El Mesbah Journal
in Psychology, Education Sciences and
Orthophony
مجلة المصباح
في علم النفس وعلوم التربية والأرطوفونيا

المجلد: (6)
العدد: (2)
سبتمبر 2026
(ص 45-62)

Jacques Lacan's Fundamental Concepts: From Psychoanalytic Theory to Contemporary Perspectives in Projective Clinical Practice

المفاهيم الأساسية لدى جاك لاكان :من النظرية التحليلية النفسية إلى المنظورات المعاصرة في الممارسة العيادية الإسقاطية

Pr/ Boualagua fatima zohra [*1]
ا.د/ بوعلاقة فاطمة الزهراء
University Mohamed Boudiaf of Msila. Algeria[*1]
جامعة محمد بوضياف، المسيلة . الجزائر
E-mail: fatima.boualagua@univ-msila.dz **البريد الإلكتروني:**
Phone Number: 213799404281 **رقم الهاتف:**

Received: 23/07/2026 Accepted: 12/08/2026 Published: 15/09/2026

Abstract

Jacques Lacan (1901–1981) profoundly reshaped psychoanalytic theory through his reinterpretation of Freud's work, integrating insights from structural linguistics, philosophy, and anthropology. His conceptual framework, organized around the Symbolic, the Imaginary, and the Real, introduced influential concepts such as the signifier, the Other, desire, lack, *objet petit a*, *jouissance*, and the Name-of-the-Father. These ideas have had a lasting impact on contemporary psychoanalytic theory and clinical practice.

Although Lacan never formulated a theory of projective techniques, his concepts have increasingly informed contemporary French projective clinical practice. Projective methods, particularly the Rorschach Inkblot Method and the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), have been reinterpreted from a Lacanian perspective emphasizing discourse, symbolic organization, subjectivity, and structural diagnosis rather than descriptive

*-Corresponding author,fatima zohra Boualagua , e.mail fatima.boualagua@univ-msila.dz

personality assessment. This approach has enriched the understanding of unconscious processes by highlighting the subject's relationship to language, desire, and the Other.

This article provides a theoretical review of Lacan's principal concepts and examines their relevance to psychoanalytic theory, clinical practice, and contemporary projective assessment. It also explores how French projective clinicians have integrated Lacanian concepts into projective interpretation without attributing to Lacan a projective theory that he never developed. The article argues that Lacanian theory offers a coherent conceptual framework for deepening projective clinical interpretation while preserving the methodological specificity of projective methods.

Keywords: Jacques Lacan; Psychoanalysis; Clinical Psychology; Projective Clinical Practice; Rorschach; TAT; Subjectivity; Signifier.

الملخص:

أعاد جاك لاكان (1901–1981) تشكيل النظرية التحليلية النفسية من خلال إعادة قراء أعمال سيغموند فرويد في ضوء اللسانيات البنيوية والفلسفة والأنثروبولوجيا. وقد أسهمت مفاهيمه الأساسية، مثل الرمزي والمتخيل والواقعي، والدال، والآخر، والرغبة، والموضوع الصغير (a)، واسم الأب، في إحداث تأثير عميق في الفكر التحليلي النفسي المعاصر والممارسة الإكلينيكية. ورغم أن لاكان لم يضع نظرية خاصة بالاختبارات الإسقاطية، فإن إطاره المفاهيمي أصبح مرجعًا مهمًا في العيادة الإسقاطية الفرنسية، ولا سيما في تفسير اختبار رورشاخ واختبار تفهم الموضوع (TAT). تقدم هذه الدراسة مراجعة نظرية لأهم مفاهيم لاكان، وتناقش إسهاماتها في النظرية التحليلية النفسية والتقييم الإسقاطي المعاصر. وتخلص إلى أن النظرية اللاكانية توفر إطارًا مفاهيميًا متماسكًا يُثري التأويل الإسقاطي من خلال التركيز على الخطاب والذاتية والتشخيص البنيوي، مع الحفاظ على الخصوصية المنهجية لأساليب التقييم الإسقاطي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: جاك لاكان، التحليل النفسي، علم النفس العيادي، العيادة الاسقاطية، الرورشاخ، الذاتية، المدلول. TAT

1. Introduction

More than four decades after his death, **Jacques Lacan** remains one of the most influential and debated figures in psychoanalytic theory. His work continues to shape contemporary discussions in psychoanalysis, clinical psychology, psychopathology, psychotherapy, and related disciplines, including philosophy, linguistics, and anthropology. Rather than establishing a new psychoanalytic school by departing from Freud, **Lacan (2006)** consistently presented his work as a *retour à Freud* (return to Freud), reinterpreting Freudian concepts through structural linguistics, structural anthropology, and contemporary philosophy. **Roudinesco (1997)** argues that this return constituted a theoretical reformulation rather than a restoration of classical Freudian thought.

A central feature of Lacanian theory is the proposition that "the unconscious is structured like a language." As **Lacan (2006)** argues, this formulation shifted psychoanalytic inquiry from instinct-based explanations toward the analysis of language, discourse, and symbolic structures. **Fink (1995)** further explains that symptoms, dreams, slips of the tongue, and fantasies should therefore be understood as formations governed by the differential functioning of signifiers rather than as direct expressions of instinctual drives.

This theoretical reorientation also transformed psychoanalytic practice. **Lacan (2006)** reconceptualized transference, interpretation, desire, and the analyst's position by emphasizing that psychoanalysis must attend not only to what patients say but also to how unconscious desire is articulated through speech. As **Evans (1996)** notes, this perspective established language as the privileged pathway to subjectivity and significantly influenced contemporary clinical psychology.

Although Lacan never formulated a systematic theory of projective techniques, his concepts have progressively informed contemporary French projective clinical practice. **Chabert (1998, 2003)** demonstrates that projective protocols can be approached through discourse, structural organization, the function of the signifier, and the subject's relation to the Other rather than through symbolic content alone. Likewise, **Azoulay**

(2019) and **Roman (2015)** show how this perspective has enriched projective assessment while preserving its Freudian foundations.

The present article pursues two objectives. First, it reviews Lacan's principal concepts and examines their significance within psychoanalytic theory. Second, it analyzes their contribution to contemporary projective clinical practice, particularly within the French projective tradition. Rather than attributing a projective theory to Lacan himself, this study argues that his conceptual framework provides a coherent theoretical foundation for interpreting projective discourse and enriching contemporary clinical assessment (**Chabert, 2003; Roman, 2015**).

2. The Emergence of Lacanian Thought

Jacques Lacan's theoretical project developed within the rich intellectual context of twentieth-century France. While remaining faithful to Freud's discoveries, **Lacan (2006)** argued that psychoanalysis had gradually lost its theoretical rigor by reducing Freudian concepts to ego psychology and adaptive models of personality. His response was not to establish a new psychoanalytic doctrine but to undertake a systematic *retour à Freud* that reinterpreted Freud's original texts in light of contemporary intellectual developments. As **Roudinesco (1997)** observes, this return represented a profound theoretical renewal rather than a restoration of classical Freudian theory.

Lacan's reformulation of psychoanalysis drew on several major intellectual traditions. **Saussure's (1916/1983)** structural linguistics provided the distinction between the signifier and the signified, enabling **Lacan (2006)** to conceptualize the unconscious as a symbolic structure governed by language. **Lévi-Strauss (1963)** reinforced the importance of symbolic systems in organizing social relations, while **Kojève's (1969)** interpretation of Hegel highlighted the centrality of recognition, desire, and the Other in the constitution of subjectivity.

Building on these influences, **Lacan (2006)** reformulated psychoanalysis as a theory of language and subjectivity rather than a psychology of instincts. **Fink (1995)** explains that the proposition "the unconscious is structured like a language" refers not to a speaking unconscious but to unconscious formations organized according to structural relations between signifiers.

Consequently, the subject is conceived as divided (*sujet barré*), constituted through language and permanently marked by lack (**Lacan, 2006**). As **Evans (1996)** and **Homer (2005)** emphasize, psychoanalysis therefore seeks to understand the symbolic organization of subjective experience rather than merely explaining observable behavior.

Lacan's teaching evolved over several decades while maintaining remarkable theoretical coherence. His early work centered on the Mirror Stage and the Imaginary, his middle period emphasized the Symbolic order and the Name-of-the-Father, and his later seminars focused on the Real and *jouissance* (**Lacan, 1977, 1993, 1998**). According to **Fink (1997)** and **Vanheule (2011)**, these developments constitute an integrated theoretical framework that continues to influence contemporary psychoanalytic theory and clinical practice.

3.1. The Mirror Stage: The Birth of the Ego

The **Mirror Stage** (*Le stade du miroir*) represents one of Lacan's earliest and most influential contributions to psychoanalytic theory. First presented in 1936 and later elaborated in *The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I* (**Lacan, 1949/2006**), it is not conceived as a developmental stage but as a structural moment in the constitution of subjectivity. As **Evans (1996)** notes, the Mirror Stage explains how the ego is constituted through identification rather than biological maturation.

According to **Lacan (1949/2006)**, between six and eighteen months the infant identifies with its reflected image, experiencing an illusory sense of bodily unity that contrasts with its fragmented sensorimotor experience. This identification, which Lacan terms *méconnaissance* (misrecognition), gives rise to the ego (*moi*) through an external image rather than an authentic sense of self. **Fink (1995)** emphasizes that this primordial identification establishes the foundation of the Imaginary order and shapes the subject's subsequent relation to identity, desire, and the Other.

Departing from Ego Psychology, **Lacan (2006)** conceives the ego as an imaginary and fundamentally alienated construction rather than an autonomous psychic agency. **Evans (1996)** further argues that imaginary identifications continue to organize interpersonal relations throughout life,

particularly through narcissism, rivalry, and idealization. Consequently, **Fink (1997)** and **Vanheule (2011)** maintain that psychoanalytic treatment aims not to reinforce the ego but to uncover the unconscious symbolic structures that sustain these imaginary identifications.

4. Contributions of Lacanian Theory to Psychoanalytic Practice

Lacan's contribution extends beyond the reinterpretation of Freudian concepts to a fundamental reformulation of psychoanalytic practice. **Lacan (1977)** redefined the analyst's position, the function of interpretation, the understanding of transference, and the aims of psychoanalytic treatment. As **Fink (1997)** explains, Lacanian psychoanalysis is directed not toward adaptation, ego strengthening, or symptom reduction, but toward the subject's encounter with unconscious desire.

From this perspective, the analyst does not provide predetermined meanings but occupies a position that allows unconscious signifiers to emerge through the patient's discourse (**Lacan, 1977**). Accordingly, interpretation no longer aims to reveal hidden meanings. Instead, **Evans (1996)** argues that it intervenes within the chain of signifiers, producing moments of rupture and subjective reorganization. **Lacan (1977)** therefore maintains that the effectiveness of interpretation depends on its symbolic effects rather than on explanatory content.

Lacan also reformulated the concept of transference through the notion of the **subject supposed to know** (*sujet supposé savoir*). According to **Lacan (1977)**, analytic work begins because the patient attributes unconscious knowledge to the analyst. **Fink (1997)** emphasizes, however, that the analyst's task is not to sustain this supposition indefinitely but gradually to dissolve it, enabling the subject to assume responsibility for his or her own desire.

Another distinctive feature of Lacanian technique is the **variable-length session**, introduced to interrupt repetitive discourse and highlight decisive signifiers. Although controversial, **Vanheule (2011)** argues that this technique reflects Lacan's view that psychoanalytic effectiveness depends

on the quality of symbolic intervention rather than on chronological duration.

Taken together, these innovations profoundly reshaped contemporary psychoanalytic practice. They redirected clinical attention from symptom elimination toward discourse, subjectivity, and the structural dynamics of desire, thereby establishing a conceptual framework that continues to inform contemporary psychoanalytic and projective clinical practice **(Fink, 1997; Chabert, 2003; Roman, 2015; Vanheule, 2024)**

5. From Lacanian Theory to Contemporary Perspectives in Projective Clinical Practice

Although Jacques Lacan never developed a systematic theory of projective techniques, his conceptual framework has profoundly influenced contemporary French projective clinical practice. This influence did not emerge through explicit methodological prescriptions but through the progressive integration of Lacanian concepts into the interpretation of projective protocols, particularly within the **Rorschach Inkblot Method** and the **Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) (Chabert, 2003; Roman, 2015; Azoulay, 2019).**

The originality of this contribution lies in shifting the focus of projective interpretation from the decoding of symbolic contents toward the structural analysis of discourse. Rather than considering projective responses as isolated indicators of personality traits, Lacanian-oriented clinicians examine how the subject constructs discourse, organizes narratives, negotiates desire, and positions himself or herself in relation to the **Other (Roman, 2015; Chabert, 2003).**

From this perspective, projective protocols are understood not merely as collections of symbolic themes but as forms of discourse through which unconscious processes become organized. Particular attention is therefore devoted to the organization of signifiers, narrative discontinuities, repetitions, silences, ambiguities, and the subject's position within the symbolic order rather than to thematic content alone **(Roman, 2015; Azoulay, 2019).**

This orientation has contributed to renewing psychoanalytic projective assessment without abandoning its Freudian foundations. Instead of replacing classical psychoanalytic interpretation, the Lacanian perspective extends it by emphasizing language, subjectivity, symbolic mediation, and structural organization as fundamental dimensions of psychological assessment **(Chabert, 2003; Roman, 2015; Emmanuelli & Azoulay, 2021).**

5.1. The Subject of the Unconscious in Projective Assessment

Classical psychoanalytic approaches to projective assessment have traditionally focused on identifying latent conflicts, defensive processes, and underlying personality dynamics through symbolic productions. **Chabert (2003)** and **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)** argue that these dimensions remain essential to projective interpretation. A Lacanian perspective, however, extends this tradition by asking a different question: **How does the subject of the unconscious emerge through discourse?** (**Lacan, 2006; Fink, 1997**).

From this perspective, projective protocols are understood as discursive productions through which unconscious desire is articulated rather than as collections of symbolic themes. Accordingly, the clinician's attention shifts from isolated thematic content to the structural organization of discourse itself. **Roman (2015)** and **Azoulay (2019)** emphasize that narrative coherence, discontinuities, repetitions, hesitations, contradictions, and metaphorical constructions provide privileged access to the subject's symbolic organization.

Within this framework, every projective narrative constitutes an act of enunciation (*énonciation*) through which the subject assumes a particular position in relation to desire, lack, authority, and the Symbolic order. Consequently, the clinical objective is not simply to uncover hidden meanings but to understand how unconscious subjectivity is structured through discourse. As **Fink (1997)**, **Chabert (2003)**, and **Roman (2015)** maintain, what is clinically significant is not only what is narrated but also how the subject speaks.

5.2. The Rorschach from a Lacanian Perspective

The **Rorschach Inkblot Method** occupies a central position in contemporary French projective clinical practice. While traditional approaches primarily emphasize perceptual determinants, cognitive organization, and personality characteristics, a Lacanian perspective redirects attention toward the subject's relationship to language, desire, and symbolic mediation. **Chabert (2003)**, **Roman (2015)**, and **Azoulay (2019)** argue that the Rorschach should be understood not merely as a perceptual test but as a form of discourse through which unconscious subjectivity becomes observable.

From this perspective, the ambiguity of the inkblots requires the examinee to organize perception through symbolic structures. As **Roman (2015)** and **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2022)** explain, the protocol reveals not only perceptual functioning but also the ways in which the subject constructs meaning, articulates desire, and occupies a position within the symbolic order.

Several Lacanian concepts are particularly relevant to this interpretative framework. **Lacan (2006)** conceptualizes the **signifier** as directing attention to the linguistic organization of responses rather than to their thematic content alone. Within the analytic situation, the **Other** is reflected in the implicit dialogical relationship between the examinee and the examiner, whereas desire becomes discernible through recurring discursive configurations. Likewise, experiences of **lack** may be inferred from omissions, silences, fragmented narratives, or failures of symbolic elaboration (**Roman, 2015**).

The **Real** becomes especially significant when language reaches its limits. According to **Lacan (1977)**, manifestations such as fragmentation, bodily disorganization, overwhelming anxiety, or failures of symbolization indicate experiences that resist coherent representation. **Vanheule (2011)** further emphasizes that such moments should be understood as structural indicators rather than isolated symptoms.

Consequently, a Lacanian reading of the Rorschach privileges the organization of discourse, the articulation of signifiers, and the subject's position within language instead of reducing interpretation to symbolic themes. As **Chabert (2003)**, **Roman (2015)**, and **Azoulay (2019)** conclude,

the protocol provides a privileged space in which unconscious subjectivity becomes accessible through discourse itself.

5.3. Narrative, Desire, and the TAT

The **Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)** offers a particularly suitable context for Lacanian interpretation because it requires the production of narrative discourse. Unlike the perceptual responses elicited by the Rorschach, TAT narratives reveal how subjects organize interpersonal relationships, temporality, desire, conflict, and symbolic positions through language. **Chabert (2003)**, **Roman (2015)**, and **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)** emphasize that these narratives provide privileged access to the symbolic organization of subjectivity.

Drawing on Paul Ricoeur's narrative hermeneutics, **Boualagua (2018)** argues that narrative should be understood as a symbolic process through which subjective meaning is progressively constructed over time. Rather than merely recounting events, narrative organizes experience and mediates the subject's relationship to reality, thereby contributing to the constitution of subjectivity. This perspective provides a valuable theoretical framework for understanding TAT narratives as symbolic constructions rather than simple descriptive accounts (**pp. 143–150**).

From a Lacanian perspective, every narrative constitutes an organization of **fantasy (***fantasme***)** through which the subject negotiates desire, authority, separation, loss, and recognition. **Lacan (1977)** conceives fantasy as a fundamental structure mediating the subject's relation to desire, while **Fink (1997)** explains that projective narratives should therefore be understood as discursive constructions rather than fictional accounts alone.

Accordingly, the clinician attends not only to what is narrated but also to how the narrative is constructed. **Roman (2015)** and **Azoulay (2019)** argue that discontinuities, contradictions, repetitive scenarios, hesitations, abrupt endings, shifts in narrative perspective, and failures of symbolization often provide richer clinical information than thematic content itself.

TAT narratives may also reveal distinctive modes of **jouissance**, illustrating recurring patterns of satisfaction, frustration, sacrifice, or impossible desire. According to **Lacan (1977)**, these configurations illuminate the subject's

characteristic relation to desire, lack, and the Other, whereas **Vanheule (2011)** emphasizes their relevance for understanding unconscious organization beyond manifest narrative themes.

Consequently, a Lacanian approach enriches TAT interpretation by integrating discourse, symbolic mediation, and unconscious structure into projective analysis. Rather than classifying stories according to thematic categories, it seeks to understand how the subject is positioned in relation to language, desire, and the Symbolic order (**Chabert, 2003; Roman, 2015; Emmanuelli & Azoulay, 2021**).

5.4. Structural Diagnosis and Projective Methods

One of Lacan's most influential contributions to contemporary psychoanalytic psychopathology is the concept of **clinical structure**. Rather than classifying individuals according to symptom severity or personality dimensions, **Lacan (1993)** conceptualizes diagnosis in terms of the subject's structural relationship to language, desire, and the Symbolic order. **Fink (1997)** and **Vanheule (2011)** emphasize that this perspective seeks to understand the organization of subjectivity rather than to assign descriptive diagnostic categories.

From this standpoint, projective methods contribute to structural diagnosis through the analysis of discourse, symbolic coherence, defensive processes, and the subject's position in relation to the Other. As **Chabert (2003)** and **Roman (2015)** argue, projective findings support the formulation of structural hypotheses rather than definitive diagnostic labels.

Within neurotic organizations, projective protocols generally reveal coherent symbolic mediation despite the persistence of unconscious conflict. In contrast, **Lacan (1993)** and **Vanheule (2011)** describe psychotic organizations as characterized by disturbances in symbolic integration, fragmentation of discourse, and disruptions in signifying processes. Perverse organizations, meanwhile, are distinguished by specific configurations of law, desire, authority, and **jouissance**, reflected in the subject's relation to the Other (**Lacan, 1977; Evans, 1996**).

Importantly, projective assessment should never be reduced to a mechanical procedure for structural classification. **Chabert (2003)**, **Roman (2015)**, and **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)** stress that structural hypotheses must always be integrated with clinical interviews, developmental history, and comprehensive psychopathological evaluation. Accordingly, projective methods constitute one component of a broader psychoanalytic assessment rather than autonomous diagnostic instruments.

5.5. Contributions of Contemporary French Projective Psychology

The integration of Lacanian concepts into contemporary projective clinical practice has been achieved primarily through the work of French psychoanalytic clinicians rather than by Lacan himself. While **Lacan (2006)** established the theoretical foundations, subsequent generations of projective psychologists incorporated these concepts into the interpretation of projective protocols. **Chabert (2003)** and **Roman (2015)** demonstrate that this development has considerably expanded the psychoanalytic understanding of projective assessment without departing from its Freudian foundations.

Among the principal contributors, **Catherine Chabert (2003)** emphasized the articulation between psychoanalytic theory and projective methods, particularly in the study of narcissistic functioning, borderline organizations, depression, and subjectivity. Likewise, **Nina Rausch de Traubenberg (1990)** strengthened the structural interpretation of the Rorschach by integrating perceptual organization with symbolic functioning, thereby supporting structural rather than merely descriptive diagnostic formulations.

Subsequent contributions have further reinforced this perspective. **Roman (2015)** conceptualizes Rorschach and TAT protocols as forms of discourse through which unconscious organization becomes accessible, an approach closely aligned with Lacanian notions of the signifier and symbolic mediation. Similarly, **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)** demonstrate how projective assessment reveals unconscious relational configurations while maintaining rigorous psychoanalytic methodology.

Although **René Roussillon (2012)** cannot be considered exclusively Lacanian, his work on symbolization, trauma, narcissistic vulnerability, and borderline psychopathology provides an important theoretical bridge between psychoanalytic theory and projective assessment. Likewise, **de Tychey (2010)** contributed to integrating psychoanalytic psychopathology with projective methodology through his work on personality organization, structural diagnosis, and clinical assessment.

Collectively, these contributions have consolidated contemporary French projective psychology by shifting attention from descriptive personality assessment toward the analysis of discourse, symbolic organization, and unconscious subjectivity. As **Chabert (2003)**, **Roman (2015)**, and **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)** conclude, Lacanian concepts have substantially enriched projective interpretation while preserving the Freudian foundations of projective methods.

5.6. Toward an Integrative Lacanian Framework for Projective Clinical Practice

The preceding discussion demonstrates that Lacanian theory provides a coherent conceptual framework for enriching contemporary projective clinical practice without replacing established projective methodologies. Rather than introducing a distinct "Lacanian Rorschach" or "Lacanian TAT," **Lacan (2006)** offers a different way of conceptualizing the relationship between language, subjectivity, and unconscious processes. As **Chabert (2003)** and **Roman (2015)** argue, this perspective extends psychoanalytic interpretation by emphasizing discourse and symbolic organization rather than isolated symbolic contents.

Within this framework, concepts such as the **signifier**, **desire**, **lack**, **fantasy**, **jouissance**, and the **Other** provide valuable tools for understanding how the subject is positioned within language. **Fink (1997)**, **Roman (2015)**, and **Azoulay (2019)** emphasize that projective interpretation should therefore privilege the structural organization of discourse over the mere identification of thematic symbols.

Accordingly, projective assessment becomes an encounter with the speaking subject rather than a simple description of psychological characteristics.

Lacan (2006) conceives projective discourse as a privileged site through which unconscious organization becomes clinically accessible, while **Vanheule (2011)** and **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)** underline the value of this perspective for understanding symbolic mediation and structural psychopathology without reducing subjectivity to diagnostic categories.

Ultimately, the principal contribution of Lacanian theory to projective clinical practice lies not in proposing new scoring procedures but in transforming the clinician's mode of listening. By privileging language, discourse, and the structural organization of subjectivity, this perspective broadens the interpretative possibilities of projective methods while remaining fully consistent with the psychoanalytic tradition from which they emerged (**Roman, 2015; Chabert, 2003; Fink, 1997**).

6. Discussion

The present review demonstrates that **Jacques Lacan's** contribution extends beyond a reinterpretation of Freudian psychoanalysis to a structural reformulation of subjectivity. By conceptualizing the unconscious through language, the signifier, desire, the Other, lack, fantasy, and *jouissance*, **Lacan (1977, 2006)** provided a coherent theoretical framework for understanding unconscious processes as symbolically mediated rather than exclusively intrapsychic. As **Fink (1997)** argues, these concepts continue to shape contemporary psychoanalytic theory because they explain how subjectivity is constituted through discourse and symbolic relations.

A central argument of this article is that Lacanian theory remains highly relevant to contemporary projective clinical practice, despite the absence of a projective methodology explicitly developed by Lacan. Its contribution lies not in introducing new assessment techniques but in offering conceptual tools that deepen the structural interpretation of projective protocols. **Chabert (2003)** and **Roman (2015)** show that this perspective broadens projective interpretation by emphasizing discourse, the organization of signifiers, and the subject's relation to desire and the Other.

The contemporary French projective tradition illustrates this development through the work of **Chabert (2003)**, **Rausch de Traubenberg (1990)**, **Roman (2015)**, **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)**, **Roussillon (2012)**, and **de Tychey (2010)**. Collectively, these authors demonstrate that projective

methods can integrate psychoanalytic depth with methodological rigor, thereby extending clinical understanding beyond descriptive personality assessment.

At the same time, theoretical precision requires distinguishing Lacan's original contributions from later developments in French projective psychology. As **Vanheule (2011)** and **Fink (1997)** emphasize, the interpretation of Rorschach and TAT protocols through Lacanian concepts represents a contemporary application of his theoretical framework rather than a methodology explicitly formulated by Lacan.

Overall, this review supports an integrative perspective in which Lacanian psychoanalysis enriches contemporary projective assessment by providing conceptual tools for understanding discourse, symbolic organization, and unconscious subjectivity while remaining fully consistent with the methodological principles of projective clinical practice.

7. Clinical Implications and Future Directions

The dialogue between Lacanian psychoanalysis and contemporary projective assessment offers valuable perspectives for clinical practice. Rather than reducing projective methods to instruments of personality description, **Roman (2015)** and **Chabert (2003)** argue that they provide privileged opportunities to examine how unconscious subjectivity is articulated through discourse, symbolization, and desire.

This perspective is particularly relevant for contemporary clinical populations characterized by complex psychopathological organizations, including borderline conditions, narcissistic vulnerabilities, traumatic experiences, and identity disturbances. **Roussillon (2012)**, Vanheule (2011, 2024) emphasize that Lacanian concepts complement traditional projective approaches by facilitating a structural understanding of language, symbolic mediation, and the subject's relationship to the Other.

At the same time, the integration of Lacanian concepts into projective assessment requires both theoretical precision and methodological rigor. **Chabert (2003)** and **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)** stress that projective interpretation should neither be reduced to the application of psychoanalytic

concepts nor detached from the methodological principles that govern contemporary projective practice. Instead, both traditions should be regarded as complementary frameworks that enrich clinical assessment.

Future research should examine the contribution of Lacanian concepts to the interpretation of Rorschach and TAT protocols across different psychopathological structures, developmental stages, and cultural contexts. As **Roman (2015)** and **Azoulay (2019)** suggest, such investigations would strengthen the dialogue between psychoanalysis and projective assessment while further advancing their contribution to contemporary clinical psychology.

8. Conclusion

This review has demonstrated that **Jacques Lacan's** reformulation of Freudian psychoanalysis continues to provide one of the most coherent theoretical frameworks for understanding subjectivity. By conceptualizing the unconscious through language, the signifier, desire, the Other, lack, fantasy, *jouissance*, and the three registers of the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real, **Lacan (1977, 2006)** profoundly reshaped psychoanalytic theory and its clinical implications.

Although Lacan never developed a specific theory of projective assessment, **Chabert (2003)**, **Roman (2015)**, and **Emmanuelli and Azoulay (2021)** demonstrate that his concepts have significantly enriched contemporary French projective clinical practice. Rather than proposing new interpretative procedures, the Lacanian perspective deepens projective interpretation by emphasizing discourse, symbolic organization, and the subject's relationship to language and desire.

The principal contribution of this article is to clarify that the application of Lacanian concepts to projective methods represents a contemporary theoretical development rather than a methodology explicitly formulated by Lacan himself. Maintaining this distinction preserves both the historical integrity of Lacanian thought and the methodological specificity of projective assessment.

Ultimately, the dialogue between Lacanian psychoanalysis and contemporary projective clinical practice remains an open field of inquiry.

By integrating structural psychoanalytic concepts with established projective methodologies, future theoretical and empirical research may further strengthen the contribution of projective assessment to contemporary clinical psychology.

References:

1.Anzieu, D. (1986). Les méthodes projectives. Presses Universitaires de France.
2.Azoulay, C. (2007). Les méthodes projectives aujourd'hui. Duno
3.Azoulay, C. (2019). Les méthodes projectives. Dunod.
4. Azoulay,C.Emmanuelli,M.Denis,C.(2022).Nouveau manuel de cotation des formes au Rorschach.Dunod.
5.Boekholt, M. (2000). Épreuves projectives et psychanalyse. Dunod.
6.Boualagua, F. Z. (2018). Quando il pittore incontra il Rorschach. In G. Gandino & D. Di Paola (Eds.), Il Rorschach e i metodi proiettivi come possibilità narrativa (pp. 143–150). Aracne Editrice. https://doi.org/10.4399/97888255146121
7.Chabert, C. (1998). Psychanalyse et méthodes projectives. Dunod.
8.Chabert, C. (2003). Les épreuves projectives en clinique adulte. Dunod.
9.de Tychey, C. (2010). La clinique projective contemporaine. Dunod.
10.Emmanuelli, M. (2004). L'examen psychologique en clinique. Dunod.
11.Evans, D. (1996). An introductory dictionary of Lacanian psychoanalysis. Routledge.
12.Fink, B. (1995). The Lacanian subject: Between language and jouissance. Princeton University Press.
13. Fink, B. (1997). A clinical introduction to Lacanian psychoanalysis: Theory and technique. Harvard University Press.
14. Freud, S. (1900/1953). The interpretation of dreams (J. Strachey, Trans. & Ed., Standard Edition, Vols. 4–5). Hogarth Press.
15. Freud, S. (1915/1957). The unconscious. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 14, pp. 159–215). Hogarth Press.
16. Freud, S. (1923/1961). The ego and the id. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 19, pp. 1–66). Hogarth Press.
17. Homer, S. (2005). Jacques Lacan. Routledge.

18. Hook, D., Vanheule, S., & Neill, C. (Eds.). (2023). Reading Lacan's Écrits. Routledge.
19. Kojève, A. (1969). Introduction to the reading of Hegel (J. H. Nichols Jr., Trans.). Basic Books.
20. Lacan, J. (1977). Écrits: A selection (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Tavistock.
21. Lacan, J. (1978). The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis (A. Sheridan, Trans.). W. W. Norton.
22. Lacan, J. (1993). The psychoses: The seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book III (1955–1956) (R. Grigg, Trans.). Routledge.
23. Lacan, J. (1998). On feminine sexuality: The limits of love and knowledge: The seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XX, Encore (1972–1973) (B. Fink, Trans.). W. W. Norton.
24. Lacan, J. (2006). Écrits (B. Fink, Trans.). W. W. Norton. (Original work published 1966)
25. Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963). Structural anthropology (C. Jacobson & B. G. Schoepf, Trans.). Basic Books.
26. Nobus, D. (2021). The law of desire: On Lacan's "Kant with Sade". Routledge.
27. Rausch de Traubenberg, N. (1998). La pratique du Rorschach. Dunod.
28. Ricoeur, P. (1984). Time and narrative (Vol. 1). University of Chicago Press.
29. Roman, P. (2015). Psychologie projective et clinique contemporaine. Dunod.
30. Roudinesco, É. (1997). Jacques Lacan. Columbia University Press.
31. Roussillon, R. (2011). Primitive agony and symbolization. Karnac.
32. Saussure, F. de. (1983). Course in general linguistics (R. Harris, Trans.). Duckworth. (Original work published 1916)
33. Vanheule, S. (2011). The subject of psychosis: A Lacanian perspective. Palgrave Macmillan.
34. Vanheule, S. (2024). Lacanian psychoanalysis: A clinical casebook. Routledge.