p.157), full stop. In spite of everything [*Envers et contre tout*], as far as Lacan the psychoanalyst addressing psychoanalysts is concerned, Elisabeth Roudinesco doesn’t deal with it at all.

Oh how Elisabeth Roudinesco loves Lacan!

Those whom she does not love are cast as “epigones”. Raising Francois Roustang’s flag,³¹ she makes his students responsible for all the deviations away from “Lacanianism”: not content to be the “enemies of their discipline and their heritage” (*LECT*, p.13), “remaining attached to a fixed reading of his texts” (*LECT*, p.146) they are those “who through their use of jargon contribute to an obscuring of his teaching” (*LECT*, p.27), to the point that, *of all* possible interpretations of Lacan’s thought, “*the worst* [is] that of his epigones” (*LECT*, p.115). Apart from the *jargon*, they are prone to “melancholic posturing, nostalgia and are uninterested in social questions” (*LECT*, p.12), their “apolitical stance verges on the ridiculous” and “[provokes] loathing” (*LECT*. p.158). More terrible still, with their “ridiculous interpretations” and “their absence of empathy”, not only have they transformed psychoanalytic treatment into “an interminable, silent and frustrating adventure”, but above all they are not interested in subjective suffering (*LECT*, p.157). Elisabeth Roudinesco will not stand for that; besides she “admits” that she has “never adhered much to this ethics of psychoanalysis” (*idem*).

Lacan, yes, but his epigones, no – neither in spite of nor at all.

It should not surprise us that such a fine Lacan *specialist* (what am I saying the “best”!³² – who has read him so closely and who knew him so well that she met him at least four times, should be involved in all the radio

broadcasts and all the television programs (or almost all), all the magazine features whenever it is a question of “evaluating his legacy” or of “marking the anniversary of his death”?

However, one of Lacan’s obsessions has escaped her scrupulous attention and her infallible *radar-for-Lacanerics*: namely that of avoiding the same fate as Freud, that his teaching might have its “meaning (...) altered”,³³ that it might be possible to make “dishonest use”³⁴ of it and that “books might be written first, with the firm intention of finding out [about his work] afterwards”.³⁵

This “obscurity” this “hermeticism” that he has been reproached for so much and his refusal to publish texts until he was at an advanced age were at least in part deliberate. What he wanted to ensure was “that in order to refer to them, one had to be determined to read them”;³⁶ to “prevent skim reading”;³⁷ to set up “barriers against abusive commentaries”³⁸ – and thus to foil imposture.

One might think that this was a wasted effort, but not for everyone.

1. “Albert and Charlene In Spite of Everything” was the title of the issue of *Paris-Match* focusing on the Prince of Monaco’s wedding in June 2011.
2. Elisabeth Roudinesco, *Lacan, envers et contre tout*, Paris, Seuil, September 2011. Hereafter *LECT*. In the following citations the italics are mine.
3. Extract from the back cover of *Lacan, envers et contre tout*: “Historian, Director of Research at the University of Paris VIII, Elisabeth Roudinesco is the author of a number of milestone works”.
4. Hereafter, *JL*. [TN: This reedited version is published alongside her two previous volumes on the history of psychoanalysis under the title *Histoire de La Psychanalyse Et Jacques Lacan*, hence the unusually high page numbers.]
5. Elisabeth Roudinesco, *Généalogies*, Paris: Fayard, 1994.
6. Elisabeth Roudinesco, *La famille en désordre*, Paris: Fayard, 2002.
7. Elisabeth Roudinesco, “Le stade du miroir, concept et archive”, in *Lacan*, ed. Jean-Michel Rabaté, Bayard Centurión, 2005.
8. Elisabeth Roudinesco, *L’analyse, l’archive*, BNF, 2001.
9. Elisabeth Roudinesco, “La Liste de Lacan; inventaire de choses disparues”, in *Lacan et la littérature*, ed. Eric Marty, Paris: Le marteau sans maître, Manucius, 2005, p.181-195.
10. *JL*, p. 1870 and 1954
11. *JL*, the title of Part VII.
12. *JL*, title of chapter III of Part VIII.
13. *JL*, title of Chapter IV of Part VIII.
14. The term plagiarist is explicitly employed by Elisabeth Roudinesco in *JL*, p.1910; she underlines over and over again that he “borrowed” from others, “without citing his sources”, for example p.1564, 1575, 1672, 1768, 1771, 1817, 1825, 1838, 1842, 1877.
15. *JL*, p.1906.

16. *Loc. cit.*
17. *JL*, p. 1950
18. *JL*, 1550. (Trans. Barbara Bray, *op. cit.* p. 35)
19. Remember that Marguerite Anzieu attacked an actress with a knife and wounded her.
20. Books and Manuscripts. Sale 1677 – Lot 160. Catalogue downloadable at: <http://artcurial.com/pdf/2010/1677.pdf>
21. Claude Jaeglé, *Portrait silencieux de Jacques Lacan*, Losanges, 2007.
22. Joseph Attié, *Mallarmé le livre*, Losanges, 2007.
23. *Généalogies*, back cover and p.9.
24. *Ibid.*, p.53: “In 1969, I entered the École freudienne de Paris, not so much through a taste for psychoanalysis as for a desire to support Lacan’s teaching and the “cause” that he was fighting for.
25. Elisabeth Roudinesco, “Le stade du miroir, concept et archive”, in *Lacan*, ed. Jean-Michel Rabaté, *op. cit.*
26. Elisabeth Roudinesco, *La famille en désordre*, *op. cit.*
27. Elisabeth Roudinesco, *L’analyse, l’archive*, *op. cit.*
28. Elisabeth Roudinesco, “La liste de Lacan”, *op. cit.*
29. *Ibid.*
30. p. 25: “Jules Lacue, jaclaque, affreud, ajoyce, l’Aimée de Mathèse”; p.49 “père-Orang, père-vers, ânon du père, père-versement, père-version, permaître, père-ternité; p.73: “apparoler, bafouille-à-je, lalangalise, langager, langagien, lituraterre mi-dire, métalanguer, par-dit, parlêtre, etc.”; p. 119: “achose, hachose, Achose, achosique”.
31. François Roustang, *Lacan, de léquivoque à l’impasse*, Paris, les éditions de Minuit, 1986.
32. *LECT*, back cover.
33. Jacques Lacan, “Interview with Gilles Lapouge”, reread by Lacan, *Le Figaro Littéraire*, 29 December 1966: “For many years, I have fought to prevent Freud’s meaning from being altered. And here I must take the same precautions myself.
34. *Ibid.*
35. Jacques Lacan “Entretien avec Pierre Daix du 26 novembre 1966”, *Les Lettres Françaises*, number 1159 of 1st to the 7th of December 1966.
36. *Ibid.*
37. Jacques Lacan, “Interview with Pilles Lapouge”, *op. cit.*
38. *Ibid.*