

are all bringing us closer to such consequences. However, as much as such suppositions seem intellectually attractive, they should not be taken too far, but they should serve as an indication of some of the complex effects of audio-visual production, which is woven in the fabric of society. Here we are talking, of course, about symbolic exchanges within any society. Therefore, there is no doubt that the identity in the framework of culture by and large functions as a recognition scheme, within which the audio-visual production provides many particular views, angles, objects, gazes, suggestions and so forth, which modify ways of seeing things and also ways of “being seen”. It should be added that the instance of “being seen” involves the *being* as such, which is the category of existence and of the existentialist philosophy.

Lacan’s theory of gaze that was developed in his most quoted seminar can be quite helpful for comprehending the extent of this. Lacan’s explanation of a little incident from his youth with a fisherman Petit-Jean has some methodological value for what we are trying to illustrate here. Petit-Jean’s claim that the can glittering on the surface of the water “doesn’t see you!” as we know, engaged Lacan’s thinking quite a lot: “To begin with, if what Petit-Jean said to me, namely, that the can did not see me, had any meaning, it was because in a sense, it was looking at me, all the same. It was looking at me at the level of the point of light, the point at which everything that looks at me is situated – and I am not speaking metaphorically” (Lacan. 1979, p. 95). Why Lacan finds it necessary and, actually, so prominent to stress that he “wasn’t speaking metaphorically”? Taking into account his relation with the group of fishermen, what we can characterise as a culturally structured situation, Lacan demonstrates how the subject, in a “form” of Lacan himself in this case, is thrown out of picture. Although in this chapter Lacan is not concentrating on identity, the process, if I may say so, of gazing and especially being seen by the objects, could be apprehended as a kind of a process of identifying. Here we cannot but evoke one of the most impertinent and beautiful *finales* in film history, namely the end of Godard’s film *Pierrot le fou* (1965), in which the Belmondo character commits a very bizarre suicide at the sea shore. As the cords of dynamite sticks that he wraps abundantly around his head explode, and the subject goes up in smoke, camera turns toward the setting sun on the line of seas’ horizon. It is the intense light of this final shot, accompanied by Rimbaud’s verses,² which bear a resemblance to the scene of Lacan’s vision of a vision. The differ-

2 Verses were taken from Rimbaud’s poem *L’Éternité* (May 1872), which starts and finishes with this “dialogic” stanza: “Elle est retrouvée./Quoi ? – L’Éternité. C’est la mer alée/ Avec le soleil.”