

DEXTER'S AND EMMA'S LOVE IN DAVID NICHOLLS' *ONE DAY*

Fitria Indah Susanti

English Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya
Fitriindah.09020154034@gmail.com

Mamik Tri Wedawati, S.S., M.Pd.

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya

Abstrak

Masalah cinta jika dilihat dari aspek psikoanalisis dapat dibangkitkan dari pertanyaan tentang jatuh dalam cara untuk mencintai. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa posisi cinta bukan untuk pecinta tetapi untuk yang lain. Namun, Lacan melihat bahwa cinta adalah seperti hal Lain besar, struktur simbolis yang sebenarnya tidak ada. Untuk mencintai akhirnya harus dilihat sebagai keinginan untuk dicintai dan jika sepasang kekasih ingin dicintai satu sama lain, itu berarti bahwa ke dua-duanya akan selalu tidak pernah mengalami untuk memenuhi cinta mereka, sehingga konflik selalu mengikuti di belakangnya seperti itu ditampilkan dalam dua karakter utama, Dexter dan Emma, di David Nicholls 'One Day. Jadi di situasi yang rumit ini cinta memimpin masalah pecinta; (1) bagaimana Dexter dan Emma mengungkapkan cinta mereka satu sama lain seperti yang digambarkan dalam David Nicholls 'One Day? (2) Bagaimana cinta mereka mempengaruhi hubungan yang rumit mereka seperti yang digambarkan dalam David Nicholls 'One Day? Untuk mengikat bagian dari analisis, metode yang digunakan adalah pendekatan objektif dan interpretasi. Berdasarkan analisis, Dexter dan Emma yang jatuh cinta, tapi keduanya tampaknya tidak tahu bagaimana menyampaikannya dengan benar. Kondisi problematis ini akhirnya membuat mereka terpisah dan itu berarti cinta tidak terpenuhi.

Kata kunci: Psikoanalisis, Cinta dan Hal lain besar.

Abstract

The problem of love if it is seen from psychoanalysis aspect can be raised from the question about falling in the way to love. It indicates that the position of love is not to the lovers but to the other. However, Lacan sees that love is like the big Other, a symbolical structure which actually does not exist. To love finally has to be seen as a wish to be loved and if two lovers want to be loved to each other, it means that the two will always never encounter to fulfill their love, so that the conflicts always follow behind it as it is shown in the two major characters, Dexter and Emma, in David Nicholls' *One Day*. Thus this complicated situation of love leads the problem of the lovers; (1) how do Dexter and Emma express their love to each other as portrayed in David Nicholls' *One Day*? (2) How does their love affect to their complicated relation as portrayed in David Nicholls' *One Day*? To tie the part of the analysis, the used method is objective approach and interpretation. Based on the analysis, Dexter and Emma are falling in love, but the two seem do not know how to present it totally. This problematical condition finally sets them apart and it implies the unfulfilled love.

Keywords: Psychoanalysis, Love and the Other.

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

INTRODUCTION

People must have heard, or at least know, the famous phrase to express an idea of emotional romantic feeling; it is "falling in love". The question which is so interesting to ask is that why does someone have to "fall" just to "love"? This question implicitly shows something important that "love" (as a noun) is not in the side of the lover, but in the side of the one who is loved (the partner). But, if love is in the side of loved one, the love of the loved one is also in the side of the lover. It means that the two lovers never encounter each other. If they never

encounter each other, it is difficult to say that love is a combination between two lovers, because they never fulfill to each other to create that love (they just cross over). This paradox situation creates a conflict that this unfulfilled love concludes a formulation; love always makes the conflict between the two lovers.

The problem of love is actually simple, but it grows to be mysterious problem because theories of it grow widely. There is always lack in these ideas of love, it brings to some questions such as, why is it that many people do not reach agreement with a sole definition of love? Why is it that sadists cannot aid but express their love through

violence? Why do Christians “love their neighbor” while to some this goes pointless? Why are there people who kill for love and people who willingly lay their lives in the name of love? Why does love incline to suffer and conflict next to its romantic happiness? In other words, it seems that love is universal but love is troubled by experiences to define it.

It may be wise to see it from its theological term as it wrote in Corinthians 13: 4-8, the Holy Bible, which defines that, “Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no records of wrong. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices in the truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres. Love never fails. It can be seen that Love in Christian biblical terminology refers to how its ethic is practiced without its demand to the result or its value. The analogy is, if someone is slapped on the left cheek, just give the reply with right cheek, then the negative is possessed by the positive and finally Love emerges on that situation.

It is different to what some thinkers think of love, for example, Plato defines love as the possession of the other or the blending with a split partner or a soul mate. Plato himself writes it in his myth of Androgyny, which narrates the story of human beings and their genital organ, that human beings once possessed both the male and the female organ, but they were punished by the gods, particularly by Zeus and Zeus who separated those two organs in each body. But, in other works, Symposium, the Collected Dialogues, Plato explains that this myth has been retold in different versions which results the idea of the soul mate. This myth can be seen to have an impact of creating the story of love in its basic level which is understood in relation to the romantic and this love with a level of romance. (Plato, 1961: 542-543).

Here, Immanuel Kant redefines that love is the persuasion of the other for personal purpose. St. Thomas Aquinas also claims that to love is willing the good thing of the beloved. For Sartre, to love is to let the other choose one in freedom (Demandante, 2014: 102-103). All of these definitions always speak about the other thing as the object of love. Thus, there is something unspoken in formulating this love. Love is not only a noun which means an object, but also it is also position which is uncertain. This characteristic of love cannot be understood clearly, because love is not a clear object. If love is an object, love must be at the outside part of the subject, thus subject can sense it, and then subject can aim to get it. The question is still same, why can't love be clear to the lovers?

This unclear condition makes love always conducting conflict for the subjects (the lovers). Love becomes a

manipulating view for the subjects to see it. Love can even be the abstract thing which is out there and then the subjects create the formulation to get it. Then, the way to get this abstract thing finally pushes subjects to make symbols to represent it and symbols do not present love totally. Thus, the problem of love is actually on the psychological aspect of the subject rather than on the love itself because the subjects create the symbols or the way to present love totally. In simpler words, love seems to give both happiness and suffering because love can be enjoyed through its symbols than its pure existence. If human just feels the symbols, human does not feel the true love. When human is not able to know how to love, there will be empty space that needs filling. When a man loves, he actually does not understand how to present love without words/symbols and it creates a situation, that the other should fulfill this empty space that the man has, and the problem is, is it impossible to love without being loved?

This discussion about love and the other indirectly explains to what Lacan implies on what he calls as the big Other (with O). The big Other differs from the other (with o); (1) the little other is the other who is not really other, but a reflection and projection of the ego, the other is the image of something other than self, and thus the other exists in the imaginary order, (2) the big Other means the ultimate alterity, an other-ness which transcends, goes beyond the other, cannot be identified clearly. Lacan compares this alterity with Language and the Law, God, and anything which are in the order of the Symbolic. Indeed, the big Other is the core of the Symbolic. The big Other is the total other or alterity which subjects look for but no one can reach it totally and it makes a subjects relate to the other (Evans, 1996: 135-136). For example, a girl wants to be Beautiful (the big Other), but it is wasted if there is no one (the other) recognizes her. To reach (as if) the Beautiful, she has to become what the other wants so that she can have the big Other. By following the society, the ego of the subject can be subjected (controlled alias tamed)

Ultimately, subject is seen as the transition from ego to subject, it means that subject is the subject of the Other. For example, when baby was born, he was continuously named and subjected for becoming like the other (people). The parents, the environment, the society, and so on, construct the baby and therefore, the other here is the view of the ego's imaginary identification to be like the other. Thus, the other is the reflection of subject because subject is what the other wants while what the other wants is having the big Other, while having the big Other must be through the other. It also can be said that the big Other is anonymous symbolical structure. The big Other fills the void of imaginary perspective and turns it to symbolical

identification, just like "Happiness", "Pride", "Justice", "God", and also "Love". In simpler explanation, God is the big Other (something subject cannot reach totally), to show that subject has God, subject should pray. Pray is just the symbol to get in to God while praying does not mean that subject reaches God totally. Thus, there is no such the big Other able to reach because subject just can do it by doing it symbolically; the big Other radically is just the Symbolic order.

This shows something implicitly that the symbolical structure, the big Other, is something always there. To reach it, subject has to get in with the signifiers (objects) and even the oppositional signifiers. Just like, a man wants Happiness by having car, after having a car, he wants to have a house, and so on without an end of what he really wants to show his Happiness. Thus, Love is never fulfilled but it just comes in its signifiers (objects) for making the subjects keep feeling of the Love they look for, although they are getting nothing from it. When subjects cannot find the substitution object of Love and then the conflict arises. Process of chaining (taking the objects to replace the abstract condition of Love) can reduce the conflicts although it is never fulfilled totally. For instance, subject will not be allowed to see the meaningless life, therefore subject must create the construction of meaning of objects to create the desire on the objects. The function of meaning to the objects does not simply to avoid the ambiguity, but it also functions to keep the big Other existing, such as "Money is not really papers, but it is Happiness", "Lee Min Ho is not just a bunch of flesh, but he is Handsome" The papers and the flesh is the real (although it is also carved in language) condition of the object and the function of the big Other is making them different from other objects (money is different from memorandum, Lee Min Ho is different from Tukul Arwana, and so on).

The semblance between the real object and its symbolical meaning is what Lacan calls as object petit a. He says that it is "semblance of being" (Lacan, 1975: 84) and therefore, a flower to express a Love is also addressed to a semblance. This semblance gives *jouissance* or enjoyment; pleasure in pain. Jacques Lacan in his Seminar XX: Encore, states that "People have been talking about nothing else but love for a long time. Need I emphasize the fact that it is at the very heart of philosophical discourse?" (Lacan, 1998: 39). Following to this statement, Lacan claims that subject should make one curiosity about the reality behind love, so that he will keep look for it without getting it. If he gets the Love, he will not be interested anymore in Love.

This problematical case of Love, which is generally known as something beautiful and romantic, occasionally introduces something paradox that love is both simple and

complicated. However, once it is fit, it will guarantee the pleasure for the subjects, although it is just a manipulating view. This conflict of Love is also depicted on the two characters, Dexter and Emma, in David Nicholls' *One Day*. In the narration, Dexter and Emma spend the night together following their graduation from Edinburgh University in 1988. They talk about how they will be once when they are 40 years old. However, they do not even try to become romantically involved to each other completely and this becomes the beginning of their friendship.

Love, as noun, which is something wished to give happiness, even gives sufferings for the lover. It is not simply about how they have prestige or way to hide their feeling, but it is also about how love manipulates them to do that way. Thus, this research finally builds this background of the study from the complicated way to reach the love they expect. When they meet, they hide it but when they are separated, they are longing to each other. Even, when they are with someone else, they still feel something lost in their heart. Love that they have contributes to this complicated action and feeling they have, what they do and what they feel are different, and it is important to see back this point as important problem; it is problem of Love itself as the object of their feeling to each other. In the effort to end this background, this research is potentially given a title "Dexter's and Emma's Love in David Nicholls' *One Day*" as the prospective title. Therefore, this study will possibly work with it as the central issue to be brought and to open the possibility to resist against the state apparatuses which are subjugating people. For that reason, it is interesting to notice this complicated love through the taken problems which is recognized as follows:

1. How do Dexter and Emma express their Love to each other as portrayed in David Nicholls' *One Day*?
2. How does their Love affect to their complicated relation as portrayed in David Nicholls' *One Day*?

METHOD

Method consists of the steps and it follows to; Reading novel, Inventorying data, classification data, and tabling the data. Besides that, the technique is interpreting the data with mimetic approach in order to make it related to the social reality.

LACAN'S PSYCHOANALYSIS

Lacan's treat on psychoanalysis is divided into three phases/orders; they are the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real. The Imaginary is actually the first phase of individual to know the world. It is also known as the Mirror stage. The mirror stage has always been viewed by Lacan as a solid piece of theorizing, a paradigm retaining its value to explain human self-consciousness,

aggressiveness, rivalry, narcissism, jealousy and fascination with images in general. (See Nobus, 1998: 104). At this phase, there is only ego, because ego means that it is individual who does not know and care of society or the others.

Lacan also values that human growth is just like a *hommelette* (broken egg) which cannot mend the broken part into the original one. The life of the subject is also influenced by the life outside the subject, or in simpler synthesis “Each human being is in the being of the other.” (Lacan, 1988a: 72). This phase is the start of the ego to understand who and what life is and for until he/she is subjected to be a subject. “The mirror stage is a drama whose internal thrust is precipitated from insufficiency to anticipation—and which manufactures for all the subject, caught up in the lure of spatial identification [...]—and, lastly, to the assumption of the armour of an alienating identity. (Lacan, 1977: 4).

This example notes the important thing to see that human’s psyche is void, it does not have anything. It is like a bird that flies and the branches of trees help it to stoop. The Imaginary order or the mirror stage can be said as the stage which contributes to the first phase of an individual to be like what external things affects and creates him/her. Obviously, at this stage, the individual still cannot define who or what he/she is, he/she still cannot differ the other and even him/herself. It is like when a baby watches a mirror and stands up in front of it, the baby is still confused to what picture on the mirror. At this moment, ego encounters the Other, the Other (Lacan writes it with little o, but in this research it will be written with big O without word big) here is the projection or the image of the other subjects. Therefore, it is important to remember that this image continuously constructs the ego and makes the ego doing “castration” (giving voluntarily to the symbolic for being accepted in the next order). After doing castration or being and becoming the Other, the ego signs that he/she enters the Symbolic order.

Different from the Imaginer, the Symbolic is an order when the ego turns to be a subject who catches the world. The world is something which is carved in language; therefore it is understood as something outside the subject that has been subjecting subject. The process, of course, is through language instruments, especially the signifiers. Lacan analogizes it with his primordial experience, “it is the discourse of the circuit in which I am integrated. I am one of its links. For instance in so far as my father made mistakes [...] I am condemned to reproduce them because I am obliged to pick up again the discourse he bequeathed to me, not simply because I am his son, but because one can’t stop the chain of discourse,

and it is precisely my duty to transmit it in its aberrant form to someone else.” (Lacan, 1988a: 89).

Thus, the Symbolic is like a force from outside toward the self or the subject to accept with unceasing force. Subject is only accepting it without any negotiation to deny it. With this point, the subject can comprehend something other than him. Discourse which enters in rush of the subject cannot be held on, it is automatically coming inside. This assumes something that discourse or language precedes subject because subject is a subject of language. Lacan notes this by saying that subject’s unconsciousness is structured like language. This statement seems to be ambiguous but it is implicitly proving the invention of language contribution in human’s psyche. It is known that people are angry if someone tells the lie, or why a woman should be angry if her friend talks something bad about his sexual relation, or even why we have to be so angry if people talk about something bad of our mother and so on. The important thing here is, the verbal violence or the mockery is just words, it is just language which is coming out to face us, but our unconsciousness sees it as the true of us, therefore the language is the element of our unconsciousness construction.

In this order, the Symbolic order, subject is also chained by the big Other (see the different writing with the Other); “it is a radical otherness which, nevertheless, forms the core of our unconscious.” (Homer, 2005: 44). Homer simplifies this by saying that The big Other is the symbolic order; it is that foreign language that we are born into and must learn to speak if we are to articulate our own desire. It is also the discourse and desires of those around us, through which we internalize and inflect our own desire. (Homer, 2005: 70).

The meaning of Homer’s statement here is actually taken from how a subject lives dependently toward language. Subject is always subject of language. To understand something, even to understand them, people should use language. It can be imagine that if there is no language, so there is no meaning. If there is no meaning, there will be also nothing. Baby was born and then he is given a name and after that he receives it without rejection. That can be the analogy of how the discourse or language construct subject and makes the subject depends on it. This language also becomes the otherness which is intimate in the subject. Lacan may say this as the anonymous thing which always adheres in subject’s unconsciousness and therefore, subject is subject of unconsciousness while the unconsciousness is structured like language. The example of the big Other can be seen in the social interaction, such as “Pride”, “Tolerance”, “Justice”, and so on. If it is seen clearly, those all are something which do not really exist, but the subject

retains it up as if it exists on somewhere he or she belongs.

Beside those terms, there is also drive should be regarded here. For Freudian, drive is envisaged as “a constant force of a biological nature, emanating from organic sources, that always has as its aim its own satisfaction through the elimination of the state of tension which operates at the source of the drive itself.” (Laplanche & Leclaire 1972: 140). Freud himself adds classification that “there are four characteristics; its pressure, its aim, its object and its source.” (Freud, 1984: 118). The aim of the drive is to seek its own satisfaction toward the object as the fixation and it achieves this by removing the source of stimulation. The source of it is “the somatic process which occurs in an organ or part of the body and whose stimulus is represented in mental life by an instinct.” (Freud, 1984: 119). Quite similar, for Lacan, every drive is sexual in nature and at the same time every drive is a death drive. This drive will increasingly be associated with the real and *jouissance* as increasingly the point which the impossibility of the encounter with the real happens. (See Homer, 2005: 76). This impossibility, for subjects, compulsively repeats painful or traumatic experiences in straight paradox to the prevalence of the pleasure principle (death drive) and it advocates that the primary purpose of life is to find the precise route to death. For Lacan, subjects are not driven towards death but by death. Lacan opposes *jouissance* to desire and suggests that desire seeks satisfaction in the consistency of *jouissance*. With regardless it is liked or not, the Symbolic is governed by the death drive. Death is the beyond of pleasure, the inaccessible, the forbidden—the ultimate limit that cannot be overcome; and this ultimate limit is also related to *jouissance*.

LOVE IN LACAN'S VIEW

Jacques Lacan in his Seminar XX: *Encore*, alleged “People have been talking about nothing else but love for a long time. Need I emphasize the fact that it is at the very heart of philosophical discourse?” Following this proclamation is his assertion that this case should make one doubtful about the truth behind love. (See Lacan, 1998: 39). The problem of love is in the fact that it is located at the side of meaning because many things can be said about it, especially definitions from linguistics and psychological aspects. The subjects' experiences makes variation of it and it must be always creating a problem in the level of its meaning. If Lacan is requested and insisted to say something about his idea of love, he will undoubtedly deliver so many hours of talk and discussion only to speak in the end that what he alleged does not make any sense at all. This is caused by a reason that he argues of the existence of love, by saying calmly

that it “is not possible to say anything meaningful or sensible about love,” (Lacan, 1991: 57) and also he adds that “the moment one begins to speak about love, one descends into imbecility.” (Lacan, 1998: 17) and that is how Lacan leads his entire seminar about love.

The problem of love in Lacan's perspective may be able to be sourced by what he claims about the big Other. For him, the big Other does not exist. It is just an anonymous symbolical structure and subject does not know where and what it is really. As a result, he also insists that love does not make any sense, it is just an ambiguous thing which is trapping subjects to keep saving its un-existence.

According to Dylan Evans in his book entitled *Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, Lacan writes a simple understanding of love for the purpose of demonstrating what the analysand (someone who is analyzed, or it can be said as the patient) does in psychoanalytic treatment. According to Lacan, he calls it as “speak about love” because the one who is analyzed delivers anything he or she wants. The full process of psychoanalytic treatment, where the analyst pulls out the knowledge of the analysand and processes his knowledge which touches or connects to the familiar emotions with the aim of organizing his desires, it is already in itself an act of love. (See Evans, 1996: 103).

As a post-structuralist, Lacan sees that the meaning of love always slips and it is like all signifiers with their signifieds. He sees that there is no signified because every signified is signifier, therefore it creates the chain of signifiers. He associates love to language and therefore, Lacan's idea of love is different from those who arrive before him or her, before the theories of love previously. Lacan says that “love aims at being, namely at what slips most in language—being that, a moment later, was going to be, or being that, due precisely to having been, gave rise to surprise.” (Lacan, 1998: 39). Later, love is being understood as something which has its consequence in the symbolic order or the order of language. It cannot be narrowed within definite boundaries because its object always slips. This slip can be said as the first thing should be remembered when two lovers always involve in regular conflicts. For Lacan, the woman can no longer gives her trust for a man's words that contains of “I love you,” because the man might mean something totally different from what he is articulating in the outside. Language is representation, the representation means to deliver the part of it, and the whole will never come out, so will love. Love is always trapped in symbolical structure.

To see it in deeper understanding, (*Amour*) or Love, for Lacan is an abstract thing which is hard to be understood. It is impossible to say anything meaningful

or sensible about love (Lacan, 1991: 57). Certainly, the moment one starts to speak about love, one descends into imbecility (Lacan, 1975: 17). Lacan says this because the condition of love is actually uncertain. It is always flying without landing. It is like language, it is the symbolical structure that traps subjects to keep falling into it. Love is like the big Other, especially for lover who romantically seeks that there is love although what they get is only the *jouissance*. This *jouissance* can only be produced by the subjects who have desires on it and unluckily, the desire is always desire of the Other. So, the way to keep the existence of love on, subjects will be provided by fantasy a path to step closer on the semblance of love and it is through the other subject. The analogy is like when two persons doing sexual relation, the man rationally sees that his penis penetrates a whole made of flesh, and so does the woman, she rationally feels that her vagina is being penetrated by a stick of flesh. But how can two fleshes which are shaking to each, produce the eternal pleasure until the two subjects attain the great massive ejaculation? The answer is on the transference situation. The transference is the process of two subjects connect their desire (although it never encounters, it always slips), so that they keep doing it as if for her or for him. Therefore, in the sexual relation, the fantasy in man will provide the scheme not to see that it is only a hole of flesh, fantasy will provide a visual imaginary illusion for the man to see that it is more than a hole of flesh, but it is a pleasure, it is a paradise, it is something very great, and it also works for the woman. Another example can be seen to the case of money, people will see that thick folds of money give the imaginary illusion of “Wealth”, “Pride”, “Happiness”, and etc., which covers the reality condition of the money, that it is only a bunch of papers.

Additionally, going back to the corner business of love, to analyze love means to analyze the effect of transference and the problem of how a fake situation can be produced by love is actually the interesting issues that Lacan operates through his symbolical order. Lacan also places great stress on the close association between love and aggressivity that means of the presence of one which essentially indicates the presence of the other. This occurrence, which Freud marks as the ‘ambivalence’, is understood by Lacan as one of the great discoveries of psychoanalysis. (See Evans, 1996: 105). Moreover, love can be located as a purely imaginary phenomenon, although it has effects in the symbolic order because they love can subject the subjects through its “non-existence” reality. Love is symbolical structure as the big Other, but it irritates subjects and poisons them and Lacan says subject in love as “a veritable subduction of the symbolic” (Lacan, 1988a: 142). The way subject falls in love will always drive the subjects to keep falling so that

love’s characteristic is auto-erotic and it has a basically narcissistic structure (see Lacan, 1977: 186). The narcissistic structure is caused by the condition of a lover who always fills ‘What do You want from’ or the Che Vuoi? of the big Other. The big Other is beyond the Other, beyond the other subjects. Lacan adds it by saying that “it’s one’s own ego that one loves in love, one’s own ego made real on the imaginary level” (Lacan, 1988a: 142). The imaginary nature of love will always lead subjects to keep falling with its fake or semblance or imitation. The simplification of love at this part is that love is like the ideal order of society, for instance, Mr. X who hates Mr. Y always speaks politely to Mr. Y and Mr. Y who also hates Mr. X also always speaks politely to Mr. X. What the two men are doing (speaking politely) is only done caused by something other, something out there, something beyond there such as “Maturity”, being “Good”, “Morality”, “Politeness”, “God”, and etc. They are trapped by those big Others (although those do not exist at all) so that they keep “speaking politely” going on although the two hate each other.

By this radical view, Lacan seems to oppose all those theories of love that speculates love as an ideal in psychoanalytic analysis (Lacan, 1992: 8) because problem of love is not a special feeling at all, but rather it relates to the problem of transference, or how subjects fill the desire of the Other and the big Other. The relation to each means that love always involves in an unreal mutual benefit and to simplify it, Lacan declares that “to love is, essentially, to wish to be loved” (Lacan, 1977: 253). It is this mutual benefit between ‘loving’ and ‘being loved’ that establishes the illusion of love, there is something which distinguishes it from the order of the drives, in which it means that there is no mutual benefit in the real sense, but it is only pure activity (See Lacan, 1977: 200) without something behind it because people do something for something does not exist (the big Other). Additionally, it is important to see that drive is strictly linked to desire. The both are coming from the field of the subject that finds the fulfill on the side of the Other (See Lacan, 1977: 189). On the other hand, the drive is not purely an alternative name for desire. Drive has to be said as the partial aspects in which desire is recognized. Desire is one and undivided, whereas the drives are partial manifestations of desire.

THE (UN)EXPRESSED LOVES OF DEXTER AND EMMA

To shock the analysis that becomes the important point of this research, it is vital to begin it with the depiction of the expressed love of Dexter and Emma to be cooked in the analysis. To categorize it into good outline, this portrayal raises to these two main characters, Dexter and Emma.

These two then become the subject of love and its discontents. Thus, this part will deploy the way Dexter and Emma portray their love indirectly.

Dexter's (Un)expressed Love

Dexter is known as a man with all flawlessness, good-looking and gorgeous. Many women fall into him, but the paradox is that he is allegedly falling in love with a woman who is different with him; Emma. She is a woman with low profile character, clever, star class. Therefore, she is not as "bad" as Dexter because Dexter is known as a playboy. These two opposite character are actually having a feeling to each other, but the two never express it clearly and it must wake a question up about why their love is not uttered directly. This question will lead to the condition of love itself, love as it is known is not something clear, especially the position of it. It is not only abstract, but it is also a delusion of how it works to subject.

Dexter, who is known as the rich good-looking young man, generally and usually will flirt the high-class woman, beautiful and hot-panty woman. However, he has fallen in love with Emma, and it makes him to chide it from his mother, as proven on this below quotation;

"I have nothing to say."
 "No-one in Rome? No nice Catholic girl?"
 "Nope."
 "Not a student, I hope."
 "Of course not."
 "What about back home? Who's been writing you those long tear-stained letters we keep forwarding?"
 "None of your business."
 "Don't make me steam them open again, just tell me!"
 "There's nothing to tell." (Nicholls: 2009: 30).

It is acknowledged that Dexter negates the truth that he falls in love with someone to his mother. Dexter's mother asks him about his girlfriend, but Dexter seems to say this in lie. He does not want to tell the truth to his mother although he loves his mother very well. This shows an implicit fact that Dexter's mother seems to have something that Dexter does not want to see. This fear, this worry, and this hiding are not something true because it is actually what Dexter's transference has worked. As it is told before that what a subject desires is what the Other desires and it is to fulfill what things the Other desires. Dexter seems to worry that he loves someone his mother does not like although his mother has not say it and even it is not known whether his mother likes or dislikes it. However, Dexter has made it as if his mother dislikes it, therefore he hides it from him.

There are some assumptions that can be taken here and one of those is the construction of handsomeness of the

society (girls). Handsomeness should be seen as the big Other that traps society (girls). As it is believed that handsomeness is like the meaning that comes after the signification, just like giving the attribution of face such as sharp nose, anti-acne, equal eyes, thick-lining eyebrows, smooth, and all aspects that sustain the meaning of Handsomeness. Therefore, many girls are falling in Dexter because of this reason. This also shows that the big Other, as symbolical structure (the meaning behind its surface that contributes in its reality) traps subject to keep being subjected on to it. To say that big Other can blur the reality is like when people see money, people will not only see a paper which has number on it, but people will also see the illustration of Wealth, Pride, Happiness (for Capitalist), and other illustration. It has to be said as illustration because this is actually the portrayal which does not really exist, it exists because it is created by subject's illustration and this illustration is sustained by the fantasy. Fantasy gives the way of the subject not to see the real reality (seeing money is just a paper, seeing face is not just a bunch of flesh, being mocked is not just felt as words, and many more), but to see the reality which is turned into illusion.

Girls who see Dexter will be drowned in the sea of this symbolical structure, they will see Dexter's physical appearance as a stimulation of their passion, compassion and even the love. Love, as big Other, cannot be presented wholly and totally, it must be represented in partial condition and it is actually the process of signification. The process of signification finally constructs some attributes as its semblances, and it is what is meant by Handsomeness that can trap girls into it; they fall in the subject who has the Love behind it.

In the case of Dexter who hides it from his mother, he does it because he has a sort of frightful illusion of "being mocked", "shame", and other things that haunt him. Therefore, he hides it as if it is the real truth he will receive when he has uncovered it. How much he hides this real fact, it shows how much he fall in Emma's love. With that fact, he is also actually able to take all women in the school and even in the campus as what can be assumed to him that he is a playboy one. Awkwardly, by being playboy, he finally ends his love adventure to a very common girl. There are so many beautiful girls, but Dexter is trapped in Emma while Emma herself is not the woman Dexter usually dates with. This, willy-nilly, affects to the construction of the scheme which is provided by the fantasy. Therefore, this aspect has to be taken as one aspect that gains the assumption of Dexter expressed love in indirect way. When his mother insists, Dexter will hide it as well,

“You really are drunk, aren’t you? [...] So what about this Emma?”

“Emma’s just a friend.”

“Is she now? Well I’m not so sure. In fact I think she likes you.”

“Everyone likes me. It’s my curse.” (Nicholls, 2009: 31).

What Dexter says about “my curse” is actually the result of fantasy to provide the blockade because Dexter’s mother has successfully entered the “impermissible” space inside of Dexter’s object cause of desire. It has to be understood in simple understanding that Love is like Happiness or other things that becomes the thing should be put out there and therefore subject can aim for it and make it as the goal. When the goal is successfully attain or being reached, subject will automatically find the deadlock. The deadlock is caused by the end of the goal; when the goal is taken, subject will not seek anything in this life. Therefore, to avoid this deadlock to make subject does not stop in the object, subject is shifted, strayed and swung away from the reality of the non-existence object. For instance, subject looks for Happiness or Love, when he is asked about Love, subject will find nothing but other explanation of Love such as “having good wife”, “being rich”, “having good car”, “living in great house”, and many more. To explain Love, subject will encounter the deadlock therefore, when subject can explain it with other explanations like what it has been written above, it means that subject has been provided by fantasy not to encounter the deadlock of unexplainable and unattainable of Love. This also means that subject is not allowed to know the reality that the object or Love he tries to reach is something does not exist; if subject know that there is nothing in this world which is meaningful, valuable, or it means that everything in the world is nothing, subject will radically go to suicide because what he desires does not give anything (gold is just metal, lips are just flesh, money is just paper, and many more).

By this explanation, Dexter’s mother has found the object that is hidden by Dexter (knowing that Dexter loves in Emma) so that Dexter has to keep it by denying it. The denial is actually what fantasy has provide on Dexter to keep hiding his love from what things he thinks can threat his big Other; Love behind Emma. The important thing that should be reminded at this part is that there nothing happens if Dexter’s mother knows that Dexter loves Emma and the only reason Dexter hides it is caused by his illusion of the reality while the reality he has created from this illusion even does not exist (he thinks that his mother will laugh to him because of loving Emma). Finally, this concludes the points in to the mean of love that love is mostly unexpressed and to un-express mean to express something that called as love.

If it is seen in narrow view, the strange thing is that Dexter seems to have known or predict or foretell that Emma will be angry if he is with other woman. This is exactly neither a prognosis nor oracle, but this is actually the clear part to explain that Love is an abstract structure, a symbolical structure which does not exist in reality. It is just floating out there, beyond the matter and concretization, and more than that, as Lacan says before, to love means to ask to be loved. Dexter does not want to hurt Emma means that that Dexter wants to be loved by Emma and this is how Love works to be expressed in its non-existence.

Another strange happens when it is known in the story that Dexter marries with Sylvie, a beautiful girl in Dexter’s campus, while Emma marries with Ian. This strange case will be looked more in another part of analysis (the discontents of love). In his marriage, Dexter and Sylvie, they meet their old friends in campus and at that time, Sylvie sees Emma who comes in the party. Sylvie asks something about Emma and Sylvie suspects that Emma, who is known as non-consort girl and clever, was Dexter’s ex. Here, Dexter seems to have strange reaction to respond it and finally he denies it.

The point that is talked here is not Sylvie, but Dexter’s reaction toward Sylvie’s suspicion. This is also not talking about Dexter who tries to cover the truth from Sylvie to shield Sylvie’s love, but here will be talked the way Dexter calls Emma as “an old friend.” When Dexter asks about Callum (Dexter’s friend at University), Sylvia replies it coolly and calmly that he is good, but when Sylvie asks about Emma, Dexter is so nervous to answer and he says that, Emma and himself were just old friend. The answer implicitly hides Dexter’s buried love. To pertain it, Dexter is a handsome guy and many girls are falling in him, but he is exactly wants Emma. However, the position he has such as handsome, rich and playboy has trapped him not to go further to look for Emma. Moreover, what he wants is what Emma wants and it does not fit to what Dexter has in front of the society (people has seen him as a handsome, rich, and successful man). This slip position to love and to be loved has made Dexter to seek the substitution for it and Sylvie has qualified for this requirements; she is more beautiful, richer, sexier and hotter than Emma. By this prestige in front of society, Dexter and Sylvie are in marriage although it is assumed that Dexter is still in love with Emma (it can be seen from the end of Dexter and Sylvie relationship; Sylvie has an affair with another guy). So, it is answerable to understand that Dexter will try to cover it from Sylvie, he seems not to want Sylvie to see the deep fact inside of Dexter’s heart it, to dig the buried fact that Emma is Dexter’s love, and it even seems that Dexter does not want to hurt Sylvie.

The last sentence may be controversial one because it is said that Dexter does not want to hurt Sylvie. This can be answered easily by looking at the Dexter's position. Dexter is a playboy, the society (Dexter's others), has been the espionages for Dexter. The espionage is the analogy of subject's construction. Subject is subject of symbolic order, the symbolic order can be the society because the society is also trapped in the symbolic order (the big Other such as Tolerance, Good, Moral, Justice and others). Therefore, what a subject wants is what the big Other wants (something beyond society) and it makes the society seems to have power to subject. Dexter seems to have been claimed as a playboy and it makes Dexter is trapped in the condition that he has to be with high-class girl like Sylvie rather than Emma. Finally, the status that he has, has controlled him to do that (does not want to hurt Sylvie because Sylvie will leave him and he will be called, by society as a fail playboy) and it will become great shame. Shame comes from the disability of subject to find a way to escape from social symbolic such as mockery, ridicule, scorn, derision, contempt, disdain, sarcasm, jeering and other symbolical violence. It also strengthens the argument that subject's unconsciousness is structured like language because subjects are suffering if they are attacked by words (it is not physical but it hurts, the hurts are coming from the constructor of subject's unconsciousness which is from language; to attack language is by using language).

Not only toward Sylvie, when Dexter goes in collapse, Dexter shows that he is still the same (a handsome, rich and great man) to Sylvia's parent and this is all caused by the call of the big Other that traps subject to do what it is demanded. Dexter tells to them (Sylvia's parents) that he loves extreme sports just to make a good impression because extreme sports are equal with amazing actions. To show that subject has done something impressive is not caused by he wants or he desires to do it, but he wants the recognition from society. Without society, subject has just passed void space for instance, using make-up for being beautiful but nobody can see it, being rich but people see him as a poor, and other examples, those will go nothing and it will be meaningful and sensible if it is recognized by other subjects. In simple word, what subject wants is what the other wants from him. These cool actions are also nearer to the sports where only success people can do it because it must require high cost. At the other hand, Sylvie's parents only see successful man who fits to marry their daughter. Here, Dexter tries to love and to love means to be loved, therefore he has to do extreme sport, not caused by his desire to do it but caused by the recognition from the other.

Another similar case with Sylvie that shows the unexpressed love is the moment when Dexter talks to

Emma. Dexter has been blinded by Emma and he does not care of his status with Ingrid. Unconsciously, Dexter does it because when he sees Emma, there raises the big illusion beyond Emma's physical appearance. It is what is called as Love as big Other, it drags subject to dive in to it and what subject wants is not it, but how it (big Other, the image of Emma more than a bunch of flesh on a face) wants subject. So, he ignores his other symbolic structure or his status with Ingrid as it is noted on this statement below,

"I just thought we might be more relaxed, with our clothes off."

"Un-believable, just unbelievable—"

"You don't think you'd be more relaxed?"

"NO!"

"Why not?"

"It doesn't matter why not! Besides, I don't think your girlfriend would be very pleased."

"Ingrid wouldn't care. She's very open-minded, Ingrid. She'd have had her top off at W. H. Smiths in the airport—" (Nicholls, 2009: 87).

Dexter does everything to keep his body closer with Emma, he does not care of Ingrid who is known to have a relation with him. This has shown an indication that this is what is called as Love, it is not expressed totally but it is always represented by words and action. However, the irony is that what Dexter represents sometimes does not fit to what Emma wants and it produces slipperiness; indeed, this is Love as big Other, something does not exist but always represented as if it exists.

Emma's (Un)expressed Love

Emma and Dexter have similar character and it is the prestige to speak directly about the love they have to each other. Therefore, it will be so immature not to include Emma in this complicated Love. Dexter is known to be falling in love with Emma, so is Emma. However, the two are always in complicated conflict and it is supposed to be from the opposite condition between the two. Dexter is a playboy and Emma is a bookworm.

To explain it more, Emma is known as a quiet woman, she is also ingenious and far-public-shot but she implicitly has a feeling of Love to Dexter. However, what Dexter always acts, reacts, behaves and recognizes to Emma is not similar to the thing that Emma expects. It means that Dexter is so tough to express their Love, while Emma is too quiet to express her Love. So, it drives Emma not to prefer saying the truth of her feeling to Dexter. But it is again, something to be said here is that Love and its way not to be uttered directly is caused by is deactivated expression. In simple word, "to love that means to be loved" has made Emma not to express it and

she prefers to wait for the absolute result whether Dexter loves her or not. The problem is, Dexter himself does not even say it truly and it will always play in enigmatic puzzle. Once, in a moment, Dexter has tried to cast a line about his feeling (his jealousy) by seeking the information about Ian to Emma.

Dexter attempts to drive a topic related to Ian and Dexter asks about the guy who is supposed to close with Emma. The truth that works here is that when Emma hears about Dexter's question, she directly denies it and it is actually sourced by Emma's illusionary anxiety that Dexter will be angry with her and other illusions. Dexter has the formulation for Emma to reach her Love. To love Dexter here means that Emma should be the one Dexter wants (Dexter is considered as the only one who has the ticket to the big Other) so that she is loved and when she is loved, she reach the enjoyment for having loved Dexter.

It is little bit complicated, but the important line should be followed is that Love is an abstract thing and to reach it, subject has to make (subject has been provided by fantasy to be able to reach its semblance; the existence of semblance because the object subject seeks does not exist and it functions to avoid subject to know that she or he looks for nothingness) the signification process to grasp it. This also answer a question of why Love is blind, Love does care physical appearance, and other examples. This also answers the mystery of why woman can love an ugly rich man, a disgusting sweaty rich boss, and other special men. These all are caused by the illusion of the big Other that blurs the reality.

The big Other is known as the symbolical structure, the symbolical structure can be known simply with language. Language actually traps subject to understand something with its meaning. The meaning finally erases the real reality of a thing or object as it has been shown in an example that a one can be angry if there is mockery while mockery is just language. This understanding also proves that subject will be always under language with its all aspects, it also works for Love.

The story goes on a case when Dexter has split his marriage with Sylvie up. When Emma hears this information, she seems to be so blushed, she seems to be so happy to hear that, but she has to hide it as well. This assumption is not taken for granted but it is sourced by a fact when Dexter is known to have decided to marry Sylvie. The one who is so broken is Emma and but she is too clever to hides it.

"So true love found you in the end."

"Something like that." He filled her glass. "How about you?"

"Oh, I'm fine. I'm fine." As a distraction, she stood. "Let's keep walking, shall we? Left or right?"
 "Right." With a sigh, he hauled himself to his feet. "Do you still see Ian?" "Not for years now."
 "Nobody else on the horizon?"
 "Don't you start, Dexter."
 "What?"
 "Sympathy for the spinster." (Nicholls, 2009: 286).

Emma has to cover all access that can hurt Dexter and she can even have a sort of presumption that Dexter will be angry if he knows that she loves him. It is actually what thing that makes Emma says that she has no relation with Ian anymore. Saying that she is not with Ian has to be looked up as the way Emma wants Dexter to be with her because she is single. Emma loves Dexter so that Emma wants Dexter to love her and the way Emma replies and responds has proven it. Moreover, she also replies with saying that she is not with Ian "Not for years now." Emma does not want to talk about Ian in front of Dexter and she has no interest to be talking about something else excluding her feeling of not making Dexter disappointed.

Additionally, Emma seems to have waited for so long, a moment to be with Dexter. She has been disappointed before, when she knows that Dexter is going to be with Sylvie at the story previously,

"I'm engaged."

Emma blinked once, very slowly. "Engaged to what?"

"To be married. To Sylvie."

"You're pleased?"

"Pleased? I'm destroyed! But really, seriously, that's fantastic news."

"You think so?"

"More than fantastic, it's, it's ... rad! It's rad and sweet. It's old skool!" (Nicholls, 2009: 287-288)

At this part, Emma has been attacked by shocking information and she must be fazed by this fact that Dexter will be with Sylvie. This can be seen from her statement, she replies it with saying "Pleased? I'm destroyed! But really, seriously, that's fantastic news." Emma, whether it is a slip of tongue or the truth she utters, has said that she is destroyed by the information. It means that Emma actually loves Dexter, she does not want Dexter to be with Sylvia, she wants Dexter to be with her, therefore it is so painful for Emma if Dexter with someone else. However, Emma does not express it directly because the way she says that she is destroyed, for her, means that Dexter must have understood that she loves him. This is how love works, Emma loves Dexter means that she wants Dexter loves her. To make it true, Dexter has not to be with someone else, so Emma can fill something lost from her Love; Dexter.

Dexter who has chosen Sylvia just gives the pain for Emma but Emma will never express it clearly because the work of the big Other is always in other objects and signification. Love which is meant should be represented by something else, it can be words, it can be gesture, and it can be action. But it is never the whole part of Love, it is just the representation of it and it is just the partial representation that can represent it. To look it in a narrow perspective, it means that Love will always give the pain but pain of pleasure. Emma, who is so sick of hearing the information, keeps hiding her Love and she does not want to say it in bare. She prefers to hide it, and the question will be: who does she hide from? Dexter has decided to be with Sylvia and Emma should not hide it anymore because she hides it to avoid Dexter to get pain but Dexter is actually fine for because he has been with Sylvia. Finally, what can be said here is that Love in Emma's psyche is something like pleasure in pain, Emma enjoys it as if the pain does not exist. She feels the pain but she defends on it and this may be related to what Lacan says, as what Socrates claims, that the best thing in life is not to be born because of being born means that human is cursed in looking for nothing. The thing that is implied is the chasing for the big Other, subject is trapped on it and subject has to seek it and take as if it exists although what is gotten is just the semblance through *objet petit a* that gives the enjoyment (pleasure in pain). In this context, Love has trapped subject to enjoy every beat of its pain and it always gives pain behind its pleasure.

In front of Ian, Emma even says directly that she does not love him but she also does not say that she loves Dexter. It is caused by the way Emma lives with Ian is from her disappointment to hear that Dexter is with Sylvia. Ian can be said as the scapegoat or the escaped-shade.

"I love him, she thought, I'm just not in love with him and also I don't love him. I've tried, I've strained to love him but I can't. I am building a life with a man I don't love, and I don't know what to do about it." (Nicholls, 2009: 187).

Based on the quotation above, it has to be assumed that Emma has said the truth of her feeling that she cannot love Ian. Emma can say it frankly because there is another one that she waits, Dexter. Dexter cannot be gotten, she disappoints and she tries to be with someone else and he is Ian. Ian is surely not the one, she even does not have any semblance to the Love she looks for. The Love she looks for can appear on Dexter but Dexter is with someone else. In conclusion, Dexter, who is with someone else that cannot be continued to be asked to love Emma, at the end makes Emma to be with Ian. However,

Emma finally says that she cannot love Ian and it means that she wants to express the unexpressed Love to Dexter. Moreover, she even never says her feeling to Dexter directly until the two are separated and this will be the point to talk in the later part because the Love that causes their separation to each other is actually the Love's discontents. His also becomes the last part of Emma's (un)expressed Love and this will be continued to talk about the Love that sets them apart.

CONCLUSION

Love should be rethought as the mysterious problem in subject's unconsciousness because to love does not mean the one wants to do something for the loved one, but to love means to be loved. To be loved shows the important part of how the conflict always arises; it is caused by the one who loves actually wants to be loved by the loved one while this can be differently happened to the partner.

Dexter and Emma are falling in love to each other but the two are never saying the truth of it. Then, it turns to be something that set them apart to each other. The content of Love should be something uniting, assembling and gathering the two lovers in happiness, but something happens to Emma and Dexter has exposed that Love has its discontents that even set them apart.

The problem happens here is that the two who never say the truth of their feeling to each other, it is not only caused by the pride and prestige which is affected by the social status (Dexter as handsome, artist and playboy one while Emma as a book worm, clever and a waiter in a restaurant), but rather the abstract thing of Love. Love is not on the loved or the lover, but it is beyond the two. It is floating somewhere subject does not know, so that to love someone means that the loved one has the attributes that makes subject feels to be able to reach the abstract Love. This is how Love should be seen as the big Other.

The big Other is symbolical structure and it exists before subject. So, everything abstract thing subject looks for is actually from symbolic structure and it is actually something does not exist. Thus, to love means to love for nothing and to avoid subject look for emptiness, the fantasy provides the way for keeping the subject to desire on to it. Thus, what subject wants is what the other wants to subject and then subject becomes what the other wants rather than becomes the subject itself. In Love, subject who loves someone actually wants to be loved by someone who is loved. Thus, this always makes slip and conflict between the two because the two do not want anything but want to be loved to each other. To love means that subject has to fall into it at the very earliest.

REFERENCES

- Demandante, Darlene. 2014. *Lacanian Perspective on Love*. Kritike Volume Eight Number One (June 2014) 102-118, ISSN 1908-7330, retrieved from: http://www.kritike.org/journal/issue_14/demandante_june2014.pdf
- Evans, Dylan. 1996. *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Fink, Bruce. 2002. "Knowledge and Jouissance," in *Reading Seminar XX: Lacan's Major Work on Love, Knowledge, and Feminine Sexuality* (eds. S. Barnard & B. Fink). New York: SUNY Press.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1984. "Instincts and Their Vicissitudes," in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*, Penguin Freud Library, vol. 11. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hamilton, Sarah. 2007. *Ethics and Literature: Love and Perception in Henry James*. Louisiana: Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- Homer, Sean. 2005. *Jacques Lacan*. New York: Routledge.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1964 (1977). *The Seminar. Book XI: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis* (trans. Alan Sheridan). London: Hogarth Press & Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1975. *Le Séminaire. Livre XX. Encore, 1972-73* (ed. Jacques-Alain Miller). Paris: Seuil.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1977. "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience," in *Écrits: A Selection* (trans. A. Sheridan). London: Routledge/Tavistock.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1988a. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book II: The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis 1954-1955* (ed. J.-A. Miller, trans. S. Tomaselli), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1988b. "Seminar on the Purloined Letter," in *the Purloined Poe: Lacan, Derrida and Psychoanalytic Reading* (trans. J. Mehlman, eds. J.P. Muller & W.J. Richardson). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1991. *Seminar VIII: On Transference 1960-1961* (ed. by Jacques Alain- Miller). Paris: Seuil.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1992. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis 1959-1960* (ed. J. A. Miller, trans. D. Porter). London: Routledge.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1998. *Seminar XX: Encore, On Feminine Sexuality The Limits of Love and Knowledge* (trans. by Bruce Fink). New York & London: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1998. *Seminar XX: Encore, On Feminine Sexuality: The Limits of Love and Knowledge* (trans. by Bruce Fink). New York & London: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Laplanche, J. & Leclaire, S. 1972. "The Unconscious: A Psychoanalytic Study," in *Yale French Studies*.
- Laplanche, J. & Pontalis, J. B. 1986. "Fantasy and the Origins of Sexuality," in *Formations of Fantasy* (eds. V. Burgin, J. Donald and C. Kaplan). London: Routledge.
- Mahardika, Alit. 2013. *A Bitter Game of Love: Dexter's And Emma's Defense Mechanisms which Contribute to Complicated Love Relationship in David Nicholls' One Day*. Surabaya: Surabaya State University.
- Nobus, D. 1998. "Life and Death in the Glass: A New Look at the Mirror Stage," in D. Nobus (ed.) *Key Concepts of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London: Rebus Press.
- O'Dwyer, Kathleen. 2007. *Jacques Lacan on Love: Realistic Cynic or Inveterate Optimist*. Crossroads Journal, vol.11 Issue 1, ISSN: 1833-878x, pp. 47-56.
- Plato. 1961. *Symposium in Collected Dialogues* (ed. by Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Žižek, Slavoj. 1992. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.