

# **SEMINAR XXIII**

## **JOYCE AND THE SINTHOME**

### **SUMMARY**

SUMMER SCHOOL  
15-19 juli 2019  
Ghent University

**Lieven Jonckheere**

# INTRODUCTION

We will waste no time on a general introduction

Let's get to the point immediately

We will try to read together Lacan's Seminar XXIII

This is the seminar where Lacan inaugurates something radically new

- From the theoretical point of view he inaugurates a radically new definition of the symptom, called the sinthom
- Which implies or presupposes (difficult to judge)
  - a radically new clinical approach of psychosis
  - the most radical questioning of psychoanalysis itself (cf. JAM at the back flap)

this questioning of the theory of the symptom, the clinic of psychosis and the art of psychonalysis

- are based on the case of James Joyce as a writer, the function of writing for Joyce
- are made possible thanks to the topology of the bo-knot or bo-chain

When you start reading a seminar of Lacan – at least when you start reading a seminar already edited by JAM – you should always take into account the way this Seminar is organised according to JAM  
This organisation shows through in the titles JAM adds – titles on 3 levels

In each Seminar

- JAM distinguishes and names the big articulations or parts
- JAM gives each lesson a title
- At the beginning of each lesson JAM designates the main themes of that lesson  
– with a kind of subtitles

In the case of Sem XXIII JAM distinguishes and names 3 parts or articulations

these parts are the 3 subjects of this seminar

- Bo-chain = esprit spirit 28
  - Lacan does not any longer approach the symptom, psychosis and psychoanalysis in the spirit, along the lines of the classic geometry  
= topology of spheres, of inside-outside
  - But Lacan questions the symptom, psychosis and psychoanalysis in the spirit *esprit*, along the lines of a new geometry  
= topology of bags and cords, topology of the bo-knot
- Joyce = piste trail Lacan is following
  - Lacan does not any longer approach the symptom, psychosis and psychoanalysis on the heels of Oedipus and in the Name-of-the-Father
  - But Lacan questions the symptom, psychosis and psychoanalysis – by following how Joyced's writership or 'pen' repaired the consequences for RSI of the failing of the father  
see back flap JAM  
"Like Dante taking the hand of Vergilius, Lacan takes the hand of Joyce when venturing into a new domain, into hell
- Real = invention invention by Lacan
  - Freud discovered the Ucs = S = structured like a language  
and also the I=imaginary of narcissism as determined by or dependent upon S=Ucs  
 $S \rightarrow I$
  - But Lacan goes beyond Freud's invention of the Ucs and narcissism – with his invention of a new form of the R that is and insists completely outside S and I = *ex-sistence*  
a real that has to hold together S and I, because I is not any longer as determined by S  
 $S // I \rightarrow$  need for inventing R

We have 5 meetings or lessons of 1 ½ hour

- LESSON 1
  - **Lalangue** – what is it, how does it work and what is this lalangue in the case of Joyce
  - sinthome – how does the Name of the Father function as a symbolic sinthome and what is the sinthome in the case of Joyce?
- LESSON 2
  - Topology as a new approach of S, I and R
  - The possible clinical uses of topology, topology in the PA praxis or clinic
- LESSON 3
  - a preliminary classic structural approach of Joyce's madness (or psychosis?)
  - 2 experimental topological approaches 2 of Joyce's madness (or psychosis?)
- LESSON 4
  - The Real as Lacan's invention
  - responsibilities or forced choices for the **parlêtre** speechbeing in front of the Real of the impossible sexual rapport
    - choose cognizance=I // Ucs=S // sinthome=R
    - choose for the construction of a sexual rapport with the other sexe – or not
- LESSON 5
  - All kinds of unanalysables: Joyce, Jesuit catholics, Japanese, English

# **LESSON 1**

## **LALANGUE THE FATHER AS A SINHOME**

## **LALANGUE** **LANGUAGE / UNCONSCIOUS** **INTERPRETATION**

### **lalangue**

first mentioned in SemXIX / developed in SemXX / best explanation or account SemXXIII 110, 117

throughout SemXXIII Lacan approaches **lalangue** on 4 levels:

- mythical-structural level – in the relation of woman and man
- subjective-developmental level – in the relation of mother and child
- clinical-practical level – in supervision, in the relation between analyst and analysant
- in the clinical case of Joyce's madness (psychosis??) of

also a digression: Chomsky's theory of language

## **lalangue on a mythical- structural level in the relation of man and woman**

at each moment in time **lalangue** is first created by the open set=**ensemble** of women  
and then 'organised' or 'transformed' into language by the all=**tout** men

- time 1: lalangue – created by women as a set **ensemble**
  - woman is Real  
woman = not all **pas tout** / women have to be taken one by one / women = a set=**ensemble**
  - women as a set create/invent all kind of new **lalangues**
    - basis = 'sounds' or lallations
      - historically these 'sounds'  
= crumbles of latin, when latin was falling apart **se décompose**
      - but this happens at each moment  
always with the crumbles of a tongue in decomposition???
      - always with the lallations of children??
    - via a primary form of writing
      - women apply a primary writing upon these crumbles, sounds, lallations
      - amongst each other women explore all the ways these sounds can be written in a particular tongue **langue**
    - result = **lalangue**
      - all the ways sounds, latin-crumbles, lallations can be written  
all possible equivoques that are possible within a language  
eg. *ce qu'on dit ment* = *ce condiment* 17  
what we say always lies = that spice or condiment  
lies spicy up language
      - **lalangue** = language as a body  
corps du S = **lalangue** – cf. fonction&champ: **langage est corps subtil**
      - **lalangue** = prothesis for these sounds, crumbling latin, lallations
- time 2: language – men as all **tout** transform **lalangue** into language=Signifiers
  - man = all **tout**
    - man = the all
    - man = Imaginary form of S = man as an idea (**dée**) **Plato?**
  - how does man transform **lalangue** into language or signifiers  
via the syntax = introduction of constructive element in **lalangue**
    - sentence structure
    - conjugation of words
  - result = language
    - language = lucubration of knowledge **élucubration de savoir** about **lalangue**
    - language = signifier as primary element, as one-un  
the all **tout** of men is holder/bearer **porteur** of the signifier

## **lalangue on a subjective–developmental level in the relation of mother and child**

the child receives language from its mother

– but this language is heard as a **lalangue**, with all of its associated affects=jouissance

the child has to make language or signifiers out of it – at the cost of developing his own particular Ucs

- time 1: women as a set create **lalangue**
- time 2: men as a whole create language
- time 3: mother speaking this language – but it is heard as a **lalangue**  
mother embodies the lallation for the child = **langue maternelle**
- time 4: subject
  - subject has to write the mother's lallation – in a kind of primary writing  
mother's **lalangue** can be written in different manners = mother speaks in equivokes
    - these motherly equivokes are not yet signifiers  
there's no primary element or signifier that can be isolated as one=**un**  
the one-**un** remains undecided : is it the phoneme ? the word ? the sentence ? the whole of thought ?
    - these motherly equivokes communicate affects **affects**  
these equivokes contain affects, and transfer affects  
these affects have something obscene about them = jouissance!!  
**lalangue**=obscenity
  - mother **lalangue** with its equivokes  
child divides itself between common language and its own Ucs
    - Subject in a hurry, head over heels, learns language of the Other (all men)  
common lucubration of knowledge about **lalangue**
    - Subject at the same time develops his own particular unconscious  
in as much as **lalangue maternelle** could not be 'understood' in language of Other (all men)
      - symbolic Ucs = structured like a language  
a kind of inconceivably private lucubration of knowledge about **lalangue maternelle**
      - real Ucs = **savoir-faire** with **lalangue maternelle**



**lalangue on a clinical-practical level  
in the relation of analyst and analysant**

XXIII, 17

the term supervision

- **contrôle** = contre role
- **super-audition** super-audition (cf. CEUNA)

supervision – but for whom?

- not supervision of 'psychoanalytically inspired' therapists,  
but supervision of 'real analysts' = analyst as produced by the pass
- preferably 'fresh' analysts = who still have some anxiety before the emergence of transference and  
the place they are assigned in this transference (cf. SemX)

## 2 times in the supervision of analysts

- time 1 of supervision
  - fresh young analyst goes for it like a rhino / they go barging in any old how because they are enthusiastic about the Ucs / they smell the Ucs of the Other
    - symbolic interpretation of the Ucs structured as a language (metaphor) the play of the signifiers
    - this interpretation follows the model of the interpretation by the Ucs itself SemXI  
*l'inconscient a déjà procédé par interprétation*
    - this interpretation produces more and more sexual meaning *sens sexuel*
  - Lacan goes along with them, because "they're always right"
    - right = if they are real analysts!! Follow their nose, they smell the Ucs
    - but also some irony: problem of *autisme à deux* SemXXIV  
= 2 interpretations by the Ucs
      - analysant enjoys his Ucs
      - analyst enjoy their interpretation that is equivalent to the Ucs
- time 2 of supervision

Lacan interrupts this rhino-analyst, this enthusiastic symbolic interpretation by pointing out what could be a real interpretation

  - Lacan points out an equivoue which the overenthusiastic (about the Ucs) analyst did not note and how he/she could have played on it
    - example ELaurent 1991
      - ELaurent:  
anxious question: "how to refrain a subject from undergoing unnecessary plastic surgery on his nose?"
      - Lacan:
        - "tell him that it is not the appropriate time *pas de saison* for *le nouveau né* "  
*nouveau né* = equivoue: 'newly born' + 'new nose'  
new nose (as a castration!) is this patient's answer to the question of becoming a father or not
        - "and say this vigourously *fortement* but with *tact*"  
delicacy, diplomacy = see how the field or terrain is at the moment, wait for the right moment
    - In the same spirit of what Freud already remarked
      - *Glanz auf der Nase* = glance at the nose
      - *Käfer!* = *que faire?*  
equivoue between two languages
  - playing on the equivoue, playing on the letter = real interpretation

- playing on the equivocal, playing on the letter = real interpretation  
not any longer the play on the signifiers that produces sexual meaning  
but the play on the letter makes resonate the pulsion/drive in the signifier, it mobilizes something of the jouissance  
in order to understand this, Lacan gives an aphoristic summary of his drive-theory 17, 40
  - starting point = confrontation between
    - on the one hand: Imaginary body with its orifices
    - on the other hand: the fact of a saying *il y a un dire*
  - effect  
drives = echo=resonance in the bodily orifices of the saying *écho du dire dans le corps*  
R of the drive establishes an accord=resonance between body=I and language=S
    - freudian orifices
      - echo=resonance of saying in the mouth = oral drive with breast as object
      - echo=resonance of saying in the anus = anal drive with faeces as object
    - lacanian orifices
      - echo=resonance of saying in the ear = invocative drive with voice *voix* as object
      - echo=resonance of saying in the eye = scopic drive with gaze *regard* as object  
but gaze is hidden by the dominance of Imaginary = i(a) = body-image  
cf. stranglehold *emprise* of the gaze on the obsessional 18  
*not the gaze but the body image as seen in the mirror!!!! VIII, 306: phallic inflation*  
cf. fable Lafontaine: "The Frog who wanted to be as big as The Ox"
        - i(a) captivates, fascinates ...
        - ... but in fact i(a) is nothing but a a bag/bubble
          - a bag that can explode ...
          - ... and reveal itself as being nothing but a big bag of shit (anal object in it)
  - result of Real interpretation
    - breaks through *autisme à deux* Sem XXIV  
*lalangue* as a common affair allows for braking the *autisme à deux* of each his own enjoyment of his own Ucs
    - shift from symptom to sinthome
      - équivoque is all we have as a weapon against the symptom
      - équivoque might free up something of the sinthome

## digression

### Chomsky's theory of language 31, 39

"Rules and Representations 1980

Lacan already knew Chomsky's ideas in december 1975

cf. visit at USA Universities (november 1975)

Stuart Schneidermann questions Lacan on Chomsky

- basic assumption: body is equipped with organs
  - these organs develop during the life of the individual
  - different kinds of organs
    - physical organs – eg hand
    - mental organs – eg language
- these organs are tools [outil](#) which serve to to apprehend=catch  
organ-tools can apprehend=catch 2 things
  - organ-tools can apprehend=catch external objects  
based on the belief in the existence of objects as 'real'
    - hand can catch an apple as something 'real'
    - language can also catch something 'real'  
language = signs=messages from the 'real'  
cf. genetic information on the 3-dimensional double helix of DNA molecule are messages of the Real that in-form the organism
  - but these organ-tools can also apprehend=catch themselves:
    - hand can take itself?  
↔ Lacan: the hand knows nothing of the other hand 43  
**over de randen van mijn handen tasten mijn handen naar mijn andere handen**
    - language can apprehend=capture itself  
↔ Lacan: no metalanguage, no language that captures language
- problem with this theory of language
  - the lacanian R is spirited away  
Chomsky's 'real' is but a symptom, something you have to believe in 39
  - metaphor is reduced to metonymy 41
    - language goes much further than what is effectively said = metaphor
    - but we=Chomsky always limit the scope of metaphor to a metonymy

## some scraps **bouts** of Lacan's 'theory of language'

- language = hole **trou**  
no language without hole
  - language does not apprehend=catch=grasp an object **saisir** *Begriff*
    - there's no object as such, no object-aim of desire (in the metonymie of desire) (Sem X)
    - Language is not a whole, an aggregate of messages from the Real, from the Real objects
  - language is/constitutes a hole in R **fait trou dans le R** = language eats=devours **mange** R
    - language does not get a grip **prise** on R by catching objects in R, but by making holes in R
    - there's only an object-cause of desire – lost object = object as hole
- language = metaphor  
no language without metaphor
  - language always goes much further than what is effectively said = metaphor
  - **this is the meaning **sens****
- language = not without symptom  
no language without symptom
  - **man's relation to language always induces symptoms in man to speak is to develop symptoms**
  - symptom is hooked onto S=language 39  
(symptom and symbol=S constitute a false hole)

***PARLÊTRE* = RSI + 4TH=SINTHOME  
THE FATHER AS 4TH=SINTHOME**

**Speechbeing = bo-chain = RSI + 4th=sinthome**

speechbeing = bo-chain

speechbeing = RSI + 4th=sinthom

- RSI are not linked *distinct*
- So there's always this need for a 4th element
  - already in Lacan's first teachings – cf. JAM fourfold structures in Lacan's teachings at the occasion of his award as doctor honoris causa UGent 1985
  - title Sem XXIII could have been "Four"

## Real

### Towards a first definition of the Real at the end of SemXXIII

- beginning SemXXIII  
Lacan does not have yet a clear cut definition of the Real  
SemXXIII is the search for a definition of the R
- end SemXXIII  
Lacan first definition of the R
  - = task/assignment: note all the expressions for the Real
  - cf. invention invention

## Imaginary

### Towards a new definition of imaginary at the end of SemXXIII

but only at the end of SemXXIII – as a result of the study of Joyce

- beginning SemXXIII  
classic definition of the Imaginary – based on the mirror stage 66  
our self-love as speechbeing makes us imagine that we have a mind and a body
  - we imagine that we have a body corps
    - we have no body – the body can clear off at any moment
    - nevertheless we do believe we have a body
      - this body is based on the mirror image
        - body = surface or bag closed with a cord (residue of consistency)
        - body = paunch=pense=pens=buikvanfles ...”(equivoque on pense)
      - this body makes up our consistency 65
        - consistency = what holds together  
cf. body does not evaporate, it subsists while being used up or consumed
        - but this consistency is not real, it's only a 'mental' consistency  
we disapprove mépris what our body really is and reach for the wrong thing  
méprise
      - this makes us ambivalent towards our body  
based on the equivoque: mon corps, je le suis = je l'essuie
        - positive: mon corps je le suis = I am my body  
sexual adoration for our body = only 'rapport' with our body  
rapport = hypnosis: we are hypnotized by our body
        - negative: mon corps, je l'essuie = I suffer my body
  - we imagine that we have a mind/mentality mental
    - we have no mind – man can lose his mind at any moment
    - nevertheless we believe we do have a mind  
this mind has 2 complications or problems:
      - the mind lies ment-alité / mental(e)ment  
cf. we make facts by saying “this is a fact” → all facts are 'false' or 'artificial'
      - the mind feels senti-mentalité / mental sent  
it is not the mind that feels but we feel the weight of this mind
- end SemXXIII  
new definition of the Imaginary – based on Joyce's different writer's ego's  
see lesson 3 about Joyce

## Symbolic

### a double definition of the Symbolic throughout SemXXIII

double definition of S is the result of previous seminars

- throughout Sem XXIII  
classic Symbolic definition of Ucs – as  $S1 \rightarrow S2$  = masterdiscourse 73
  - first formulation 23
    - $S1 \rightarrow S2$   
S1 linked with S2 thanks to the signified  
signified = sign of arbitration (umpire) between S1/S2, for the choice of these signifiers = imaginary forcing = a kind of 'independent will' suggesting to one to manhandle the other
    - divided subject supposed on locus of truth = subject half-saying the truth
    - object a on the locus of the product (discourse as artisan!)
  - second formulation
    - start: enigma of enunciation=*dire* (fact closed upon itself = the fact of the fact = the pinnacle (*faîte*) of the fact or the fact of the pinnacle) (place of truth in discourse)
    - what is enunciated=*dit* (not uttered!!) ( $S1 \rightarrow S2$ )
    - division subject (rather object a)
- throughout Sem XXIII  
new Real definition of Ucs – as the letter or Signifier on its own  
 $S1 // S2$  = detached
  - $S1$  = ambiguity 1/0
    - indicates the one *un* (1) ...  
based on unary trait
    - ... as an empty bag *sac* or set *ensemble* (0)  
based on the body-image  $i(a)$  = body without organs (JAM)
  - $S2$  = symbol

## 4th=sinthome

at the very beginning of SemXXIII Lacan comes straight to the point

necessity of 4th element in order to link the *distinct* separate orders of RSI

– and this 4th element is the sinthome



**the Name-of-the-Father is the first=Symbolic or structural version of the 4th=sinthome  
SemXXIII is a search for other forms of 4th=sinthome – I sinthoms and R sinthoms??**

father has to have 3 sides/faces in order to function as a sinthome 22, 150

- father 1 = Name-of-the-Father or father-of-the-Law = dead father
  - father 2 = Jouissance-of-the-Father or [père-version](#) = living father
  - father 3 = Father-of-the-Name = father who makes a fool of himself  
– by trying to guess the already godgiven names
- 
- father 1 = Name-of-the-Father or father-of-the-Law = dead father  
cf. first period of Lacan's teaching  
cf. Preliminary Question 1958-1959
    - what is the Signifier of the Name-of-the-Father?
      - the Signifier of the Name-of-the-Father? is result of redoubling of Symbolic  
[E578 Nom-du-Père redouble à la place de l'Autre le signifiant lui-même du ternaire symbolique, en tant qu'il \(NdP\) constitue la loi du signifiant.](#)  
"Name of the Father redoubles in the Other's place the very signifier of the symbolic ternary, insofar as it (NdP) constitutes the law of the signifier"  
[E583 dans l'Autre, en tant que lieu du signifiant, le Nom-du-Père est le signifiant de l'Autre en tant que lieu de la loi.](#)  
"in the Other, as locus of the signifier, NdP is the signifier of the Other as locus of the Law"
      - Signifier of the Name-of-the-Father takes the place of the lack of signifier of the Other  
Cf. Subversion 1960  
[E813 dans l'Autre comme lieu du signifiant, la seule garantie pour un énoncé d'autorité est son énonciation même, car il est vain qu'il le cherche dans un autre signifiant, lequel d'aucune façon ne saurait apparaître hors de ce lieu. Il n'y a pas de métalangage qui puisse être parlé, il n'y a pas d'Autre de l'Autre. C'est en imposteur que se présente pour y suppléer, le Législateur \(celui qui prétend ériger la Loi\).](#)  
« in the Other as locus of the signifier the only guarantee for an authoritative statement is its very enunciation, since it would be pointless for the statement to seek it in another signifier, which could in no way appear outside that locus. There's no metalanguage that can be spoken, there's no Other of the Other. And when the Legislator (he who claims to lay down the Law) comes forward to make up for this, he does so as an impostor. »
    - The discourse of the mother guarantees the signifier of the Name-of-the-Father E579  
opposition:
      - [psychologie](#)  
[façon dont la mère s'accommode de la personne du père](#)
      - [psychoanalyse](#)
        - [cas que la mère fait de l'autorité de la parole du père](#)
        - [place que la mère réserve au Nom-du-Père dans la promotion de la loi](#)
- 
- opposition
- [psychologie](#)  
the way the mother accommodates the father as a person
  - [Psychoanalysis](#)
    - importance the mother attributes to the authority of the speech of the father
    - place she reserves for the Name-of-the-Father in the promotion of the law

- father 2 = Jouissance-of-the-Father = père-version = living father  
the name père-version suggests that there is something perverse about the father, something perverse about the jouissance of the father  
cf. 2 sides or times in the articulation of the relation of the father and the mother in Lacan
  - time 1: discourse of the mother has to introduce or guarantee the Symbolic Name of the Father
  - time 2: real father has to manifest himself outside the mother's discourse about him
    - bad way for the father to manifest himself outside of the mother's discourse E579  
paradoxe de la relation du père à la loi explique les possibles effets ravageants du père
      - père a réellement la fonction de législateur / il fait les lois
      - père se se prévaut de la loi (prétendre):  
se pose en pilier de la foi, en parangon de l'intégrité ou de la dévotion, en vertueux ou en virtuose, en servant d'une œuvre de salut (nation, natalité, sauvegarde, salubrité, legs, légalité, pur, pire, empire)  
= idéaux qui lui offrent l'occasions d'être en posture de démerite, d'insuffisance, de fraude = exclure le Nom-du-Père de sa position dans le signifiant  
paradox of the father's relation tot the law explains some potential devastating effects
        - when the father really is a legislator, he really makes the laws
        - when the father boasts that he makes laws  
presenting himself as an ideal: pillar of faith, parangon of integrity or devotion, virtuous or virtuoso, servant of a charitable cause (nation or birth rate, safety or salubrity, legacy or law, the pure, the lowest of the low, or the empire)  
= opportunities to seem to be at fault, to fall short, to be fraudulent  
= opportunities to exclude the Name-of-the Father from its position in the signifier
    - good way for the father to manifest himself outside of the mother's discourse cf. SemXXII  
two elements:
      - father as an exception  
paradox: it's only by being an exception that a man can realise the type of the father function
        - first of all this position of exception has to be accessible to any man
        - but in the end it is important that not any man can achieve this position of exception
      - the essential symptom of the father
        - the father may have symptoms (normality is not what is required from a father)
        - but in the tend the father has to have one essential symptom  
amour père-versement orienté perverse love for the mother of the child  
= paternal perversion  
she is his object a, an object in his fantasy – causing his desire
        - on this base he has to intervene exceptionally (again) in education  
– making sure that the child does not see immediately what is at stake in what het does not say (his mi-Dieu or non-dire, his not being too principled)  
↔ Schrebers father = always represents the law, always educates
        - result: father is entitled to respect and love of his child

- father 3 = Father-of-the-Name père du nom 22  
cf. process of naming=*nommer* = a mockery *semblant*
- stage 1 of naming = God creates  
and has already given names in secret – God creates by naming things
- stage 2 of naming = God instructs Adam = Father??? to give names to his divine creations  
this is a joke, a mockery (mock-heroic)
  - given: tongue (*langue*) of Eve = *lalangue ??*
  - Adam: has to name everything – but with a double problem:
    - has to do this in the tongue *lalangue* of Eve (Adam=Madam!)
    - has to guess the god-given names  
divine creation doubled by the parley *parlote* of the *parlêtre*
  - afterwards Eve is the first to use this naming by Adam  
– and the problems begin:
    - Eve talks to the serpent (identified by Adam!!)
    - Eve (first – really??) and then Adam (second) bite into the apple  
original sin (cf. sin-thome)
    - Both (or only Adam??) becomes anxious
      - clench their buttocks = making a thin split  
*faille* = fault (reasoning), weak spot, crack, fissure, split, slit (vagina)
      - but this split does not stop growing bigger and bigger  
*ne cesse pas* = necessity
    - solution for this anxiety = phallus or castration  
**full solution for Adam – for Eve only a partial solution**
      - *faut-pas / faux pas* = you may not / false step
      - the *cesse*="stop!" of the castration as possible  
possible = *cesser de s'écrire* = what would stop being written (or writing itself) in  
case a discourse would come to be that is not a semblance)
- stage 3 of naming = science names 'nature'
  - science names something 'nature' / decides what is The Law of Nature  
bv "sex is natural" (because in man there's no naturally sexual relation)
  - science excludes real nature  
real nature = pot-pourri of everything not part of what is named nature  
*la nature n'est pas une* – nature is not one/whole

## **LESSON 2**

### **TOPOLOGY AS A NEW GEOMETRY TOWARDS A TOPOLOGICAL CLINIC**

**TOPOLOGY**  
**2 MORES=HABITS=CUSTOMS=MANNERS OF GEOMETRY**

**2 mores=habits=customs=manners of geometry**  
**(cf. *more geometrico*)**

- geometry
  - measuring of the earth=geo
  - try to get grip on space, conception of space
- 2 types of geometry
  - classical geometry
    - Imaginary conception of space, based on our body image
    - Starting from the basic opposition inside/outside as presented by the sphere
  - new geometry = topology  
we must immediately distinguish between 2 types of topology
    - both are not based on our body image
    - both do not start from the opposition inside/outside

## 2 types of topology

- topology of surfaces
  - Sém IX – SemXIV
    - examples  
Möbius strip, cross-caps, torus, etc
    - important point:  
what is a real hole **trou** = a hole that cannot be reduced  
cf. function of Möbius ring as a frame
    - what do these surfaces teach us?  
non rapport with the object – and how to remedy it with the fantasy  
**cf. fantasy = relationship between 'heterogeneous' elements??**  
**QP E553-554 note and E905-906**
- topology of knots
  - Sém XIX, 91 – SemXXIV
    - examples  
based on rings=circles = line stretching to infinity
      - chain=link=**chaîne** (made of several circles that are linked)
      - knot=**noeud** (made from one circle)  
this knot is derived from the chain – as its core
    - principle
      - wedging/clenching **coinçage**  
relation between any one thing and any other thing is a matter of wedging/clenching
        - ordinary=olympic chain – interlock)
        - bo-chain – do not interlock, but clench!!!
      - no standard chains  
only inconceivably private variations on 4-bo-chain = RSI + 4th  
36, 40 + notice JAM 202-203
        - Symbolic = Ucs (structured like a language)
          - The Ucs is Freud's version of the Symbolic  
other versions of the Symbolic exist – Joyce proves that
          - Symbolic = what constitutes/is a hole that cannot be made undone **fait trou**
          - cf. Freud *Urverdrängung* = primal repression
        - Imaginary = body i(a)
          - Narcissism or the mirror-based body (body-image) & mind (body-ego) is  
Freud's version of the Imaginary  
other versions of the Symbolic exist – Joyce proves that
          - Imaginary = what consists
          - due to our feeble-mindedness **débilité mentale** of our mind as constituted in the mirror phase, we cannot help imagine consistency – erroneously !!
        - Real = **jouissance of the body**
          - The jouissance of the body is Lacan's invention of a bit of Real  
other bits of Real do exist
          - Real = what ex-sists or exists&insists outside I and S, without link with I or S  
as radically different
          - cf. Real is **hors-sens** = outside meaning
        - 4th=sinthome
          - reduction of this 4th term is impossible (41)

- both of these types of topology baffle the symbolic and the Imaginary  
but this is especially the case for topology of the rings
- topology baffles the Imaginary
  - we cannot fall back upon our body-image
    - the feeble-mindedness of the Imaginary always makes us imagine consistency  
we only have eyes for the Imaginary side of bo-chains
    - consequence: structural clumsiness in handling topological figures
  - Lacan illustrates this during his Seminars – he's 'hopeless'
  - finally this implies a clinical ethic of clumsiness  
cf. [lalangue](#) interpretation with imperfect and even tasteless equivoques
- topology baffles the symbolic
  - we cannot fall back upon a mathematical theory  
no mathemes for topological figures and their transformations
  - Soury and Thomé try to develop this theory  
but Lacan each time tries to prove that there's no theory
  - finally this implies a clinical ethic of theorylessness  
cf. no interpretation based on theory  
cf. Freud: each case is new, each case subverts the theory, makes a hole in the theory

**no theory of knots yet? 46**  
**Soury & Thomé vs Lacan**

- who are Soury (and Thomé)
  - 2 mathematicians
  - post may 1968: tried to develop a new way of living together in “small groups” (3 or 4) homosexuals? Soury had a huge fascination and anxiety for The Woman and her jouissance
  - working with Lacan on the bo-chains Soury developed a huge transference (psychotic?)
    - and absolutely wanted to start an analysis with Lacan
    - as Lacan did not commit himself, Soury committed suicide, it is said (Roudinesco)
- topology according to Soury & Thomé
  - identify braintwisters/brainteasers **casse-têtes**
    - simple bo-chains problems which had not been raised yet
    - 2 ways of trying to make new bo-knots:
      - orientation  
RSI different color → orientation RSI → 2 different knots: levogyre=leftturning or dextrogyre=rightturning
      - order  
**cf. JAM XXIII, 202 – 3 orders**  
Order matters RSI – like a game of throwing rings:
        - first R, then S and finally I (linking both)
        - first S, then I and finally R (linking both)
        - first I, then R and finally S (linking both)
  - the solutions of these new bo-knots or bo-chains are singular
    - they cannot be mastered, repeated and transmitted easily
    - nevertheless they try to master, repeat and transmit these solutions
      - which means that they tried to develop a theory or matheem of the bo-knot



- Lacan's problems with topology according to Soury & Thomé
  - nothing new  
more often than not Lacan can 'prove' that Soury & Thomé's bo-chains are not new
    - are there an infinite number of different bo-chains?  
is there only one bo-chain? can all bo-chains be reduced to one basic bo-chain?
      - cf. Soury and Thomé try to demonstrate that there are 2 different 3-bo-chains 111 by orienting (giving a direction) and coloring the rings
      - Lacan demonstrates that it is enough to orient (give a direction) one ring but finally concludes that there's only one bo-chain???
  - in between Lacan uses direction/orientation and colour for other purposes:
    - orientation or direction sens  
for explaining the difference between truth/real
      - truth has as sens = direction/orientation (phallus) → meaning
      - real has no sens = no direction/orientation (phallus) → no meaning
    - color 116  
for explaining the difference between man/woman = truth/real
      - the only form of being être in sex is the being of a colour être de la couleur  
sexual beings = beings of colour
      - biosexual man and woman = rings that can take on 2 psychosexual beings=colors: a phallic color or a non-phallic color
        - biosexual woman can take on the psychosexual color of a man  
femme couleur d'homme = hysteria??
        - biosexual man can take on the psychosexual color of a woman
        - man with man's colour
        - woman with woman's colour
  - cf. table of sexuation SemXX
  - is the only relevant difference the difference between the 3-bo-chain and the 4-bo-chain?  
These problems question the relevance of the bo-knot for the clinic
- no theory  
Soury&Thomé cannot explain how they managed to find these new bo-knots  
they cannot develop a theory of the bo-knots, finding new bo-knots is not based on a theory  
how then do they find their new bo-knots?
  - Thanks to their gift (mathematicians)?  
Not caught in the Imaginary feeble-mindedness of the body-image? Psychotic??
  - thanks to their dialogue=conversation (friendship/supervision)?
    - Lacan desperately wants to dialogue at this moment of his teaching
    - once again a clinical ethic based on topology: the ethic of conversation  
cf. function of conversation for the new clinic JAM  
conversation is easier in the case of topological approach of the clinic  
you have to discuss about the one structure of a case  
you can discuss about several topological readings of a case

### what does topology of bo-chains and bo-knot teach or show/monstrate? 37

- establishes a relation between things not linked, between any one thing and any other thing
  - no rapport man/woman, between S/R/I – and how remedy it with a sinthome  
support of the sexual relationship as Real
  - no rapport R/SI – and how to remedy it with a sinthome  
RSI + sinthome = support of the subject as Real  
 $S1 \rightarrow S2 = \text{support of the subject as supposed}$
- making true holes out of fals holes = verification of the hole [trou](#) as being Real
  - true hole = hole that cannot be reduced
  - cf. possible reading of Lacan's teaching: how to make a true hole (out of a fals hole)  
the true hole makes life possible
    - \$ as a hole in the S (alienation)  
how to make this hole true? How to guarantee this hole?  
By the object a (separation), via the Möbius ring
    - 4 discourses as guarantee of 4 different holes
    - topology of surfaces = how to make a real hole
    - bo-chain guarantees a true hole

## TOWARDS A NEW TOPOLOGICAL CLINIC? A CLINIC OF THE BO-CHAIN?

5 forms of clinic / praxis where the bo-chain can make a contribution:

- with the 3-bo-chain  
at the same time
  - topological reading of Lacan's clinic of jouissance
  - topological reading of Freud's transstructural clinic of *Hemmung, Symptom, Angst*
- with the 3-bo-knot or trefoil-bo-knot
  - on the one hand: topological reading of the structural psychiatric clinic of neurosis/psychosis
  - on the other hand: topological reading of psychoanalysis as 'therapy' or 'remedy'
- with the 4-bo-knot  
towards different topological readings of Lacan's clinic of singularity

a topological reading of Lacan's clinic of jouissance 55

distribution of jouissance in 3-bo-chain

+

a topological reading of Freuds transstructural clinic of *Hemmung Symptom und Angst* 1926

Freud's *Hemmung Symptom und Angst* in the 3-bo-chain 48

main reference Sem XXII, 10/12/74

- Jouissance of the barred Other [Autre barré](#)  
jouissance of a woman / the jouissance of the body
  - junction  $R/I - R \rightarrow I$ 
    - jouissance of barred Other = R = ex-sistence
    - but this R of the jouissance of the barred Other casts a shadow on the I = anxiety  
anxiety = too much R jouissance of the barred Other  
anxiety = effect of ex-sistence of the R
  - exclusion of S  
the Other does not exist  
there is no Other of the Other = no Signifier outside  $S=A$
- phallic Jouissance (jouissance under/of the phallus=castration)
  - junction  $S/R - S \rightarrow R$ 
    - jouissance phallique = S = trou
    - but this S of the jouissance phallique casts a shadow in the R = symptom  
symptom = too much S jouissance phallique  
symptom = effect of the hole of the S
  - exclusion of  
cf. penile jouissance [pénis](#)  $\neq$  phallic jouissance
    - penile jouissance = outside (cf. Hans)
      - I reason  
mirror image 'makes' the body-image the support of gaps and at the same time makes the objects that fill these gaps (56)  
cf. penis lacks in het mirror image
      - S reason  
speech makes us experience penile jouissance as parasitic
  - phallic jouissance (castration) = inside
    - Ucs links speech to this parasitic penile jouissance  
and reintegrates it by making it phallic – via castration (56)
    - locus of might [pouvoir](#)

- (jouissance of) meaning [sens / jouis-sens](#)
  - junction of S/I –  $I \rightarrow S$ 
    - jouissance of meaning = I = consistence
    - but this I jouissance of meaning casts a shadow in the S = inhibition
      - inhibition = too much jouissance of meaning
      - inhibition = effect of the consistency of the I
      - inhibition = the hole of the S catches an I bodily function
    - inhibition feels uncanny/odd [inquiétante étrangeté](#) (a form of anxiety) but a different kind of inhibition towards bo-chains!!!
      - inhibition towards R of bo-chain is due to the feeble-mindedness of our mind (we always fall back on our body-image as formed in the mirror phase)
      - inhibition towards bo-chain does not feel uncanny – but simply stupid
  - exclusion of R
    - the R forecloses meaning (jouissance of meaning)
- objet (a) (56.72-73)
  - point of wedging/clenching [coincement](#) of RSI

## a topological reading of the structural psychiatric clinic psychosis and neurosis as trefoil-bo-knots and bo-chains

- starting point  
3-bo-chain can be simplified as trefoil-bo-knot or cloverleaf [noeud à trois / noeud trèfle](#)
  - R, S and I are all consistent=I, hole=S and ex-sistent=R (56)
  - for the reduction of the 3-bo-chain to the trefoil-bo-knot it is only important to remember that R, S and I all of the three ex-sist 50
    - Real = ex-sistence  
because it is stopped arrêt by S and I, butts cogne into S en I, runs up se heurter S and I  
no links with I or S, linked to nothing,
    - Symbolic = existence  
because it is stopped by R and I
    - Imaginary = existence  
because it is stopped by R and S
  - In this sense R, S and I are not distinct/different = RSI are analogous
  - thus R, S can form one single continuous consistence = trefoil-bo-knot 42, 45, 50, 53  
Nevertheless trefoil-knot cannot be transformed into a simple ring
    - RSI remain distinguished  
R, S and I can become 'longer' or 'shorter', but cannot be reduced to nothing
    - RSI wedge, grip something  
object (a) is fixed
- topological reading of the structural psychiatric clinic
  - paranoia = 'personality' = 1 trefoil-bo-knot 53
    - personality [personnalité](#)
      - paranoia = to have personality = to be a personality = to be yourself (delusion?)  
people with the strongest personalities are paranoiacs  
cf. "only paranoiacs will survive"
      - but even in neurotics to have a personality is a kind of paranoid symptom  
neurotic subject = a run-of-the mill or common paranoia [commun](#)  
cf. connaissance paranoïaque of the mirror stage also in neurotics!!  
cf. I want to get to know myself!!
    - paranoia or personality = RSI is a trefoil-bo-knot or a single continuous consistency  
[cf. L-schema Schreber E571](#)  
I fills up the holes in S
      - hole in S filled in an asymptotic way by "parole où se maintient le crée = I(A) ipv NdP
      - hole in I filled in an asymptotic way by "jouissance transsexualiste" = i(a) ipf  $\Phi$   
as a consequence the field of Reality collapses
    - [paranoia or 'personality' is the simplest form of the subject](#)
  - neurosis = subject = a bo-chain of minimum 4 trefoil-bo-knots 51, 53-54

- neurosis = subject = a bo-chain of minimum 4 trefoil-bo-knots 51, 53-54
  - minimal model for the topology of the neurotic subject
    - group of 3 RSI=trefoil-bo-knots  
group of 3 paranoiacs **3 paranoid entities**  
RSI=trefoil-bo-knot, RSI= trefoil-bo-knot, RSI= trefoil-bo-knot
    - + 4th=sinthome = a 'personality' (not necessarily a real paranoiac or trefoil-bo-knot)  
this leader-sinthome is the Name-of-the-Father
  - expanded model for the topology of the neurotic subject
    - braid **tresse/texture** of an infinite number of trefoil-bo-knots  
**infinite number of paranoid entities with continuity of RSI !!**
    - + flocculation (klontering = becoming lumpy) of potential 4th elements (not necessarily trefoil-bo-knots)
      - only some chosen **élus** 4th element = sinthome
      - in the case of neurosis these 4th elements always have a privileged relation with the Ucs=S  
**cf. alternative Names of the Father???**  
**cf. Name of the Father as redoubling of the S=Ucs!!!**

a topological reading of psychoanalytic therapy  
 making a 'paranoid personality' – but with 'an opening'  
 making a trefoil-bo-knot = making sutures of S/I and S/R **sutures** by splicing **épissures** them

72-73

- starting point
  - no Other of the Other → no jouissance of the Other of the Other
  - R = RSI are separated
- PA cure = answer to this Real. making sutures of RSI via splices  
 an especially stupid/daft **con** and 'artificial' answer = **therapy!!!???**  
**other solution than the 4th=sinthome??!**  
**not a solution that the subject uses, but only in PA as therapy???**
  - definitions
    - splice **épissure** (splits)
      - seaman's art: joining ropes seamlessly by interweaving the twines of these ropes
      - surgeon's art: joining the borders of a wound (model of cranial bones) – cf. irregularity!!
    - result = suture **suture**
      - suture = seam, joint  
cf. JAM on suture
      - text 1965
        - subject is absent in S, in its own discourse
        - nevertheless the subject is represented in S by a substitute **tenant-lieu** which closes the gap of the subject eg the object
      - SemXII
        - criticism SLeclaire: "analyst does not make sutures!"
        - Lacan defends JAM, referring to the **huit intérieur** Sém XI 244
          - how to prevent the subject at the end of PA from identifying with his analyst as an ideal I(A) – by putting oneself in the position of object (a)
          - identification with I(A) = suture??
  - PA cure = makes sutures via 2 typical splices  
 (and therefore Lacan calls PA = especially daft/stupid **con** response to the enigma)
    - splice of S&I  
 Symbolic = Ucs knowledge & Imaginary = ???  
 → produces meaning **sens therapeutic???**
    - splice of S&R  
 Symbolic = **sinthome?? Ucs knowledge!!** & Real = parasitic jouissance  
 → makes possible phallic jouissance  
 → **j'ouïs-sens = ouïr un sens** = jouissance of the hearing of meaning
    - **no splice of R&I ???**  
**trefoil-bo-knot remains open to the side of the jouissance of the barred Other !!! 73**  
**so therapy makes a paranoid personality – but with 'an opening'! What is this 'opening'?**



**towards a topological reading of Lacan's clinic of singularity  
the inconceivably private case of Joyce**

**See lesson 3**

# **LESSON 3**

## **JOYCE**

**WAS JOYCE MAD=PSYCHOTIC? FOU**  
**FROM WHAT POINT ON CAN YOU SAY THAT SOMEONE IS MAD=PSYCHOTIC?**

77-80, 83

Lacan does not seem to doubt Joyce's psychosis

So why then does Lacan never mention the term psychosis concerning Joyce??

With Joyce he wants to introduce a radically new way of looking at psychosis

- not contaminated with our preliminary knowledge (lacanian + psychiatric) about psychosis
- no limited to a kind of negative comparison with neurosis as a paradigm  
 (neurosis = Name of the Father – psychosis = no Name of the Father)

at the beginning of SemXXIII

first definition of the sinthome

based on the distinction between the orthodox freudian symptom and heretic Joycean symptom = sinthome?

throughout SemXXIII

3 approaches of Joyce's 'problem' with RSI and its symptomatic solutions by his being a writer

- classical structural approach – as a kind of preliminary?  
 with the symptom of being The Hero-Artist young Joyce makes himself a Father, Phallus and Ego
- 2 topological approaches of the evolution of Joyce's symptom of being a writer
  - first topological approach of Joyce's problem with RSI and its solution by being a writer  
 – based on the trefoil-bo-knot
  - second topological approach of Joyce's problem with RSI and its solution by being a writer  
 – based on the 4-bo-chain

## JOYCE AND THE SINTHOME SINTHOME VERSUS SYMPTOM

14

- to have an orthodox freudian symptom
  - symptom 'based' on principles of Thomas Aquinas  
[Saint Thomas d'Aquin](#) = [sinthome madaquin](#)  
Saint Thomas Aquinas = sinthom as-aquinas
  - 2 registers of the orthodox Freudian = Saint Thomas symptom
    - S register of Truth = law (of the Father) in the symptom  
symptom gives truth its place  
cf. Lacan's usual compliment for catholicism = only true religion
    - I register of Beauty of Form (*claritas*) in the symptom
      - symptom has an established form (eg medical, psychological, etc)  
– and remains within the common sublimations
      - beauty of the symptom reveals the presence of God as Name-of-the-Father  
cf. precedence of S over I

- to be a heretic sinthome  
The way Joyce writes is a sinthome without any **madaquinism** (masaquiniasism)  
so, as a writer Joyce becomes a heretic compared tot Saint Thomas
  - What is a heretic
    - equivoque: RSI **hérésie** = heresy
    - *haeresis*=choice or particular opinion  
heretic = chooses his own way by which to tackle the truth  
in the case of Lacan the heretic chooses his own way to tackle RSI
  - as writer Joyce is a heretic compared tot Saint Thomas on 3 points:
    - no Symbolic Truth in his writing=sinthome = lawless (JAM 209)
      - psychologically Joyce continues to be attached to The Truth  
eg writings of the Church Fathers and Jesuits = a mould for his thinking  
(cf. **not being married while being married with Nora**)
      - but in his writing he foils/crosses/thwarts déjouer The Truth  
no unconscious Truth hidden in his writing  
**sinthome roule-comme-je-te-pousse** = sinthome rolls wherever it is pushed by me
    - no Imaginary Beauty in his writing=sinthome
      - his writing does not have an established form, but he invents his own form  
new sublimation??? = **escabeau**
        - not in SemXXIII – but in articles on Joyce
        - **escabeau**=step-stool = new support for i(a)=narcissism instead of I(A)
      - his writing is nog beautiful, because it does not reveal God'spresence as NdP
    - sinthome als Real  
to be the sinthome = to be a 'dupe' of the sinthome
      - take into account the nature of the sinthome
      - use it logically – to the point of reaching the R of the sinthome
      - then the sinthome will be sated  
cf. **jusqu'à plus soif** = *ad nauseam*, to the point of weariness (*tot vervelens toe*)  
cf. run the sinthome into the ground (*tot vervelens toe herhalen*)  
cf. **se passer du sinthome, à condition de s'en servir**
  - results: being a heretic sinthome as a= writer, Joyce becomes a **saint homme** holy man
- political dimension of Joyce's sinthome  
difficulties Joyce to be Irish – divided between:
  - Irish nationalism as the son of his father=Fenian
    - tried to "forge in the smithy of his soul the uncreated conscience of his race"
    - sinthome = sint'home rule  
**Home rule = autonomy for Ireland 1880-1900**
  - exile from Ireland as a sexual being
    - a few months after meeting Nora he had to leave Ireland
    - only time he got back to Dublin without Nora he was inundated by sexual fantasies  
– did not yet write in his own inconceivably private or singular sinthomatic way...

Joyce could only be Irish outside of Ireland – thanks to his writing=sinthome

**PRELIMINARY STRUCTURAL APPROACH  
OF THE PROBLEM OF YOUNG JOYCE WITH RSI  
AND ITS SYMPTOMATIC SOLUTION BY BEING A WRITER**

**The symptom of being a writer makes the Father, the Phallus and the Ego**

Paradigm of the R-scheme in Question Preliminary 1958, 559-571  
precedence of Symbolic over Imaginary

**Joyce's problem**

**Joyce is a poor wretch** [hère](#)

- time 1 = problem in the S  
hole in the S = no Name-of-the-Father 94, 87-89
  - Joyce has no S father = failing [carence](#) or abdication [démission](#)
    - his father is unworthy
    - his father did not teach him anything
    - his father is a Fenian/[feignant](#) = equivoque
      - drinks and is a [feignant](#) = good for nothing
      - is an Irish nationalist = Fenian
  - this boils down to a *de facto* foreclosure of the father [Verwerfung de fait](#)
    - de facto
      - feitelijk, praktisch gesproken, in de praktijk
      - no symbolic Verwerfung = no subjective decision, he had no choice ???
    - cf. other mention 121
      - foreclosure version slight/light [léger](#) = subject forecloses Name-of-the-Father
      - foreclosure version massive/solid = Real forecloses meaning
- time 2 = consequences in the I
  - hole in the I = no phallus  
just like in the case of Schreber
  - no I ego  
Schreber keeps his ego – be it in a distorted way: as the future wife of God

**Joyce solves these 3 problems (no Father, no Phallus, no Ego)  
with the help of a Family Romance 15, 22**

This family romance is the myth of Dedalus and Icarus

- Joyce becomes The High Flying Artist Icarus ...
- ... thanks to The Father Artificer Dedalus, who made his literary wings
- Dedalus or the father as artificer
  - Dedalus = artificer
    - *Daidalos* "cunningly wrought", "to work artfully" or "of knowledge
    - skillful craftsman and artist – symbol of wisdom, knowledge, and power  
invented and built the labyrinth for king Minos of Crete, but shortly after finishing it king Minos had Daedalus imprisoned within the labyrinth. He and his son Icarus devised a plan to escape by using wings made of wax that Daedalus had invented. They escaped, but sadly Icarus did not heed his father's warnings and flew too close
  - "old father, old artificer" Daedalus has to "stand Joyce now and ever in good stead"
    - stead = position
    - stand me in good stead = come in handy when I need you (*van pas of te gade komen*)  
*se passer à condition de s'en servir*  
we know how this ended for Icarus, this casual or opportunistic use of the father artificer

- Stephen Dedalus = the son Icarus as a smith (with his mallet=hammer or chopper=axe)
  - Icarus = smith  
mallet=hammer or chopper=axe
  - thanks to the support of his father-artificer Dedalus the son Joyce should be able “to forge in the smithy of his soul the uncreated conscience of his race”  
he can become The Artist as a Hero, the pre-eminently Irish artist  
for Lacan this belief of Joyce in being The Artist as a Hero, has a double function  
it provides him with an imaginary phallus and with an ego  
phallic ego = he enjoys his ego???
  - The Artist as Imaginary phallus 15
    - the phallus = what centers Joyce’s jouissance:
    - S1 = The Artist = Hero → S2 = save Irish writing=art??
  - The Artist as Imaginary Ego: Joyce believes in The Artist as Hero  
JAM made Lacan explain what he meant by this new ego  
discussion after an intervention on Joyce by Jacques Aubert, 1977
    - completely constructed ego
      - 100% autobiographical = an exact copy of the history of his own ego  
cf. ego’s in a *Bildungsroman*
      - strong ego (instead of feeble mirror ego)  
JAM says it is an obsessional ego (as often seen in psychosis – cf. SemIII)
    - spare or emergency ego  
on which the subject can fall back in case of need  
– in case his own mirror would crash, would clear off once again
    - ego not yet integrated in the ‘knot’ of the speechbeing
      - does not yet function as a sinthome, it does not yet make a bo-knot of RSI
      - this ego remains enigma/riddle to Joyce
        - Joyce has to decipher his new ego
        - but Joyce does not get far with his deciphering of his new ego:  
he continues to believe in all of his symptoms  
– or rather they remain in place even if he does not believe in them any longer
- compare with double function of Schreber paranoid delusion E571
- hole of the father in S  
filled in an asymptotic way by “parole où se maintient le crée = I(A) ipv NdP
- hole of the phallus in I  
filled in an asymptotic way by “jouissance transsexualiste” = i(a) ipf Φ  
destiny of the ego=m – future to become God’s wife



## digression

these 2 symptoms remain in place even if he does not believe in them any longer

- cf. "Ulysses"
  - Father Artificer  
Joyce does not any longer believe in the new Father-Artificer  
but this new Father-Artificer remains a symptom
    - Joyce no longer really/firmly believes in this new Father Artificer  
Stephen goes looking for the father ... but he only finds Bloom
      - Bloom
        - desperately wants to be a father = he's looking for a son
        - but he wonders whether he wants to be a father or a mother  
cf. Joyce's mad **folie** love towards Nora = carrying her in his womb  
**cf. psychotic push-to-The-Woman or delusion of becoming a woman**
      - Stephen
        - Looking for a father, but he does not want this kind of father
        - does not even want a father any more: he had his fill with the father!
    - But this Father Artificer remains a symptom  
Joyce remains rooted in the father while dismissing him **renie**  
Stephen & Bloom are of the same matter (two parts of the same speechbeing)  
cf. Bleephen (= bark = Dutch *blaffen*, ln) & *Stumm* (= German stupid) = stupid dog
  - The Artist  
Joyce does not any longer believe in his new Artist Ego  
but the Artist Ego remains a symptom
    - Joyce no longer really/firmly believes in his artistic Ego Stephen  
he does not any longer adore his artistic ego, Stephen The Hero or The Artist  
but he sneers/chuckles **ricaner** at this ego – as he would chuckle at a bad joke
    - But this artistic Ego remains a symptom
  - Also the case for the Imaginary phallus??
- but also later on in "Finnegans Wake"???

**FIRST TOPOLOGICAL APPROACH  
OF THE PROBLEM OF JOYCE WITH RSI  
AND ITS SYMPTOMATIC SOLUTION BY BEING A WRITER  
VIA THE TREFOIL-BO-KNOT**

**starting point : Joyce's problem**

- pure subject = 'paranoid personality' = the subject as trefoil-bo-knot  
personality = common madness or 'paranoia' of most people 87, 53
  - RSI continue into each other  
= one single consistency
  - Nevertheless trefoil-knot cannot be transformed into a simple ring
    - RSI remain distinguished  
R, S and I can become 'longer' or 'shorter', but cannot be reduced to nothing
    - RSI wedge, grip something  
object (a) is fixed
- the fault/error/mistake in Joyce's 'paranoid personality' or trefoil-bo-knot
  - Joyce has no 'paranoid personality'  
Joyce starts with a false trefoil-bo-knot  
his trefoil-bo-knot can degenerate into a simple ring – with 2 consequences:
    - no more distinction between RSI – RSI can completely disappear
    - nothing is gripped tight, wedged, 'caught' – no object a is fixed
  - mistake trefoil-bo-knot is caused by the de facto foreclosure of the father  
cf. supra
  - consequences/manifestations of the mistake in the trefoil-bo-knot
    - symbolic consequence  
Joyce has no Ucs, Joyce is not subscribed to the Ucs [désabonné de l' lcs](#)  
cf. in writing he masters the Ucs formations, he makes the Ucs in a conscious way  
Joyce is not subject of his Ucs formations, but ego (artificer) of the Ucs formations  
[cf. infra](#)
    - imaginary consequence  
Joyce's body-image does not sticks to him
      - 3 moments in the loss of body-image + body-ego

- 3 moments in the loss of body-image + body-ego
  - time 3  
loss of body-image + body-ego revealed in Joyce's reaction to being beaten by comrades  
 cf. "Portrait": anecdote of being beaten by fellow students
    - discussion with Heron (eros!) about his essay on Byron
      - in an essay Stephen has defended Byron
      - Heron accuses Byron of being a heretic and immora and also accuses Stephen of being heretic
      - Stephen does not want to renounce Byron – and thus he receives a severe beating by Heron and friends. "Struggling and kicking under the cuts of the cane and the blows of the knotty stump Stephen was borne back against a barbed wire fence."
    - reaction Stephen to this beating  
 "when remembering this scene he wondered why he bore no malice now to those who had tormented him. He had not forgotten a whit of their cowardice and cruelty but the memory of it called forth no anger from him. All the descriptions of fierce love and hatred which he had met in books had seemed to him therefore unreal. Even that night as he stumbled homewards along Jones's Road he had felt that some power was divesting him of that sudden-woven anger as easily as a fruit is divested of its soft ripe peel."
  - loss of body image + body-ego apparent in Joyce's reaction to previous 'beatings'  
related preconditions for his reaction to the beating by his comrades
    - time 2  
reaction to pandying by a teacher (beating on the open hands)  
 "To think of his hands beaten and swollen with pain all in a moment made him feel so sorry for them as if they were not his own but someone else's that he felt sorry for (...) he thought of the hands which he had held out in the air (...) and that shook helplessly (...) like a loose leaf in the air" **jardin des supplices**
    - time 1  
reaction to first masturbation (closed hands)
      - body:  
 "body to which he had yielded, was dying. Into the grave with it. Nail it down into a wooden box the corpse. Carry it out of the house on the shoulders of hirelings."
      - Soul&affect:  
 "He had heard the names of the passions of love and hate pronounced solemnly on the stage and in the pulpit (kansel), had found them set forth solemnly in books and had wondered why his soul was unable to harbour them for any time or to force his lips to utter their names with conviction. A brief anger had often invested (!!!!) him but he had never been able to make it an abiding passion and had always felt himself passing out of it as if his very body were being divested with ease of some outer skin or peel"
- interpretations Lacan

- interpretations Lacan 147, 151
  - neurosis
    - we have a confused image of our body
    - nevertheless this body-image is the basis of the ego and it 'confused' affects
  - Joyce (psychosis)
    - no body-image at all
      - does not enjoy beating (no masochism, not real pervert)
      - disgusted dégoût with his own body Lacan adds this
    - his ego does not stick to its role, by feeling affects  
but the ego and its affects (anger&lust) immediately peel off  
like chasing away or putting between parentheses a bad memory

**first: emergency solutions for the S and I consequences of this fault in the trefoil-bo-knot  
Joyce falls back on an external Symbolic and an external Imaginary**

- instead of an Ucs. 79, 88  
an emergency external Symbolic = The teaching of Church reinforces [armature](#) (warping beton)  
his thought [pensée](#)  
Joyce falls back upon the teachings of the Churchfathers and the Jesuits (Diplomatic Church)  
**alternative S substitute is Dedalus-Icarus myth = more specifically for the relation son-father**
- from the beginning – in his adolescence ...  
cf. "Portrait of The Artist"  
Stephen (Young Joyce) did not want to explicitly abandon the teachings of the Church  
cf. motto: "Silence, exile and cunning"
  - "I will not serve any longer home, fatherland, or church – using for my defense, as a strategy: silence (against home), exile (against fatherland), and cunning (against church)."
  - cunning = strategy of the jesuits, their resourcefulness, the way they always succeed in reasoning themselves out of the problems (amongst other things with their use of the *reservatio mentalis* = cf. "I swear to tell the truth, not the whole truth but nevertheless nothing but the truth, so help me God")
- ... to the end ...  
cf. marriage
  - Joyce finally married Nora – against all of his principles, but because Nora all of sudden had started to call their psychotic daughter Lucia a bastard
  - But before marrying her Joyce made sure that some obscure churchfather's teachings would guarantee that this marriage was not really 'legal' according to church laws
- instead of a body-image 78, 83  
an emergency external Imaginary = the body of Nora as a glove [gant](#) for his body

- instead of a body-image 78, 83  
an emergency external Imaginary = the body of Nora as a glove *gant* for his body  
Nora's body gives him a body for his body (meta-body). tying his body to his *jouissance*
- From the beginning ...
  - Shortly after Joyce met Nora in Dublin, they decided to go into exile together (Italy)  
the only time Joyce returned to Dublin, without Nora, he was completely overwhelmed by sexual fantasies about her:
    - strong oedipal cuckoldfantasy about Nora doing it with any other man
      - one-woman-among-others in rapport with any (other (old???) man
      - when Nora becomes his wife Joyce imagines her in rapport with any other man  
cf. "well as well him as another" (Molly Bloom, at the end of "Ulysses")
    - chaotic infantile perverse fantasies about Nora's body – full of piss and shit  
as a defense against these fantasies Joyce begged her to send him erotic letters – which she reluctantly did – Joyce's erotic letters to Nora are his overenthusiastic response to hers
    - Nora's erotic letters got lost
    - Joyce's erotic letters were only published in 1975 = year of SemXXIII  
– but Lacan already knew them *video*
  - Lacan can make neither head nor tail of these letters *ne s'y retrouve pas*  
nevertheless his clinical experience makes him say that Joyce's erotic letters betray a *drôle de rapport sexuel* = odd / funny old sexual rapport
    - allusion to *drôle de guerre* odd war  
period during first world war when both parties were waiting in their trenches, from time to time shouting and firing and throwing presents at each other
    - odd sexual rapport = kind of ambivalence:
      - Nora is his chosen woman, his one woman  
Nora fits him like a glove  
Nora's body grips his body tightly like a glove *elle le serre*
      - The conditions for this fit:
        - Joyce's depreciation of Nora's body
          - Nora is of no use to Joyce *elle sert à rien*
          - He turns the glove of her body inside-outside – and as a result:
            - it shows all its hidden dirt = objects (a) *partial object perversions*
            - the button moves to the inside = clitoris *and phallic sexuality*  
clitoris as a blackhead that woman has to get rid off 84  
cf. obsession girls with blackheads in the face of their boyfriends  
Joyce only slips on this glove of Nora's body with utter repugnance  
*cf. disgust at his own body (added by Lacan)*
          - but also the cuckoldfantasy about Nora with other men=phallus  
but Lacan does not stress this????
      - illusion of sexual rapport shattered with each newborn child (*sprig=rejeton=spruit*) – even a real drama for Joyce
        - Nora's body no longer serves as an inside-outside-turned-glove to his body
        - *cf. Joyce drinking heavily (dipsomania) at these moments (not 'present')*
  - .... but not till the end
    - *temporary literary sexual rapport with Nora when Joyce returned to Dublin without Nora*
    - *but he does not stick tot his external Imaginary for the rest of his life!*  
*Traversing of cuckold fantasy via obscene letters*
    - *he did not continue to believe in this sinthom – but it remained in place!!!*

**But how does Joyce finally or definitively mend/correct this faulty trefoil-bo-knot?  
Joyce's madness = trying to establish for himself the common paranoia of personality**

- topology: correcting the fault of his trefoil-bo-knot at its origin 88, 97  
and not in its I and S consequences 98-99
- this fundamental correction is operated by making his own Name as a writer of enigma's/riddles or inconceivably private jokes
  - what is being a writer of inconceivably private jokes?  
Joyce deconstructs language and creates his own [lalangue](#)
    - historically
      - lallations
      - written in all possible ways by the set [ensemble](#) of women amongst each other = [lalangues](#)
      - these lalangues are transformed into language by the all [tout](#) of men
    - Joyce = reverses history!  
Joyce undoes languages – reverses languages into [lalangue](#) again
    - destruction of English language
      - base: English language in itself is not consistent (already fractured)  
Lacan refers to Jones, but without mentioning him  
cf. Jones – A linguistic factor in English Characterology 1920
        - typically English character trait of 'propriety'=*fatsoen*  
decency, but degenerating into prudishness=*preuts/tuttig/stijfdeftigheid*
        - based on the division
          - original Saxon language = vivid, robust, virile gut language
          - language of the Norman invaders – and later on the Latin cultural language
      - cf. animals:
        - living animal in the pasture: sheep
        - animal as meat on the table: mutton=*schapenvlees*
      - Joyce breaks down this already fractured English  
cf. Sollers: English language does not exist any longer after "Finnegans Wake"  
([langue](#) tongue)
    - Joyce combines the remnants of English with fragments of other languages (Dutch!!)  
technique / praxis = playing with writing [écriture](#) cf. SemXX, 37
      - slipping and sliding [glissement](#) (metonymia!) of signifiers into each other
      - signifiers telescoped into each other
        - usually 3 words
        - that are combined – but not in a perfect way, not a perfect equivoque  
words get broken in the process of telescoping
    - this results in equivoques = inconceivably private jokes

- this results in equivoques = inconceivably private jokes
- what is an equivoque = inconceivably private joke?? enigma = riddle !!  
XVII, 39ev and XXIII, 68, 7 enigma **énigme** versus quote **citation**
  - enigma/riddle = E<sub>e</sub>
    - what is said?  
an enunciation **énonciation, dire** without a clear statement **énoncé, dit**  
something is said **énonciation, dire**, but it remains unclear what is said **énoncé, dit**  
XXIII 68 the art of saying something in between the lines **entre les lignes**
      - listener has to turn/translate this enunciation into a statement  
listener has to interpret the enunciation (what it means to him)
      - consequence: the listener has to assume the consequences of his 'interpretation'
    - PA interpretation:  
analyst repeats something the subject said  
and that has no link to anything else the subject said
  - quote = e<sub>E</sub>
    - who said that?  
a clear statement **énoncé, dit** without clear enunciation **énonciation**  
it remains unclear who said that = enigma of the enunciation
      - the gap of the enigma of the enunciation **is filled up** with the name/authority of an author (he knows why he is saying this) **functions as 'truth of truth' JAM 237**
      - listener has to decide whether the author is 'serious' **or ironical**
      - condition: the listener has to participate in the same discourse
    - PA interpretation:  
analyst repeats something the subject said  
and that has a link to what the subject already said
- Joyce's hyperenigma's
  - corruption or mockery of the enigma  
cf. Fox Riddle (Stephen Dedalus in "Ulysses") 71  
the answer to the riddle (statement) is more of an enigma than the original enigma (enunciation) itself
  - Joyce raises the enigma to the potential of writing  
**porte l'énigme à la puissance de l'écriture**  
Joyce becomes the writer of the enigma par excellence  
writing has more possibilities=potential of enigma? cf. Freud on Uncanny
- Joyce makes equivoques or inconceivably private jokes on all levels
  - text = web of equivoques or riddles 153
  - content and frame **cadre** are linked by equivoques 147  
frames the content homonymically equivoque=*gelijkluidend*  
there's an intrinsic link of the frame with the stuff that is recounted
    - paradigm  
cf. about a print of Cork city: Joyce said, 'that's Cork. I said: I know it's Cork but what's the frame made of?' Joyce said, 'that's cork. I had great trouble getting frame makers to make it  
Joyce was suffering from associative mania (Frank O'Connor)
    - cf. Ulysses  
each chapter framed in a particular way (dialectics, rhetorics, theology, etc)



- preconditions for the equivoques or inconceivably private jokes
  - Joyce's peculiar form of alcoholism  
shift in style of alcoholism
    - beginning: very active, macho style of alcoholism – dipsomania
      - roaming from pub to pub, with drunken fights, ending up in the gutter
      - when becoming a father, which made him miss the birth of his children
    - end: more passive, female style of alcoholism  
drinking systematically the same white wine (fendant de Sion) from sunset on, dressed up, in the bar of a luxury hotel
      - alcohol removed the barriers against imposed speech  
alcohol turned Joyce into a kind of linguistic sponge, opened him up to the invasion by the polyphony of female chatter, to lalangue
      - the morning after he just squeezed out everything on paper and processed it diligently
  - his belief in the telepathic gift of his daughter Lucia  
see below: digression about Lucia Joyce
    - "Lucia is clairvoyant – just like mijzelf"
      - she informs him of what happens to some people  
eg that Joyce's sister, who was living in Dublin, had moved
      - as her madness increased, his belief in her clairvoyance increased
    - diagnosis of the folie à deux of Joyce and Lucia
      - Jung
      - Lacan  
Lucia's telepathy = extension of Joyce's symptom of imposed speech  
(thoughts of others are imposed on Lucia)
- result: Joyce's new lalangue only serves the purpose of jouissance

- result: Joyce's new **lalangue** only serves the purpose of jouissance
  - this new language does not any longer produce meaning **sens**  
progressive expressions
    - language gets many meanings  
Joyce can be read in an infinite number of ways
    - meaning of language becomes obscured XX, 37  
the signified is extremely densely interlarded **truffer** (*doorspekt*) with signifiers, because far too many signifiers are combined in the production of meaning
    - language has no more meaning XXIII, 74
      - Joyce cannot be read at all **ça ne se lit pas**
      - cf. Adams "Surface and Symbol" 1962: Joyce's writing is a chain reaction of
        - 'inconceivably private jokes'
          - meaning **sens** cannot be shared – it remains a private affair
          - **my favorite expression for singularity**  
(cf. Freud about the dream as *unausstehlich witzlich*, Briefe Fließ 11/09/99)
        - 'eftsooneries'
          - meaning **sens** is put off till ... soon (one more moment and then...)
          - but more often than not one is thrown off track **dérouter**  
and left with the feeling that one will never get the meaning **sens**
  - this language has become all jouissance  
an obscure, and even repelling jouissance transpires
    - cf. Adams: inconceivably private jokes  
we cannot laugh with his jokes
    - cf. Sollers: turns English into **l'élanguages = les langues + élation** (mania)  
you cannot laugh with a manic jokes
    - cf. Nora (wife) was disgusted with his laughing hysterically at night when writing, when telescoping signifiers
  - how comes that Joyce could treat language like that?
    - desire of Joyce
      - desire or calling to be an artificer **savoir faire** with language (writer!) 118  
**savoir faire** = know how / make do with
      - very strong desire  
**art-dire** art = **hardi** = bold/daring + **ardeur** = ardent enunciation/saying **dire**
    - jouissance of Joyce
      - fascinated by the creation of **lalangue**, with its equivokes, by women amongst each other – lost before the jouissance of these women
      - does not automatically behave like all men  
does not panick and transform **lalangue** into language or signifiers
      - but in his writing he tries to find back these creation of **lalangue** by women talking amongst each other = **pousse-à-La-Femme**

- what is making his own name? (as a writer of inconceivably private jokes)
  - making his own name = Joyce's fundamental desire or calling [appelé](#)
    - Calling to make himself a name as a writer of inconceivably private jokes  
a writer without precedent and without possible following or imitation
    - does Joyce have a paranoid calling?
      - no paranoid Redeemer delusion 80, 85, 89  
christian redeemer myth = père-version = sadism father + masochism son!
        - ↔ clinic: no rapport sado/maso (based on false polarity active/passive)
        - ↔ freudian castration: symbolic transmission of phallus from father to son  
father's phallus has to be cancelled out before the son is entitled to it
      - **but maybe a paranoid delusion of becoming a woman [pousse-à-La-Femme](#)**  
**see second topological approach**
- Making himself a name  
= transforming his proper name [nom propre](#) into a common name [nom commun](#) 88
  - what is a proper name  
different approaches:
    - common sense = direct reference theory (Mill)
      - distinguishes a man, animal or thing from others of the same species  
uniquely identifies a referent in the world.  
refers to the thing we are talking about,
      - does not tell anything about it
    - formal logic (Frege)
      - may also apply to imaginary and inexistent entities
      - entity can be identified by more than 1 proper name and take different senses  
– eg "Homer believed the morning star was the evening star"
    - descriptivist (Russell)  
refers to a set of true propositions that uniquely describe a referent  
– eg "Aristotle" refers to "the teacher of Alexander the Great"
    - causal-historical (Kripke)  
social groups link the name to its reference in a naming event – eg baptism  
**is this Lacan's reference???**
  - reduces his proper name to a common name  
makes a common name out of his proper name  
reintroduces his proper name into the common names  
**cf. [diapers all called 'Pampers' – writers all called 'Joyces'](#)**
  - condition: subject can have more than one proper name eg surname
    - bv. James Joyce also known as Dedalus
    - bv. Jacques Lacan also known as [jaculaque+han!](#) ([en avoir sa claque](#) = to be fed up with it + [han](#) = sigh of effort cf. tennis Wickmayer)
  - in relation to the university
    - to be an artist (name S1!) who would keep the whole world (university S2!) busy 77
    - proper name does all it can to make itself more than S1 in relation to  
S2=knowledge
  - he makes his proper name at the expense of the (name-of-the-)father
    - valorizes his proper name at the expense of the father
    - wants the homage to his name that he himself refused to anyone else  
**cf. [adolescents demanding respect from the people they do not respect themselves](#)**

- result of making his name as a writer: Joyce becomes the symptom himself = sinthome
  - PA should follow the developement of the symptom throughout Joyce's oeuvre 70  
from symptom to sinthomen = how Joyce became the symptom himself
  - symptom is called sinthome from the moment the speechbeing can completely identify with his symptom, when the speechbeing is his symptom

## digression

### Lucia Joyce madness

- very young age  
conduct disorder'  
especially towards her parent
  - very aggressive towards her mother
    - and she would remain like this for the rest of her life
  - wanted to be the centre of attention of her father
    - but also very seductive towards her father's friends
- puberty
  - obsessed with her appearance, her mirror image
  - tried to burn down the house and fugues
  - addicted and very fat
- adolescence
  - held together by her dancing (strange postures  
cf. Lacan about dancing 154
    - surprised that dance does not serve the body more ...
    - ... as **condensation**
      - **danse**
      - **condensation** condensation=*Verdichtung*=metaphor
  - psychotic breakdown
    - after being called a 'bastard' by her mother
      - Joyce never wanted to marry Nora – who consequently considered their children to be 'bastards'
      - when the future wife of their son made a problem of Joyce and Nora not being married, Nora got completely upset and called her children 'bastards'
    - Lucia reacted with a psychotic delusion, putting herself in the place of her father, adopting his delusion : "I am The Artist" **c'est moi qui est l'artiste**  
she did so at the anniversary of her father, in front of all his admirers

- Therapies
  - Joyce's first solution of Lucia's psychosis was legal marriage
    - he all of a sudden decided to marry Nora – making sure first that this marriage would not be legal from the point of view of clerical law
    - he pushed Lucia to marry too (one of her pretendors was Beckett)
  - this therapy by marriage not being a success, Joyce embarked upon a long journey of bringing Lucia to all kinds of psychiatric institutions
    - but only to help her to escape time and again
  - in 1934 father and daughter went to see Jung, in Zurich
    - Jung was able to cut immediately Lucia's catatonic trance but said that a psychoanalytic treatment might provoke a catastrophe
    - Jung told Joyce "that nobody could make any head of her but Joyce himself, as she was a very exceptional case"
  - Joyce left Lucia in Jung's clinic
    - but very soon Lucia developed a negative transference towards "this big fat materialistic Swiss man, who is trying to get hold of my soul"
  - Jung breaks off treatment: Lucia a lost case, living in a folie à deux with her father:
    - "Lucia is a misunderstood literary genius – just like myself"
      - poems
        - when Jung pointed out schizoid elements in her poems Joyce insisted that they were not yet understood anticipations of a new literature
      - lettrines
        - Joyce stimulated Lucia to draw initial letters in the style of the Book of Kells
        - and considered that in this field also she was a misunderstood genius
    - "Lucia is clairvoyant – just like myself"
      - she informs him of what happens to some people
        - eg that J's sister, who was living in Dublin, had moved
      - as her madness increased, his belief in her clairvoyance increased
- diagnosis of the folie à deux of Joyce and Lucia
  - Jung
    - mystical identity or participation (...) two people going to the bottom of a river – one diving, the other falling. Lucia is his femme inspiratrice (anima), which explains his reluctance to have her certified. His own anima was so solidly identified with her that to have her certified would have been an admission that he himself had a latent psychosis
  - Ellmann
    - secret hope that when he got out of the dark night of "Finnegans Wake", his daughter would escape from her own darkness
  - Lacan
    - Lucia's telepathy = extension of Joyce's symptom of imposed speech (**thoughts of others are imposed on Lucia**)

**SECOND TOPOLOGICAL APPROACH  
OF THE PROBLEM OF JOYCE WITH RSI  
AND ITS SYMPTOMATIC SOLUTION BY BEING A WRITER**

**BASED ON THE 4-BO-CHAIN**

**'structural' or 'typical' mistakes and mendings in 3-bo-chain 94**  
**R, S and I are all free – mended in a borromean way by a 4th=sinthome**

### particular mistakes in the case of Joyce's 3-bo-chain

S&R interlocked → I free → a double of I (writer's ego) likes S&R and I a in a pseudo bo way

- Symbolic (Ucs) & Real are interlocked [lié](#) (like olympic rings) 154
  - a first panic reaction = elementary phenomenon or symptom
  - what Lacan calls [désabonné de l'Ics](#)  
Joyce is not subscribed to the Ucs, subscription to the Ucs got cancelled  
instead of being a regular sucker for the Ucs, Joyce regularly suffers from [paroles imposées](#)  
imposed speech = Signifier in the Real
- imposed speech in a case presentation 95
  - context – info
    - 17-02-1976 = the day before the Seminar session
    - Gérard Primeau or Lumeroy
    - English translation Schneidermann – “Returning to Freud” 1980
  - clinical process
    - starting point (elementary phenomenon) = imposed speech 95
      - imposed speech = speech as parasite, veneer [placage](#), cancer  
cf. WSBurroughs: language is a virus from outer space  
eg “dirty political assassination” [sale assassinat politique](#)
      - not a hallucination??  
no message, subject is not targeted in its jouissance (no insults or defamation)  
just words words words which traverse the speechbeing
    - reaction to this imposed speech
      - reaction 1= equivocation  
signifier is reduced to a subtle/simple torsion of the voice  
eg “dirty political assassination” [sale assassinat politique](#) becomes “dirty political registrarship [sale assistanat politique](#)
      - reaction 2 = inner protest (voice)  
he talks back in silence  
eg sentences starting with “but ...” [mais](#)
        - problem = he becomes a sending telepath  
everyone can hear this inner protest, everybody can read his thoughts  
he has no more secret, no more ‘reserve’
        - consequently suicide attempt
  - Lacan calls this a “lacanian psychosis”
    - contentwise: what he complains about makes sense in Lacan's theory
      - imposed speech is a normal phenomenon  
this is the primary relation of the speechbeing to language
      - so why do so called normal men not perceive this imposed speech?
    - Formally: he uses Lacan's categories of RSI, but in his own neologistic way
- Imposed speech in the case of Joyce



- Imposed speech in the case of Joyce
  - elementary phenomenon of imposed speech  
getting worse, imposed speech is building up during Joyce's life
  - starts with an inkling [soupçon](#) of imposed speech
    - imposed speech are not just words words words which traverse Joyce  
cf. the case of the patient of the case presentation
    - imposed speech is the trivial chatter of women amongst each other,  
which Joyce happens to overhear
      - paradigm = chat between his mother and her aunt,  
*"Is that Mary Ellen?" – "No, Eliza, it's Jim" (= roepnaam van James Joyce in zijn familie kring) – "O ... O, goodnight, Jim" – "D'ye want anything, Eliza?" – "I thought it was Mary Ellen, Jim ..."*  
Best example: insisting Yes at the end of "Ulysses"  
*Joyce decided upon the final word of Ulysses when he overheard Lilian Wallace negotiating endlessly with a housepainter. As time passed, Mrs. Wallace kept responding with the word "yes"*
      - chatter of women amongst each other reveals another relation to language,  
reveals their jouissance as creators of [lalangue](#), of all the equivoques a particular language allows for
  - speech is more and more imposed on Joyce 96  
Joyce gets flooded by imposed speech  
– not only chatter of women amongst each other??
  - reactions Joyce to imposed speech

- reactions Joyce to imposed speech
  - to begin with:  
Joyce handles the first discrete form of imposed speech (chatter of women)  
by calling it epiphanies
    - digression: a short history of epiphany
      - religious 'concept' – indicating a specific form of manifestation of a God  
Gods can manifest themselves in different ways
        - as a deafening thunder (voice)
        - as a blinding light (gaze) = epiphany
      - Thomas Aquinas developed an aesthetical theory based on the epiphany
        - God manifests himself in a flash of light
        - beauty is a sign of the divine
        - so this light should always shine through in beauty = *claritas*
    - Joyce corrupts Thomas' religious idea of epiphany
      - young Joyce took this idea of epiphany from Thomas Aquinas
        - *a sudden spiritual manifestation/revelation*
          - *either in the vulgarity of speech or of gesture*
          - *or in a memorable phase of the mind itself*
        - *the soul of the commonest thing seems to be radiant*  
*luminous silent stasis of aesthetic pleasure*
      - but Joyce ultimately subverted this idea of epiphany
        - no epiphany of God (as Name-of-the-Father) in Reality – via beauty
        - but epiphany of the Hole in Language
          - via the jouissance of women chattering amongst each other
          - via the female jouissance of *lalangue*
    - but finally  
as Joyce is flooded by imposed speech, he has to develop another defense than calling it epiphanies  
he has to develop the sinthome of making his name as a writer
- Imaginary is freed and can clear off 148  
in order to understand where this literary sinthome comes from we should recall that as a consequence of the mistake in his bo-chain the Imaginary of his narcissism, is set free  
Joyce easily feels divested of his mirror-made body & mind (with its psychic affects) "as easily as a fruit is divested of its soft ripe peel"  
*supra*

**mistake bo-chain Joyce is mended *réparer* by 4th term = writers ego as sinthome**

but there's also a good side to this setting free of the Imaginary of his narcissism (body+mind)  
it means that it can be dedoubled – creating a new Imaginary, the Imaginary of the writers's ego  
a writer's ego that then can be used as a sinthom that can knot R&S and his original I together

mind: this sinthom of the writer's ego does not really make a bo-chain  
R and S remain interlocked!!

### Joyce's 3 successive letter-based or literary ego's 147

= progressive responses to the being flooded of his mirror-based ego by imposed speech

- writer's ego 1  
literary character Stephen Hero or Stephen Dedalus based on his own biography=history  
functions as a spare ego, in case his mirror-based body image would clear off
  - how does Joyce treat imposed speech with these 'autobiographical' Stephen character?
    - turns imposed speech of women chatting amongst each or **lalangue** into epiphanies  
this chatter is a hole in language
    - develops a uncontrolled growth of metaphors around these holes in language  
cfr Eco: Joyce creates a verbal music as linguistic equivalent of an epiphany
  - addres of this hypermetaphorical processing of imposed speech  
what kind of Other is Joyce supposing?
    - not yet the university
      - and its hermeneutical approach (trying to interpret)
      - making Joyce's proper name as a common name
    - but all of the big mythical libraries of the world
      - where his epiphanies should be conserved for the generations to come
      - realising oneness: *When one reads these strange pages of one long gone, one feels that one is at one with one who once...*
- writer's ego 2  
the obscenely described body of his wife Nora  
as an inside-outside turned glove Nora's body contains his mirror-based body image
  - not clear how this obscene writing about Nora's body treats imposed speech (chatter of women amongst each other)
    - Joyce started these obscene letters to Nora, when he got back to Dublin without her
    - was he flooded there by imposed speech, by women talking amongst each other?
  - 2 types of epiphanies
    - linguistic epiphanies  
typically the imposed speech of meaningless chatter of women amongst each other
    - visual epiphanies
      - but 'epiphany' is also a name for the 'imposed jouissance of the female body'
      - typically "a woman absorbed in her own jouissance, as a hole in the Real"
        - paradigm in "The Dead"  
Gabriel realises that he's nothing to his wife, that she is and will forever remain absorbed in her own jouissance
          - when he surprises his wife standing on the stairs in the shadow and listening to distant music, he asks himself what she is a symbol of
          - when she turns to him he is seized by a sudden joy – but only to feel completely dejected when he realizes that she must have been thinking of and longing for her first lover who had committed suicide at the age of 16
        - this posture of being absorbed in her own jouissance is a posture that he discovers time and again in Nora – and which he tries to shatter with his obscene description of her body

- writer's ego 3  
Joyce becomes writer of [énigme](#) enigma = riddles = equivoques = inconceivably private jokes  
a a writers of the riddle he makes himself a name at the university  
this name at the university functions as a sinthome that bo-knots the interlocked SR (language  
in the Real or imposed speech) with the freely floating I (inconsistent body-image and -ego)
  - his equivoques or inconceivably private jokes break apart, dismantle the imposed speech  
 = chatter of women amongst each other  
 = [lalangue](#) created by the set [ensemble](#) of women
  - but by recombining the remains Joyce creates a superior form of [lalangue](#) or chatter of women amongst each other 97
    - writes the way women chatter amongst each other,  
 ike the set of women Joyce creates [lalangue](#) with his writing
    - last writer's ego = push-to-The-Woman [pousse-à-La-Femme](#) *Verweiblichung*  
 considers himself to be a woman, when he realizes himself as being a symptom  
[se tient pour femme à l'occasion de s'accomplir en tant que symptôme](#) (AE 569)

## **LESSON 4**

### **INVENTION OF THE REAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN FRONT OF THE REAL**

## LACAN'S INVENTION OF ANOTHER ODD BIT OF REAL

### Definition of the Real

- negative approaches
  - Real ↔ truth
    - Real has no link with truth  
there's no true Real vrai Réel as opposed to a 'false Real'  
cf. JAM 217
      - Adorno's plea against Heideggers authentic in (*echt*)
      - Joyce's mockery of Aquina's authentic (*claritas*)
      - Lacan's criticism évider of any idea of 'evidence' via 'true Real'  
(bv vrai intensionnel qui toucherait au Réel – JAM 236 on 'intension/extension')
    - Real is to be found in the entanglements of the true embrouilles du vrai
      - the true perforates itself
        - in speaking we try to crate meaning sens and true vrai
        - but we have to do this with air coming out of a mouth that originally sucks  
we speak for the jouissance of using our mouth as an erogenous zone
      - in this process the true gets entangled ...
      - the Real is to be found in these entanglements of the Real
    - Real = "the truth about the truth" 66  
keeping a close track of the Real in the bo-knot = saying the truth about truth
  - Real ↔ law  
the Real = impossible 137
  - Real ↔ reality (Ucs)
    - Real = precarious supposition of what conditions 'reality'  
gap between Real and 'reality' cannot be bridged
    - Real = Lacan's sinthomatic response to the 'reality' of Freud's Ucs 132, 139  
each invention (in PA??) = sinthomatic response to Freud's Ucs
      - Lacan's invention of R = sinthomatic response to Freud's Ucs  
why is he so interested in R?? Cf. twisted cigar = sinthome of his R 139
      - each particular analyst has to invent a sinthome in response to Freud's Ucs??  
each particular analyst is himself a singular sinthomatic response to his Ucs?
        - cf. the psychoanalyst (not psychoanalysis) is a sinthome 135
        - cf. SémXI theory of transference betrays the desire of the analyst??  
the fact that he has to invent his own position??

- Real ↔ meaning sens
  - Meaning
    - sens = meaning / sensé = meaningful/sensible
    - meaning = copulation of S (language/Ucs) and I (body-image/ego) 121  
new Imaginary that establishes meaning sens 121
    - meaning = provisional 119
    - meaning = metaphor-made 121
      - metaphor shows that we believe in the sexual rapport
      - metaphor shows that our belief in the sexual rapport is the result of a confusion  
confusion = “taking a bladder for a lantern” prendre des vessies pour des lanternes
        - vessel (= couple man/woman) can only be taken for lantern (= sexual rapport) because inside this vessel (= couple) there is fire (= Real jouissance)
        - but this fire itself is a but a mask=fallacy for the ‘real’ Real  
the real Real is the absolute zero (in this couple!!)
  - meaning = direction  
cf. double meaning sens
    - sens has to do with direction or ‘orientation’  
meaning is always oriented in a particular direction  
meaning is sexually oriented via the phallus
    - only what has meaning sens can be true  
direction (phallus) > meaning > true
  - Real forecloses meaning forclusion de sens
    - R bears no meaning / R excludes meaning
    - R is excluded from meaning = best formulation according to Lacan
    - R forecloses meaning 121  
2 levels of foreclosure:
      - foreclosure version slight/light léger = subject forecloses Name-of-the-Father
      - foreclosure version massive/solid = Real forecloses meaning
    - relation R and meaning via 3-bo-knot 134, 48, 55
      - ‘outside’ Real = (jouissance of) meaning sens jouis-sens
      - ‘outside’ Symbolic = real hole of no Other of the Other = jouissance of a woman
      - ‘outside’ Imaginary = phallic jouissance??
  - R has no meaning sens because R has no direction/orientation sens  
no direction (phallus) > no meaning > no truth



- Real ↔ links  
Real is only odds and ends bout / trognon
  - Real only comes in odd and ends / bits and bobs  
two French words – difficult to translate:
    - bout
      - bite (oral)
      - scrap or snatch (of a tekst, a conversation)
      - odd (cf. odd number, but also the person who is left over, who does not get paired)  
cf. odds and ends / bits and bobs épars désassortis
    - trognon = core / stump/stub
  - Real bits or odds are not linked/connected ne se relie à rien
    - Imaginary does not link the Real odds
      - imaginary object depends on (abides by) a ternary relation (RSI)
      - object a does not depend on this ternary relation  
object a is an absolute – a bout of the Real  
cf unification body in front of mirror – but objects are separated from it
    - Symbolic does not link the Real odds
      - In S nothing can be said about R
      - when you speak about R you immediately fall into the Signifier trap
        - when you say something is ‘not’, you fall into S trap of yes/no (Verneinung)
        - when you say “there’s no sexual rapport”, you introduce R sexuality into, linking it with other signifiers, allowing S to spin its web around it
    - (beautiful) writing écriture does not link the Real odds (SemXX)
      - matheem / mathematical/logical formula (XX) = demonstrating the Real  
but in a way that everything is linked/corresponds (se correspond)
      - cannot be the last ‘word’ about the R – which only consists of bouts
    - (ugly writing of) topology of bo-chain does link the real odds (XXIII)
      - monstrating the Real
      - but finally this is also a fallacy (cf. supra) = there is no evidence of the Real
- Positive approach  
Real = jouissance
  - Pleasure  
true gives pleasure plaisir *Lust*
  - jouissance
    - Real does not provide any pleasure  
but it gives jouissance = Lacan’s distortion of Freuds ‘no pleasure’
      - Freud: maso = jouissance given by the Real
      - Lacan: writing écrit = jouissance given by the Real ??  
cf. writings Joyce inspired by jouissance of the R??
    - Jouissance as parasitic 73  
Real = jouissance of the body (erogenous) 85, 77

Real can only be monstrated **montrer**  
no proof=evidence of R

- Ucs = evidence/proof/demonstration of the true
  - evidence or proof of the true = Ucs formations
  - demonstrating (S, truth) is a loss/decline (*déchéance*) compared with monstrating (R)
- no evidence/proof/demonstration of R
  - R is self-evident
    - **montrer** = show itself, display itself, monstrate (cf. monstration of Christ body)cf. equivoque
    - **évidement** of **évidence** emptying/hollowing each form of evidence
  - bo-chain is fallacious **fallace=semblant** proof/evidence/testimony **témoignage** or assurance  
assurance of R 111
    - bo-chain = proof/evidence of R because it constitutes a real hole **trou** 118  
bo-chain transforms a false hole into a real hole = verifies a hole as R
      - false hole = 2 rings do not interlock
      - transformation false hole into R hole = 3th ring combined with 2 rings in a bo-way
    - clinic of verifications of the hole as R
      - neurosis
        - false hole = **R and I do not interlock, but also S and I, and S and R**
        - transformation false hole into real hole = via the phallus=castration or NdP??  
**phallus = duplication of S = 4th??**
      - Joyce (psychosis)
        - false hole = S and sinthome do not interlock  
**cannot be the sinthome??? Nora as temporary unsuccessful sinthome???**
        - transformation false hole into real hole = via the sinthome

## Isolated historical instances of emergence/finding of **bouts/trognons** of the Real 123

In fact it is not a question of emergence **émerger** or finding **trouver**, but of invention **inventer**  
invention of a bit of Real disturbs the continuous going round in circles of the world **tourner en rond**

- Newton
  - Newton invented a bit of R = law of gravity 1687  
every particle attracts every other particle in the universe  
with a force which is directly proportional to the product of their masses and inversely  
proportional to the square of the distance between their centers
  - stupid reactions tot his invention of a **bout** of Real  
cf. Kant: Newton = a new sickness
  - Newton did not try to preserve his R  
he remained religious  
"Gravity explains the motions of the planets, but it cannot explain who set the planets in motion.  
God governs all things and knows all that is or can be done"
- Freud – or rather Lacan?? 123, 128
  - Lacan invented a bit of R = sexual non-rapport
    - Freud discovered traces of Ucs  
but remained within the realm of meaning **sens** or meaningfulness **sensé**
    - Lacan is driven to despair by Freud's addiction to meaning **sens** in het Ucs  
and thus invented his **bouts** of Real
      - **object a as waste object – man himself as waste object in the S**
      - **no sexual rapport, due to different jouissances**
  - stupid reactions
    - man does not recognize himself in what he is
      - traces of the unconscious
      - waste object **ridiculizing Lacan's La Femme n'existe pas and pas de rapport sexuel**
    - why?
      - Ucs always gets restored – traces Ucs always get effaced
        - spontaneously: traces of Ucs efface themselves spontaneously
        - actively: all discourses (analytical discourse included) effaces traces of Ucs
      - **and what with the new bits of R???**
  - Lacan tried to preserve his R  
tried to fix this waste object in the position of the analyst, at the end of a psychoanalysis  
this is the place where man should always recognize himself in the object that he is
- Me as an analyst / you as an analyst  
**Does every singular analyst have to invent his odd piece of Real  
which makes it possible for him to continue to function as an analyst?**

## Real and space

Real = object (a) as wedding-point in bo-chain ↔ RSI of the 3-dimensional space\_86

- SI of the 3-dimensional space = air bubble [soufflure](#) / glove [gant](#)
  - Imaginary
    - space as a concentric expansion or centrifugal dynamic
      - the eye is the starting point
      - but the eye also has a blind spot (what is not seen, integrated in this space)  
= the gaze as an object
    - space based on a kinaesthetic imagination
  - Symbolic  
3-dimensional space = verbal construction
- there is no Real space – the Real is the ever shifting wedding-point of the bo-chain\_81
  - wedding point [coincement](#)
    - bo-chain is pointless [equivoque](#), it has no use [ça sert à rien](#) ...
    - ... but it grips tightly [ça serre](#), it wedges [coincer](#) a point  
this wedding point is the core/navel of the bo-chain  
this wedding point has 2 characteristics:
      - it is a true hole = it cannot be reduced to nothing  
because the point it grips or wedges can be figured as an infinite straight line
      - it does not remain in place, it cannot be fixed – it continually slips

[cf. se passer du père \(sert à rien\) à condition de s'en servir](#)  
[se passer du noeud bo, à condition de se servir de son point de coincement](#)
  - this wedding point can be called object (a)
    - object (as) is an obstacle [ob-staculer](#) to this Imaginary and Symbolic space  
[osbjet](#) (a) = osseous+object ([os](#) *weer=knoest=knot in the wood*) 145  
cf. faeces, breast can be taken in the hand (*Begriff*) and be thrown as a weapon

Real = new type of idea *idée* – writing of the Real

- Imaginary  
Plato (philosophy) imagines 'the idea'  
idea = what can be reminiscence = no form of writing??  
Idea = pre-existing ideal form, shape, appearance=aanblik (cf. Gestalt)
  - Plato uses 2 words for this ideal form
    - *Idea*
    - *Eido*
  - man imagines that he reminiscences an already existing idea
    - Plato  
cf. allegory of the cave
      - we live chained to the wall of a cave, facing a blank wall  
we only see shadows on the wall from pure forms passing in front of a fire behind us  
and we give names to these shadows: these shadows are our 'reality'.
      - If we were to escape we would find a world we do not understand
        - the sun is incomprehensible
        - the higher reality of the pure forms is incomprehensible
    - philosopher sees that the shadows are not reality – he can perceive the pure forms
  - christian platonists  
idea exists in the Mind of God
  - modern platonism  
idea exists in the mind of a human being  
cognitivism???

- Symbolic  
Freud discovers the reality of the Ucs  
articulates it = lucubrates *élucubration* on it = Freud's forms of writing
  - as energy – that cannot get lost 130, 133
    - energetics
      - we always find back a constant (no energy lost)
      - a constant binds Stimulus and Response
    - speechbeing divided
      - energetics apply
        - pleasure principle governs reality = we always find back this constant
      - energetics do not apply
        - disturbed by psychical 'energy' as R = *jouissance*
  - as thoughts *pensées*=*Gedanken* – that can be remembered *remémoration*=*Erinnerung*  
thanks to their impression 131
    - impression
      - brain = networks *réseau*=*Netz* or links *chaînes* of impressions *frayages*=*Bahnungen*
    - speechbeing divided
      - impression applies
        - remembering *remémoration*=*Erinnerung*
          - networks of impressions (S1) are entered into existing knowledge = Ucs (S2)
          - cf. automaton SemXI
        - S1 represents the subject fort S2 in a truthfull way
          - a reality that functions truthfully *not the R!!!*
      - impression does not apply
        - it does not take into account R of *jouissance*

- Real  
Lacan invents the Real<sup>130</sup>  
he writes it as bo-knots [coincage](#) and constantly makes errors
  - Lacan forces a new way of writing the Real  
2 forms of Lacan's new writing of the Real:
    - R = link between S and I 132, 134
      - S (Ucs Freud) and I (narcissism Freud) remain foreign to one another
      - R = 'organ' that links Symbolic and Imaginary – allows for a 3-bo-chain
    - R = bo-chain of RSI
  - Lacans invention or new writing of the Real acts as a trauma
    - Forcing
      - Lacan has found the bo-chain by forcing things 143
      - writing = act / way of doing [faire](#) 144 [writing = forcing](#)
    - Trauma
      - for himself  
Real imposed itself upon Lacan [imposé](#) – [not imposed speech but imposed R=jouissance](#)  
[cf. Freud's discovery of Ucs \(Lacans analysis of Irma-dream\) = imposed writing of Ucs](#)
      - [For each analyst](#)
      - [For science/culture/mankind](#)  
[cf. emergence of another \[bout de Réel\]\(#\) – and the reactions to it](#)
  - A primary writing of the Real

- A primary writing of T  
cf. logical times of writing  
(primary) writing of R via bo-chain → signifiers → thought=Ucs *pensée* → (secondary) writing
- time 1 = primary or autonomous writing of the Real = bo-chain  
writing of bo-chain via 3 unary traits *trait unaire* *einziger Zug*
  - function of unary trait
    - functions as one *un* and makes a hole *trou*
    - initiates substitution and combinatory
  - best support for the unary trait  
infinite straight line *droite infinie*
- time 2 = Signifiers  
once R written as a bo-chain, Signifiers can be fastened to it – in 2 ways 144
  - classic philosophy: via sayings
    - *dit-mension = dimension du dit* = dimension of what is said
    - often these saying (what is said) is a lie *mensonge = mention + mensonge*
  - Lacans philosophy: via what only can be written
    - *philosophy of equivoques?? cf. folisophy*
    - first 'philosophy' that stands up):
- time 3 = secondary writing based on the Signifier
  - writing = precipitation of the Signifier  
writing down what we are saying
  - Derrida stresses this writing *écriture et la différance* (priority claim Lacan cf. *Lituraterre*)  
cf. JAM 232ev



- writing and PA cure
  - proces of a PA cure
    - R of infantile sexuality = jouissance = traumatic
    - childhood memories = primary or autonomous writing  
cf. screen-memories *Deckerinnerung* = bo-chain??
    - handling/processing/treating childhood screen-memories in PA
      - free association – under transference
        - talk about childhood memories,  
attach signifiers to these childhood memories  
utterances *énoncés* = free association = appearance of signifiers
        - production of thought = Ucs formations
    - writing as result of PA?
      - PA does not (automatically) push to (secondary) writing about childhood memories
        - Shortcut from *primary* writing to *secondary* writing, without passing by *S*
        - *no production of the Ucs?*
      - writing in the Pass at the end of PA
        - *this is not secondary writing about childhood memories*
        - *another kind of writing*
          - *mathematical formula (of fantasy, as axiom)*
          - *Joycean writing = telescoping of different versions (of sinthom)*
  - writers in PA
    - start a PA for writer's block? (Inhibition/Symptom/Anxiety)
    - what does it mean to write for this subject → will the subject continue to be a writer?

- implications for PA practice of Lacans invention or new writing of the Real 135
  - efficacy/effectiveness of PA = making a bo-chain
  - an analyst should be a helpmeet **aide contre the Real??** by helping to make a bo-chain  
**but in which position does the analyst have to put himself, in order to achieve that?**
    - not speaking from the position of the Name-of-the-Father  
= making the Ucs more 'consistent'
    - but speaking from the real hole of the lack of the Other of the Other  
proving that the **parlêtre**
    - can bypass/forego the Name-of-the-Father, can manage without the Name-of-the-Father ...
    - on the condition that it make use of this Name-of-the-Father  
**not dependent on the Father, not addicted to the father**  
**using the Father when it serves, in a pragmatic, opportunistic or expedient way**  
**cf. père sert à rien, mais il serre father has no use, but he wedges RSI**

**RESPONSIBILITY OR FORCED CHOICE OF THE SUBJECT  
IN FRONT OF THE REAL  
REAL = NON-EXISTENCE OF THE OTHER  
REAL = IMPOSSIBLE JOUISSANCE OF BODY OF THE OTHER**

**FIRST CHOICE FOR THE SPEECHBEING  
COGNIZANCE // UCS // SINHOME=ARTIFICE=SAVOIR-FAIRE**

61, 64-65

**problem: no jouissance of the Other (subject cannot enjoy the body of the Other)**

- Other = S
- But there's no Other of the Other = there's no Other who 'masters' this S
  - no God who operates The Last Judgment
  - the God-based Name-of-the-Father is only a semblant of this Other of the Other so the Other does not exist
- consequences for the jouissance
  - no (sexual) jouissance of the Other
    - the Other does not enjoy us
    - we do not enjoy the Other via the phallus
  - there's only the Real (limited reality) of the ex-sistence of the sexe  
there's only the Real of the sexual non-rapport

responsabilité responsibility/accountability/answerability of the subject in front of the R subject  
R of lack of jouissance of (the body of) the Other  
R of sexual non-rapport

different answers

cf. Neurosenwahl Freud

cf. subversion 1960: reactions to S de A barré or the desire of the Other

- with phobic signifier
- with the fantasy
  - hysteric – as an elusive object a
  - obsessional – as a strong ego
- fall back upon Imaginary cognizance [connaissance](#)
  - based on the mirror image
  - cf. [connaissance](#) paranoïaque
  - cognizance constitutes the I ego as *Innenwelt* vs *Umwelt*
  - cognizance gives a priori meaning [sense](#) (to everything)
    - referring to the sexual relation as existing
    - via the opposition active/passive
- create your own particular S Ucs  
introducing a form of thought/pondering [pensée](#) in the Real = Ucs  
Symbolic or Ucs thoughts [pensées](#) Gedanken = Ucs knowledge [savoir](#) Wissen
  - based on the Signifier
    - the Ucs as the play of metonymy and metaphor ...
    - ... makes the symbolic subject as the signifier that is lacking
  - Ucs thought does not give a priori a sexual meaning sense
    - this sexual meaning is produced by a metaphor [pas de sens](#)
    - based on the infantile sexuality (partial drives + Oedipus)
- invent your own singular or odd bit of Real  
introducing an artifice in the Real = **sinthome**
  - definition of artifice=sinthome
    - something the speechbeing does [faire](#)  
the speechbeing shows that he knows how to act, how to handle things [savoir faire](#)  
[savoir faire](#) = know how / make do with
    - this [savoir faire](#) eludes his grasp [échappe](#)
    - this [savoir faire](#) only yields a very small/slender [mince](#) jouissance = the spirit [esprit](#)  
*Lustgewinn witz*
    - this artifice=sinthome makes the real subject as a bo-chain
  - invent your own bit of Real
  - paradigm of the artifice=sinthome introduced in the R = making a pot cf. SemVII  
'artificer' can be translated as 'potter'
    - the pot is an artifice that creates a universe  
(so the universe is not created by God, via the One [y a de l'Un](#))
    - **by the way: the pot is also a fiction that creates a truth**  
cf. word 'fiction' stems from the latin *ingere* = to shape, fashion, mould by kneading clay
    - artifice=sinthome can take the form of 'art' (in the broad sense)

**SECOND CHOICE FOR THE SEXED BEING  
TO BE A MAN // TO BE A WOMAN  
A WOMAN AS A SINTHOM FOR ALL MEN // THE MAN AS A RAVAGE FOR A WOMAN**

97 ev

once again based on the topology of the trefoil-bo-knot

**starting point**  
**man and woman both are false trefoil-bo-knots**

- not clear what is the mistake  
in the case of Joyce the mistake is the abdication of the father
- both man and woman can degenerate into a simple circle/ring  
this implies 2 problems:
  - no distinction RSI – RSI can disappear
  - no wedging-point (no object a fixed)

**the false trefoil-bo-knot of the subject can be mended by the other sex**  
**the other sex allows man and woman to make a real trefoil-bo-knot**  
**together man and woman can form a real trefoil-bo-knot = sexual rapport**

mending of the speechbeing as false trefoil-bo-knot by the other sexe can take place at 2 sites  
**cf. Joyce correcting his false trefoil-bo-knot – in its consequences or at the site of the fault itself**

- false trefoil-bo-knot is mended where the consequences of the mistake appear 98-99
  - this mending can take place at two sites of the false trefoil-bo-knot
  - this mending does not transform the false trefoil-bo-knot into a true trefoil-bo-knot
  - the false trefoil-bo-knot and its mending are reversible  
which means that the false trefoil-bo-knot and its mending are equivalent
  - applied to the rapport between man and woman
    - both sexes are equivalent  
man and woman can switch places = reversibility of man and woman  
**cf reversibility = operational thinking Piaget**  
the function of a woman for a man = the function of a man for a woman  
no distinction between man and woman
  - consequently there's no sexual rapport between man and woman  
as different and thus as each other's complement

- false trefoil-bo-knot is mended at the very site of the mistake itself 97
  - this mending can only take place at one site
  - this mending transforms the false trefoil-bo-knot into a true trefoil-bo-knot
  - the false trefoil-bo-knot and its mending are not reversible  
which means that the false trefoil-bo-knot and its mending are not equivalent
  - applied to the sexual rapport between man and woman
    - both sexes are not equivalent 101  
the function of a woman for a man  $\neq$  the function of a man for a woman  
man and woman cannot switch places = man and woman are not reversible
    - for all Man a=one woman is a sinthome (symptom?)  
*pour tout homme une femme est un sinthome*
      - each man = false trefoil-bo-knot
      - mistake corrected at the origin by a=one woman functioning as a sinthome
      - *for each man woman is a therapy / man is healed by one woman??*  
*cf. God creates Eve as a helpmeet for Adam, a helpmeet against himself*  
*woman cures man of himself*
      - *man can go from woman-symptom to woman-symptom*
    - for a=one woman
      - each woman = false trefoil-bo-knot
      - mistake can be corrected at its origin in 2 ways:
        - by a symptom  
*for hysterical woman:*
          - *a man is a sinthome/symptom???*
          - *a woman is her sinthome/symptom – cf. Dora, Mrs K is her sinthome??*
        - Woman can go
          - from man-symtome to man-symptome
          - from woman-symptome to woman-symptome
      - By a ravage = The Man is a ravage  
*pour une femme L'Homme est tout ce qui vous plaira = un ravage*
        - woman is ravished (pulled out of herself) and ruined by The Man  
ravage is the contrary of therapy or healing  
*After this: love-life is finished – woman does not recover from a ravage*
        - *The Man is modelled on The Mother (too intimate)*  
*not on the Name-of-the-Father*
        - *Is this erotomania??*
        - *Man cannot be completely ravished by woman*  
*there's always a limit in his love, he cannot completely go for it = castration*
  - result = sexual rapport

## digression

### singularity of a woman

- Aristotle excludes singularity  
Cf. Metaphysics 14
  - Aristotle = opposition universal / particular
    - universal = *pan* = all *tout*  
more abstract
      - what particular things have in common = characteristics / qualities  
repeatable/recurrent entities that can be exemplified by particular things
        - 3 qualities / characteristics
          - types or kinds: e.g. mammal, doghood
          - properties: e.g. shortness, strongness, redness)
          - relations: e.g. father of, next to, betweenness
        - eg two green chairs: 'chairness' and 'greenness' are universals
      - Lacan: universal = Symbolic = signifier
        - cf. "for all men the function of the phallus goes" = "all men are castrated" (SemXX)
        - one signifier is enough: S1 = half-said truth (*vérité mi-dite*)
    - particular  
more concrete
      - instances of a universal type  
eg particular dog, red thing, or object that is between other things
      - Lacan (cf. "Pleasure and Free association" 14/06/75): particular = Ucs
        - neurotic symptom = particularity of the subject  
as a formation of Ucs the symptom is a particular instance of the Ucs
        - free association = particularities – of the same order as the symptom = particular instances of the Ucs
  - Aristotle = exclusion of singularity  
singularity = *mè pantes* = not all *pas tout*
  - Lacan reintroduces singularity
    - paradigm of singularity = women
      - The Woman = not all *pas toute*  
The Woman = all (you want) ... but not that! *tout (ce que vous voudrez) mais pas ça!*  
cf. Socrates didn't want to hear his wife when drinking the poison: "all you want, but not that!"
      - The-woman *La-femme* = God (another name of God) 14  
– both do not exist
    - the singular in the cure
      - problem  
via particular instances of the Ucs (= neurotic symptom + free associations)
        - how to clasp *serrer* something singular (= R)??
        - how to encourage the subject to sneak into the right hole/burrow *trou* ??
      - forms of the singular appearing in the cure
        - a woman
        - destiny *destinée* of the speechbeing
        - the sinthome



## TO BE A MAN / TO BE A WOMAN VIA THE CAST AWAY PENIS

### Man

**Phallus = the cast away penis or the  $\Phi$  makes a sexual rapport man/women 127**

- man does not make love with his penis  
instrument or connecting device **truchement** for copulation (penis) is to be cast away on the refuse  
dump **au rancart**
- man makes love with his unconscious
  - Ucs = phallus (castration) – in relation to woman as (a)
  - Ucs = phonation stands in for the male, for man **cf. X**  
phonation = production of speech sounds of phonemes  
**cf. man has to talk (humor)**

woman

sexual rapport man/woman

staged by the fantasy of the impossibility to cast away the penis 126

extreme case = film by Oshima (1976) "l'Empire des sens" / "In the realm of the senses"

- true story Sada Abe murder 1936
  - Failed as a geisha and went into prostitution
    - Sexually never satisfied
    - 30 years old finally finds a man who does not flinch – but he does not want to leave his wife
  - Killing and castration
    - she becomes jealous  
threatens to cut his penis, if he ever uses it again with another woman (as seen in a play)
    - killing  
After 2 nights of sex, they start choking each other during orgasm – repeated for hours, until his face is left distorted – he then takes an overdose of a sedative and tells her to strangle him in his sleep – which she does
    - After the killing
      - a burden is lifted from her shoulders, and she feels a sense of clarity
      - After lying with the body for hours
        - she cuts off his genitalia
        - and she writes
          - with blood on his left thigh, and on sheet: "Sada and Ishida are alone **one**"
          - with the knife she carves the character for her name into his left arm
        - she puts on his underwear,  
wraps his genitalia in a magazine, and hides them in her kimono – and leaves
  - necrophilia  
**she does not want to cast away the penis**
    - puts his penis in her mouth and tries to insert it
    - considers suicide, by jumping from a cliff while holding on to his penis
  - arrested after 3 days
    - police not convinced, she shows his penis as proof **cf. everybody laughing happily**
    - explanation
      - I took the part of him that brought back to me the most vivid memories
      - if I killed him no other woman could ever touch him again
  - afterwards
    - penis size
      - rumors that the penis was of extraordinary size
      - to Tokyo University Medical School's pathology museum  
display after WWII – but got lost **finally got cast away, in the male universe of university**
    - fame
      - interviewed as authority on both sexuality and freedom – appearing in plays
      - model employee in a working class club – with an act: slowly descends a staircase.  
The men in the pub putting their hands over their crotches, and shouting "Hide the knives!" and "I'm afraid to go and pee!"
    - Director of In the Realm of the Senses found her in a nunnery  
died 1971

- Movie Nagisa Oshima "L'empire des sens" (In the Realm of the Senses) 1976
  - Title
    - Japanese title: Corrida of love (love=death – allusion to bullfighting)
    - French title taken from Barthes' "L'empire des signes" (1970 – commented in "Lituraterre")  
cf. Japan: sex is only in explicit sex – West: sex is everywhere except in explicit sex
  - story changed?
    - a prostitute turned housekeeper loves to spy on the love-making of her bosses – and starts a relation with the man of the house
    - she does not tolerate the idea that his penis will be used with another woman
  - censorship
    - French film because it could not be edited in Japan
    - most controversial scene:  
he pushes an egg into her vulva, she push it out and then he eats it
    - Belgium was only European country that banned it (cf Scoop!!!) ban was lifted in 1994
- interpretation Lacan = female fantasy
  - what is the female fantasy
    - cut off the penis of a man ...
    - ... but a living or a dead man?
  - Comments Lacan
    - the movie remains ambiguous
      - man is killed ...
      - ... but still bleeds profusely when his penis is cut off  
(impossible if the heart does not beat any longer)
    - cf. *Propos directifs sexualité féminine 1960*
      - no man without castration
      - so woman adores a castrated lover or a dead man (and even both united in the same man = castrated dead man) as the ideal *incubus*
  - what is the aim/effect of this female fantasy on man / on th onlooker?

- 
- what does this fantasy show?
  - Singularity of a woman
    - the Other of the Other is called God, but in fact is The Woman *La Femme*  
resemblance God and Woman: both are egg-laying or 'spawners'  
*pondeuse=kinderfabriek – spawner=kuitvis*  
cf. Lacan also impressed with the scene where the woman puts an egg in her vagina  
(eye of the voyeur = she spied with an open mouth on the sexual relations of her  
bosses and at her lover fucking an old geisha (parents?) → she attacks the eyes of  
geisha's (cf Lacan sisters Papin)
    - God and The Woman do not exist  
there are only particular *singular* women one by one  
one woman is never the Other of the Other
  - Power of a woman
    - power of Japanese women
    - any woman knows how to get her leg over the bar between Signifier and signified  
*n'importe quelle femme sait sauter la barre entre signifiant et signifié*  
??? *lalangue?* No metaphors in her speaking
- Effect on Lacan
  - first: speechless with amazement / breathless / flabbergasted *soufflé*
  - second: wants to embark on a folisophy 128
    - *a sofia=wisdom based on folie=madness, subverted by madness*
    - this should be a less ominous/sinister form of wisdom *sagesse*  
(although the biblical Book of Wisdom is not bad either, because it is based on the lack  
*manque*)
    - cf. new form of wisdom = Joyce's wisdom of the *sinthome* JAM 243
      - not resign to the lack, not return to zero (homeostasis of the universal within the  
limits of the pleasure principle)
      - but to make use of the singularity of your 'psychical handicap', as good as it gets  
*pour le meilleur et pour le pire*, without giving in to common sense

# **LESSON 5**

## **UNANALYSABLES**

### **a principle**

a new approach of the clinic implies new analysables ... and unanalysables

the analysables and unanalysables of the topological clinic are not the same as those of the structural clinic

## JOYCE = SINTHOME → CANNOT BE ANALYZED

120

**Joyce suggests that his writing=person can easily be analysed with Freudian psychoanalysis**

everything seems to have a sexual meaning

**but Joyce's writing=person is unanalysable with Freudian psychoanalysis**

everybody is defeated by Joyce

everybody breaks his teeth in trying to analyze Joyce

- Adams – “Symbol and surface” 1967
  - Important reference for Lacan
    - consistency
    - inconceivably private joke
    - etc
  - Surface and Symbol according to Oscar Wilde  
All art is at once surface and symbol. Those who go beneath the surface do so at their peril. Those who read the symbol do so at their peril. It is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors.
- Lacan
  - Lacan does not tackle Joyce in a dialogue with Freud  
but in a dialogue with Joyce-expert Jacques Aubert – as his guide, his touchstone  
just like he dialogues with Soury and Thomé concerning the bo-chains
  - Lacan has the same problem with Joyce as he has with bo-chains  
encounters the limits of his own imaginary and symbolic = subjective implication
    - limits of his own Symbolic  
cf. Lacan dreams 120
      - dreamtext
        - Lacan as a mediocre penman (*scribouilleur*) – without a role
        - Lacan judges characters before the public of his seminar
      - Interpretation: just like in a psychodrama  
*Lacan and Aubert in a psychodrama around Joyce*
    - limits of his own Imaginary  
Lacan feels impeded *empêchement* 125  
*cf. Sem X, 19 = caught in the trap of the Imaginary*

## why is Joyce's writing=person unanalysable with Freudian psychoanalysis?

- Joyce's relationship with language  
he endlessly delaying of meaning = eftsooneries
- Joyce has no transference on PA (negative transference?)  
Joyce was not disposed to PA 79
  - cf. Joyce's malicious puns on names = negative transference
    - "Swiss Tweedledum Jung is not to be confounded with Viennese Tweedledee Freud"
      - Lewis Carroll
      - tweedle = bungle (klungelen) on a violin = fiedelen
      - tweedledum and tweedledee = één pot nat, lood om oud ijzer  
they are all the same / it's six of one and half a dozen of the other
    - Lacan reacts with his own malicious puns on the name of Joyce
      - Joy = Freude
      - Joyce = an a-Freud [anti-Freud](#) / [affreux](#) horrible/awfull
  - Based on his missed encounter with PA?



- Based on his missed encounter with PA?  
cf. 3 missed encounters with Jung
  - encounter 1 = 1919
    - maecenas Edith Rockefeller offers to pay for an analysis with Jung, in Zurich (she was also supporting Jung financially!)  
because of the negative effects of his alcoholism on his writing
    - Joyce refuses – making the remark about tweedledum Jung “amusing himself at the expense (in every sense of the word) of ladies and gentlemen who are troubled with the bees in their bonnets”  
Lacan backs Joyce up (Lituraterre 1971)
      - Lacan calls Joyce’s maecenas a **messe-haine** = hate-mass  
wanting the best for him she risked to produce the worst
      - Joyce would not have benefited from an analysis (Jungian or Freudian)  
with his singular form of writing he had already achieved the best a PA can achieve  
= reduce the letter to litter = emptied of all meaning **sens**  
= Signifier reveals itself to be only source of jouissance
    - but when Joyce did not longer receive the financial support by Edith Rockefeller, he reacted in a paranoid manner, accusing a common friend that he had convinced her that this was the only way to stop his drinking
  - encounter 2 = 1930-1932  
Joyce asked Jung for a preface to the German translation of the book about “Ulysses” he himself had ‘dictated’ to Stuart Gilbert
    - in the first version of the preface  
Jung declared that “Ulysses” could be read backwards = typical schizophrenic creation  
Joyce was not amused – the preface did not get published
    - in 1932 Jung wrote a new version of the preface: “Ulysses. Ein Monolog”  
it took Jung 3 years to read the book
      - but he would “never be able to tell whether I enjoyed it: I was bored, I grumbled, cursed, admired (...) but finally I happened to get out of it by sheer good luck”
      - he complimented Joyce with his knowledge of “the real psychology of a woman” –  
a compliment that Joyce from then on would always oppose to Nora’s litany that he “did know nothing about women”
  - encounter 3 = 1934  
Jung becomes the twentieth doctor for Joyce’s psychotic daughter Lucia  
finally diagnosing a *folie à deux* between father and daughter

- Joyce did not believe in the meaning of history
  - theories about history 3 forms of 'history'-myths or history-fantasies
    - Imaginary history
      - progress towards an end (teleology)
        - theory
          - something has to be realised
        - examples
          - philosophy: Hegel
          - psychology: Self-psychology
      - eternal return of the same
        - theory
          - history is eternal return of the same = always finding back **retrouver** the same
          - history is futile = no progress
          - history is a nightmare – without possibility of awakening  
everything always starts all over again
        - examples (see digression)
          - Vico **see digression below**
          - Blavatsky **see digression below**
          - Jung
    - Symbolic history  
Freudian psychoanalysis
      - history based on trauma
      - two reactions to a trauma
        - historisation
          - development of Ucs – with its repetition as shown in Ucs formations
        - non-historisation
          - development of death-drive = drifting or floating off **dérive** towards death  
progress always bears the stamp of death  
cf. death-drive = Real as impossible
    - Real History  
Lacan with the idea of the recurrent invention of unlinked bits and pieces of Real
  - Joyce and history  
Joyce believes in history as eternal return of the same (Vico / Blavatsky / Jung)
    - Joyce wants to awake from the nightmare that history is to him **désir de réveil**  
“history is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake” (Stephen in “Ulysses”)
      - history is a nightmare
        - history = eternal return of the same  
Joyce was fascinated by Vico, Mrs. Blavatsky ... and Jung
        - history = big words that make us so unhappy
      - contempt Joyce for history  
wants to awake from this nightmare, wants to escape this eternal return  
**desire for the Real / desire to awake, to wake up**
    - But “Finnegans Wake” shows that there is no awakening from the nightmare of history
      - the dreamer cannot be identified **no subject who tells the dream**
      - the dreamer is identical with the dream **no point outside the dream**
- in this way “Finnegans Wake” functions as a sinthome  
**symptom is like a dream – sinthome is like a nightmare**

digression: eternal return of the same

history is governed by the same laws as nature

- Philosophy: Vico
  - who  
Italian political philosopher and rhetorician
  - theory about history "Scienza Nuova" 1725  
civilization develops in a recurring cycle (*ricorso*) of 3 ages  
each age is characterized by master figures of language
    - divine=poetic age  
human and natural phenomena are understood via metaphors
    - heroic age  
human and natural phenomena are understood via metonymy
    - human age  
which language figure??

in this way the recurring cycle of 3 ages constitutes an ideal eternal history.
- psychology: Mrs. Blavatsky
  - who
    - Russian occultist and medium
    - founded the theosophic Society 1875
      - basis of western esoterism = synthesis religion and science via eastern philosophy (a kind of 3-bo-knot!!)
      - biggest imposter/fraud of all times  
– but hugely popular with artists and 'mad scientists' (JAM 229)
    - lived in Ostend for some time
  - rhythmic model of the universe – based on 2 mouvements (Hindu) (JAM 230)
    - creation=manvantara = Universe emerges
    - dissolution=pralaya = Universe disappears = "Universal night"  
cf. movement of the sun (history based on a natural rhythm)
- Jungs idea of the collective Ucs  
eg animus/anima pop up in different forms

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OTHER UNANALYSABLES BECAUSE OF THEIR RELATION WITH LANGUAGE</b></p>
---

126

jesuitism/English/Japanese languages

- Are opposed to the play **jeu** and the manipulation **maniement** of the Ucs
- because of the co-existence of two languages,  
one of these languages supports the Ucs and consequently makes the Ucs superfluous,  
unnecessary

## two tongues / two languages

133

- logic
  - basis = lalangue
  - reaction = division between 2 tongues langue
    - a tongue the subject speaks = language langage
    - a tongue the subject does not speak – support of the Ucs
- paradigm Sem III, 71  
Corsican patient with 2 tongues
  - tongue he chooses not to speak = Corsican he spoke as a child with his parents
    - he cannot repeat any longer what he said as a child in Corsican to his parents
    - supports his Ucs
  - tongue he speaks = French he speaks in his adult life
    - imagines that he chooses to speak French = neurotic!!
    - perceives French as imposed paroles imposées = psychotic!!
- normally=neurosis has also 2 tongues
  - tongue the neurotic chooses not to speak  
language the subject chooses not to speak supports his Ucs
  - tongue the neurotic imagines that he chooses to speak  
he has also to create the language that he chooses to speak  
**E725 la responsabilité première de la PA est devant le langage**
    - each of us gives this tongue at each moment a little push/nudge towards meaning sens  
each of us contributes to this tongue with his/her particular Ucs
      - when what we say is a fact of saying dire
      - **when producing Ucs formations eg lapsus**  
**not the same as the creation of lalangue by the set of women chatting amongst each other**
  - result 136
    - we keep alive the tongue that we speak
    - we stay within reality (we do not create a new collective reality (illusion of revolution))

- Joyce=psychosis
- two tongues
  - tongue Joyce chooses not to speak = Gaelic
    - Gaelic=*Keltisch*
      - name
        - in Irish language: Gaeilge = Gaelic
        - in English language: Irish
      - oldest Western literature in the common language (not latin)
      - 18th century lost ground:
        - 'civilising' by Anglo-British administrations & Catholic church discourages Gaelic
        - immigration to USA (great Famine): English allowed for jobs other than farming
      - end 19th intellectual Gaelic Revival
        - folk tradition
        - journalism and modern literature.
      - Irish is first official language of Republic of Ireland (English is the other)
    - Relation Joyce with Gaelic
      - no sympathy for Yeats-inspired Irish=Gaelic literary revival = a lost bet
      - great sympathy for Gaelic language as embodied in a woman (like Nora)
        - cf. epiphanies of women talking amongst each other (in English!!)
        - cf. "exceptional purity of Irish womanhood" corrupted by church/fatherland/home
  - **Substitute for the Ucs? No! Does not support his Ucs!!!**
  - tongue Joyce perceives as imposed = English
    - destruction of English instead of keeping it alive thanks to the constant injection of his Ucs
    - reducing English to *lalangue*
  - tongue Joyce chooses to speak = Italian
    - family Joyce spoke Italian!!
    - his children have Italian names Lucia & Giorgio

## 2 tongues of the catholics = Jesuits

- the quintessence of catholicism as represented by the Jesuits  
and especially in their notion of reservatio mentalis or mental equivocation
    - what?
      - Jesuit invention: 16th-century Spanish Jesuit Martin de Azpilcueta = Navarrus
        - sometimes truth or the whole of truth must not be told
        - if it serves a greater good
          - in a conflict between justice and veracity, justice should prevail.
          - you may lie if it serves justice (as you perceive it)
        - As long as you say the whole truth mentally, to God
    - cf. I Swear To Tell The Truth and Nothing But The Truth but not The Whole Truth – So Help Me God
    - Church=Pope condemned it (politics!!)
    - but the jesuits secretly have maintained it  
hypocrisy??
    - how? equivocation  
using ambiguous words/expressions (ambiguous in itself or due to the circumstances of time, place, or person), knowing that the person who you are talking to will go for the untrue version
    - typically Irish ...  
Irish church in dealing with child sexual abuse – until recently
  - JAM also about the Jesuits (obsessed with their wit or trickery) = to outwit the jesuit
- Joyce was a die-hard child of the jesuits
  - a Jesuit at heart
    - remained faithful to the teachings of the churchfathers and the jesuits
      - as reinforcement (*armature*) of his thinking
    - even tried to be more jesuit than the jesuits themselves
      - cf silence, exile and cunning
      - cunning = to outwit the Jesuit – be more jesuit (more *reservatio mentalis*) than the jesuits
  - doubly unanalysable??
    - Catholic – remained for the rest of his life
    - Sinthome

## 2 tongues of the Japanese

not analysable – but not for the same reasons as the jesuits 126  
nevertheless Japanese Language also opposes the play *jeu* and manipulation *maniement* of the Ucs  
(making Japanese unanalysable), because of the coexistence of two languages in Japanese

cf. Lituraterre 1971

- Traumatic introduction of Chinese writing in spoken Japanese
  - Japanese is only a spoken language – no written Japanese
  - 500 AD 'introduction of Chinese writing (Kanji = Han Characters) = trauma
- as a result of the traumatic introduction of Chinese writing, spoken Japanese got divided in Japanese Chinese characters/writing can be read and pronounced in 2 different ways this is a form of division of the subject
  - On'yomi = sound-reading
    - Japanese reading or pronunciation of the character based on its Chinese pronunciation
      - a handicapped Chinese, because Japanese spoken language is limited qua sounds
      - there exist several Japanese versions of the Chinese pronunciation of a character
    - used for ideas/concepts that the Chinese introduced to Japan (Confucianism!)  
Japanese did not know these ideas before and did not need to have spoken words for them
    - compositions of Kanji's are mostly pronounced in this 'Chinese' way
  - Lacan interpretation
    - fake Chinese pronunciation of the Chinese character = the repressed or Ucs
    - letter/writing is a void that can be filled with *jouissance* (of the voice!)
  - Kun'yomi = meaning-reading
    - reading or pronunciation of the character based on the way the Japanese in their oral language already named the thing it refers to  
based on a the pronunciation of a native Japanese word that closely approximates the meaning of the Chinese character
    - used for things that are common to China and Japan – usually more concrete things
    - a single Kanji is mostly pronounced in this way
  - Lacan interpretation
    - letter/writing = take-off *appui* for the Signifier and its metaphorisation
    - Subject speaks in a very formal way *semblants*, *parole vide*  
according to the complicated rules of politeness/courtesy  
eg no emotions in the presence of higher ranking or elder people



See movie “Silence” by Martin Scorsese (2016)

jesuits and Japanese try to outwit each other in the matter of this double language (and the lack of Ucs)  
– who is the master of this double language excluding the Ucs? The whole movie through it looks like  
the Japanese will be the masters – but finally the Jesuits, with their *reservatio mentalis* turn out to be the  
real masters of double language (pope very much liked the movie)

## 2 tongues of the English

coexistence of two languages in English *lalangue*  
consequently English *lalangue* opposes the play *jeu* and the manipulation *maniement* of the Ucs  
English are not analysable

- English = two languages  
Lacan refers to Jones, but without mentioning him  
cf. E Jones – A linguistic factor in English Characterology 1920
  - typically English character trait of 'propriety'=fatsoen decency, but degenerating into prudishness=preuts/tuttig/stijfdeftigheid also respectability)
  - based on the division between
    - original Saxon language (gut language, vivid, robust, virile)  
cf. Kun'yomi = meaning-reading = Japanese speaking like Japanese in Japan very formal, in England very trashy
    - language of the Norman invaders – and later on the Latin cultural language  
cf. On'yomi = sound-reading = Japanese speaking like Chinese takes the place of the Ucs
- that English language makes the Ucs superfluous makes Lacan worry about the future of PA
  - At that moment: He only knows one English analyst, he says – and the guy is Scottish Fairbairn ??
  - Future
    - English becomes the Universal language
    - It appears to be difficult to translate Lacan in English