

| <i>DU SYMBOLE, ET DE SA FONCTION RELIGIEUSE</i> | <i>THE SYMBOL, AND ITS RELIGIOUS FUNCTION</i> | <i>THE SYMBOL, AND ITS RELIGIOUS FUNCTION</i> |
|---|---|---|
| Intervention de Lacan au Congrès de psychologie religieuse, Paris, Septembre 1954 | Intervention of Lacan to the Congress of Religious Psychology, Paris, September 1954, | Intervention of Lacan to the Congress of Religious Psychology, Paris, September 1954, |
| French text from : http://elpsicoanalistalector.blogspot.com/2012/05/jacques-lacan-du-symbole-et-de-sa.html?m=1 | Translated by Richard G. Klein and edited by Andrew Stein | Translated by Anthony Chadwick |
| R. P Bruno —Vous savez tous la compétence, la haute compétence du Dr Lacan, puisqu'il a été à la tête de toute la psychanalyse en France, et je crois que tout le monde se réfère à lui pour tout ce qui vit et existe maintenant dans notre pays à ce propos. Il donnera maintenant sa conférence, qu'il a promise ce matin, et dont nous avons eu un avant-goût dans ses interventions. Nous allons commencer tout de suite, parce que je crois que l'après-midi est très chargé. | R. P Bruno -You all know the skill, the high competence of Dr. Lacan, since he has been at the head of all psychoanalysis in France, and I believe that everyone refers to him for all that now lives and now exists in our country in this regard. He will now give his conference, which he promised this morning, and which we had a foretaste of in the in the interventions. We will start immediately, because I believe that the afternoon is very busy. | R. P Bruno -You all know the skill, the high competence of Dr. Lacan, since he has been at the head of all psychoanalysis in France, and I believe that everyone refers to him for all that lives and now exists in our country in this regard. He will now give his talk, which he promised this morning, and which we had a taste of in the interventions. We will start immediately because I believe that the afternoon is very busy. |
| Dr Laforgue, président de séance — Alors, mon ami Lacan va consacrer son art et son talent à tout ce qu'un psychanalyste peut dire au sujet du symbolisme en général. C'est du moins ce qu'il vient de me dire, et je lui donne la parole. 53 | Dr. Laforgue, Chairman of the meeting —Well, my friend Lacan will devote his art and his talent to everything a psychoanalyst can say about the subject of symbolism in general. It's the least of what he has just told me, and I give him the floor. 53 | Dr. Laforgue, Chairman of the meeting —Well, my friend Lacan will devote his art and his talent to everything a psychoanalyst can say about the subject of symbolism in general. At least that is what he has just told me, and I hand it over to him 53 |
| J. L. — Tout ce qu'un psychanalyste peut dire du symbolisme, en général ou en particulier, ça nous emmènerait loin! Parce qu'il en sait des choses, le psychanalyste, sur le symbolisme! Il en sait beaucoup, il en sait même trop pour pouvoir si facilement s'y retrouver. Aussi | J. L. - Everything a psychoanalyst can say about symbolism, in general or in particular, it would take us away/too far! Because the psychoanalyst knows some things about symbolism! He knows a lot, he knows too much about it to be able to | J. L. - Everything a psychoanalyst can say about symbolism, in general or in particular, that would take us way too far! Because he knows some things, the psychoanalyst, on symbolism! He knows a lot, he knows too much for you easily to find |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>bien m'étais-je limité, dans un premier titre de ce propos, à parler de l'efficacité symbolique dans la psychanalyse.</p> | <p>easily find his way around there. Also I limited myself, in a first title for this talk to speak about the symbolic effectiveness in psychoanalysis.</p> | <p>your way around. Also I limited myself, in a first title of in this topic, to speaking of symbolic effectiveness in psychoanalysis.</p> |
| <p>Eh bien, ne croyez pas que ce soit ce dont je traiterai aujourd'hui. J'y ai renoncé il y a déjà un mois et demi, quand le Père Bruno, à qui je dois l'honneur d'être ici devant vous, m'a fait remarquer que cette réunion se passait tout de même autour de saint Jean de la Croix. En effet, je crois qu'il faut à ce que je vais vous dire donner un centre conforme à l'inspiration qui nous réunit. Il s'agira donc, en somme, de ce qu'un psychanalyste qui a tenté de méditer sur son expérience peut dire du symbole, en relation avec sa fonction religieuse. 'Pourquoi hésiter à le dire? C'est un assez joli mot en soi, et nous sommes dans un milieu tel que je ne vois pas pourquoi nous hésiterions à le prononcer, d'autant qu'il désigne le caractère relationnel du symbole. 54</p> | <p>Well, do not think this is what I will treat today. I rejected it a month and a half ago already, when Father Bruno, to whom I owe the honor of being here before you, made me note that this meeting turns all the same around St. John of the Cross. Indeed, I think it is necessary to what I want to say to you that I provide a basis that conforms to the inspiration that brings us together. It is a question then, in sum, of what a psychoanalyst who has tried to meditate on his experience means by the symbol, in relationship with its religious function. 'Why hesitate to say it? It is a rather pretty word in itself, and we are in such an environment that I don't see why we would hesitate to say/pronounce it, inasmuch as it designates the relational character of the symbol. 54</p> | <p>Well, do not think this is what I will treat today. I gave up on that already a month and a half ago, when Father Bruno, to whom I owe the honor of being here before you, told me that this meeting was taking place on the subject of St. John of the Cross. Indeed, I think I must give a center to what I am going to say that conforms to the inspiration that brings us together. In short, this will be a question of what a psychoanalyst who has tried to meditate on his experience can say of the symbol, in relationship with its religious function. 'Why hesitate to say it? It is a rather pretty word in itself, and we are in such an environment that I don't see why we would hesitate to pronounce it, in as much as it designates the relational character of the symbol. 54</p> |
| <p>Je rappelle en effet que le symbole a peut-être essentiellement une valeur de relation — je me tiens exprès à ce terme général — desujet à sujet. D'autres ici l'ont fait intervenir, M. Laforgue en particulier, certes d'un autre point de vue, en soulignant qu'en raison de la fonction du conflit social, le symbole peut être un crypto-langage. Ce n'est pas le terme qu'il a employé, j'interprète sa pensée, je la traduis, je crois que c'est ce que mon confrère a voulu dire.</p> | <p>I would point out, in fact, that the symbol has perhaps essentially a relationship value - I am expressly referring to the general term, of subject to subject. Others here have made interventions about it. Mr. Laforgue in particular, certainly from another point of view, stresses that because of the function of social conflict, the symbol may be a crypto-language. This is not the term he used, I interpret his thoughts, I translate them, I think that this is what my colleague wanted to say</p> | <p>I would point out, in fact, that the symbol has perhaps essentially a relationship value - I am expressly referring to this general subject matter – of subject to subject. Others here have brought it up, Mr. Laforgue in particular, certainly from another point of view, pointing out that because of the function of social conflict, the symbol may be a crypto-language. This is not the term he used, I interpret his thoughts, I translate them, I</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | think that this is what my colleague meant. |
| <p>C'est d'autre part sa fonction de langage, à proprement parler, que M. Mircea Eliade nous a évoquée à propos du symbole — parce que dire que c'est un pré-langage, cher monsieur Mircea Eliade, veut dire très exactement que ça tient la fonction du langage. Le symbole, pour les Australiens, c'est quand même de la métaphysique! Qu'ils le sachent ou non, comme M. Jourdain faisait de la prose sans le savoir. C'est là notre point de vue de psychanalyste, et il nous intéresse tant!</p> | <p>It is the other function of language <langage>, properly speaking, that Mr. Mircea Eliade evoked for us about the symbol – because to say it is a pre-language, dear Mr. Mircea Eliade, means exactly that it has the function of language. The symbol, for the Australians, it is still even metaphysical! Whether they know it or not, as Mr. Jourdain makes prose without knowing it. This is our point of view as a psychoanalyst, and it interests us so much!</p> | <p>On the other hand, it is its function of language, properly speaking, that Mr. Mircea Eliade evoked about the symbol – because to say it is a pre-language, dear Mr. Mircea Eliade, means exactly that it carries out the function of language. The symbol, for the Australians, it is still even metaphysical! Whether they know it or not, as Mr. Jourdain makes prose without knowing it. This is our point of view as a psychoanalyst, and it interests us so much!</p> |
| <p>Donc, une question se pose à propos du symbole, celle de savoir quelle est sa fonction relationnelle. C'est une sorte d'énigme.</p> | <p>So there is a question that poses itself about the symbol, that of knowing what is its relational function.. It's a kind of an enigma.</p> | <p>So there is a question that poses itself about the symbol, that of knowing what is its relational function. It's a kind of an enigma.</p> |
| <p>La définition du symbole que le Père Lucien 55 nous a donnée tout d'abord dans son exposé me paraît être vraiment le meilleur départ qu'on pouvait prendre à ce sujet. Il a rappelé que l'une des définitions officielles, concrètes, du mot «symbole» dans la langue grecque renvoie à la tessère brisée dont la réunion constitue justement ce que nous sommes en train de chercher, la valeur relationnelle du symbole.</p> | <p>The definition of the symbol that Father Lucien 55 gave us first of all in his presentation seems to me to be really the best start which one could take on this subject. He recalled that one of the formal, concrete, definitions of the word "symbol" in the Greek language refers to the broken tessera whose reunion constitutes precisely what we are looking for, the relational value of the symbol.</p> | <p>The definition of the symbol that Father Lucien 55 gave us first of all in his presentation seems to me to be really the best start which one could make on this subject. He recalled that one of the formal, concrete, definitions of the word "symbol" in the Greek language refers to the broken tessera whose reunion constitutes precisely what we are looking for, the relational value of the symbol.</p> |
| <p>Si ces deux moitiés sont restées séparées dans l'exposé du Père Lucien pour nous laisser admirer leur réunion, c'est précisément parce qu'il est parti de la notion d'expérience personnelle. Tous les départs sont bons, et comment celui-là n'aurait-il pas été justifié s'agissant d'une expérience, sinon aussi</p> | <p>If these two halves remained separate In Father Lucien's expose to let us admire their reunion, it is precisely because it began from the concept of personal. All departures are good, and how would it not have justified acting from experience, if not personal, than at least isolated from the</p> | <p>If these two halves remained separate in Father Lucien's exposé to let us admire their reunion, it is precisely because that he started from the notion of personal experience. All departures are good, and would that one not have been justified, since it was a question of an</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>personnelle, du moins aussi isolée du monde qu'est l'expérience mystique? Étant parti de la fonction d'expression personnelle du symbole, le Père Lucien ne pouvait manquer d'ajouter au milieu de son exposé que le symbole se retrouve par tout, et avec le même sens.</p> | <p>world as the mystic's experience is? Being part of the function of personal expression of the symbol, Father Lucien could not fail to add in the midst of his expose that the symbol finds itself by all, and with the same meaning.</p> | <p>experience, if not as personal, at least as isolated from the world as the mystical experience? Having started from the function of personal expression of the symbol, Father Lucien could not fail to add in the middle of his exposé that the symbol is found everywhere, and with the same meaning.</p> |
| <p>Je suis en train de m'arrêter au bord de certains mots, il faut tout de même que je fasse le pas, et que je parle, pourquoi pas, de la valeur universelle du symbole. 56</p> | <p>I am stopping at the edge of certain words, I must still take the step, and that I speak, why not, of the universal value of the symbol. 56</p> | <p>I am stopping at the edge of certain words, I must still take the step, and that I speak, why not, of the universal value of the symbol. 56</p> |
| <p>Encore faut-il relever qu'introduisant la notion d'universel, nous introduisons une ambiguïté. Dire que le symbole est universel, c'est une donnée de fait, mais c'est dire aussi qu'il est universalisant, c'est-à-dire qu'il constitue comme tel un univers</p> | <p>It should also be pointed out that introducing the notion of the universal, we introduce a ambiguity. To say that the symbol is universal, is a given fact, but it also means that it is universalizing, that is to say it is constituted as such a universe</p> | <p>It should also be pointed out that introducing the notion of universal, we introduce an ambiguity. To say that the symbol is universal is a given fact, but it also means that it is universalizing, that is to say that it constitutes as such a universe</p> |
| <p>Nous voilà déjà au centre de gravité du sujet. J'ai l'impression qu'il faut faire effort pour se retenir d'y aller tout de suite, qu'il faut se cramponner au bord de la cuvette, car on y glisse irrésistiblement par toutes les voies. Si l'on se retient, c'est pour avoir le temps de s'y reconnaître, car de quelque bord que nous prenions l'expérience du symbole, c'est toujours de la notion de réunion qu'il s'agit en fin de compte.</p> | <p>We are already at the center of gravity of the subject. I have the impression that it is necessary to make an effort to be careful not too go to fast, that one must cling/hang on to the edge of the bowl, because one irresistibly slips there no matter which way one goes. If we are holding back, it is to have the time to recognize, because from whatever side we take the experience of the symbol, it is always of the notion of a reunion that matters in the final account.</p> | <p>We are already at the center of gravity of the subject. I have the impression that it is necessary to make an effort to be careful not to go there at once, that we have to cling on to the edge of the bowl, because we slip into it irresistibly by all ways. If we are holding back, it is to have the time to recognize where we are, because from whatever side we experience the symbol, it is always of the notion of a reunion that it is a question in the final account.</p> |
| <p>D'autre part, s'il y a bien quelque chose où se montre la fonction créatrice, fondatrice, du symbole, c'est bien la parole. Il est très curieux que ce terme ne soit pas plus sorti ici que certains autres. Il s'agit de la parole</p> | <p>On the other hand, if there is indeed something where the creative function of the symbol shows itself, it is the word <parole>. It is very curious that this term is no longer used here than certain others. It is the act of speech <parole></p> | <p>On the other hand, if there is indeed something where it demonstrates the creative function, founding function of the symbol, it is speech <parole>. It is very curious that this term is not used here as much as certain others. It</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | is a question of speech <parole> |
| Il s'agit de la parole en tant précisément qu'elle établit et fonde entre les sujets une relation qui ne prend justement pas les deux sujets tels qu'ils sont pour les mettre ensemble. Elle les constitue en tant que sujets dans la 57 | It is the act of speech precisely that establishes and founds a relationship between the subjects that does not take both subjects as they are put together. It constitutes them as subjects in the 57 | It is about speech precisely in as much as it establishes and founds a relationship between subjects that does not take both subjects as they are in order to put them together. It constitutes them as subjects in the 57 |
| relations meme qui les fait accéder à une dimension nouvelle. La fonction fondatrice de la parole dans la relation interhumaine me parait, tout compte fait, avoir été négligée. Pourtant, elle est si essentielle à notre problème que c'est pour ne pas avoir reconnu l'originalité, je dirai, absolue du niveau où elle fonctionne, que nous nous trouvons devant toutes sortes d'ambigüitiés. | same relations which makes them access a new dimension. The founding function of speech <parole> in the inter-human relationship seems to me, on balance, to have been neglected. Yet it is so essential to our problem that it is for not having recognized the originality, I would say, absolute from the level in which it operates, that we find ourselves confronted with all sorts of ambiguities. | relationship that makes them access a new dimension. The founding function of speech in the inter-human relationship seems to me, on balance, to have been neglected. Yet it is so essential to our problem that it is for not having recognized the absolute originality, I would say, of the level on which it operates, that we find ourselves confronted with all sorts of ambiguities. |
| On a pu me dire tout à l'heure que je parlais du «sociale». Mais pas du tout! Le social est marqué de la fonction de la parole, elle y est imprimée. Il y a d'autres sociaux parfaitement convenables, des tas de sociaux animaux qui nous ont beaucoup intéressés depuis quelque temps, où il n'y a pas la parole. | I was told just now that I was talking about the "social". But not at all! The social is marked with the function of the word <parole>, it is printed there. There are other perfectly suitable social groups, lots of social animals which have interested us for some time, where there is no speech <parole> | I was told earlier that I was talking about the "social". But not at all! The social is marked with the function of the word, it is printed there. There are other perfectly suitable social groups, lots of social animals which have interested us for some time, where there is no speech <parole> |
| Il en va de même de l'usage de la notion de l'inconscient comme collectif. | The same applies to the use of the notion of the unconscious as a collective | The same applies to the use of the notion of the unconscious as a collective. |
| Je le proclame devant la société qui m'entend, je défie qu'on me dise ce que ça veut dire, l'inconscient collectif. Quant à moi, je n'en sais absolument rien, si ce n'est à le définir comme le discours sans signification, <i>le flatus vocis</i> , le bruit et la fureur des paroles humaines, le discours insensé pour autant qu'il | I proclaim it before the society that hears me, I defy to be told what the collective unconscious means. As for me, I know absolutely nothing, except to detain it as meaningless discourse, <i>the flatus vocis</i> , the noise and fury of human words, the foolish discourse insofar as | I proclaim it before the society that hears me, I challenge you to tell me what it means, the collective unconscious. As for me, I know absolutely nothing, except to hold it to be meaningless discourse, the <i>flatus vocis</i> , the noise and fury of human words, the foolish discourse insofar as it |

| relie dans sa vibration générale ceux qui en sont les supports 58 | it links in its general vibration those who support them 58 | links in its general vibration those who support it 58 |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Dans l'ensemble, la collectivité ne sait pas ce qu'elle dit, et, à la vérité, on s'en passe fort bien. Le discours garde une valeur indépendamment de tout sens assumé. Comme le dit quelque part Mallarmé, «le discours humain est quelque chose comme cette monnaie à l'image effacée qu'on se passe de la main à la main». Et ça sert à quelque chose. Ça sert à ce qu'on ne se crêpe pas le chignon, à ce qu'on ne se coupe pas le cou à tous les coups! On tient des propos d'autobus, et grâce à cela, bon Dieu, on a l'air de s'entendre, c'est déjà bien suffisant. L'inconscient collectif, si vous voulez, c'est cela, c'est ce que tout le monde raconte, des histoires de vicomte, n'est-ce pas! En dehors de cela, je ne sais absolument pas ce que ça veut dire.</p> | <p>On the whole, the collectivity does not know what it says, and, indeed, we do without it very well. Speech <le discours> retains a value independently of any meaning assumed. As it is said in some part of Mallarmé, "the human discourse is something like this effaced currency that people pass from hand to hand". And that serves something. That one does not cut one's neck every time! We're holding on about the autobus, and thanks to that, good Lord, we seem to agree, it is already good enough. The collective unconscious, if you will, it is what everybody is saying, the stories of the viscount, is it not? Outside of that, I do not know what that means.</p> | <p>On the whole, the collectivity does not know what it says, and, indeed, we do without it very well. Speech <le discours> retains a value independently of any assumed meaning. As Mallarmé says somewhere, "human discourse is something like those coins whose image is rubbed off that are passed from hand to hand". And that serves something. It means that one does not get one's knickers in a twist, that one does not cut off one's nose to spite one's face every time! We talk about ordinary things, and thanks to that, good Lord, we seem to understand one another, it is already quite sufficient. The collective unconscious, if you will, is the tale everybody is telling, soap opera tales, is it not? Outside of that, I do not know what that means.</p> |
| <p>Ce pas étant déblayé, nous pouvons nous poser la question de savoir ce que c'est que la parole. La première chose à remarquer, c'est ce qu'introduit dans le monde la parole dans sa fonction symbolique. Nous revenons donc sur la notion du monde à partir de la parole. Avant la parole, 59 nous n'avons rien du tout, c'est le néant, le chaos, et l'esprit de Dieu peut-être flottant sur les eaux — mais nous ne sommes pas en communication avec Lui! A partir de la parole, quelque chose surgit dans le monde qui est nouveau, et qui y introduit des transformations puissantes.</p> | <p>This step being cleared, we can pose the question of knowing what speech <parole> is like. The first thing to note is that the word <parole> is introduced into the world in its symbolic function. We therefore return to the notion of the world from the word <parole>. Before the speech <parole>, 59 we have nothing at all, it is the nothingness, the chaos, and the spirit of God may be floating on the waters - but we are not in communication with Him! Starting with the word <parole> something emerges in the world that is new, and which</p> | <p>This step being cleared, we can pose the question of knowing what speech <parole> is. The first thing to note is that which speech introduces into the world in its symbolic function. We therefore return to the notion of the world starting from speech. Before speech, 59 We have nothing at all, it is the nothingness, chaos, and the spirit of God may be floating on the waters - but we are not in communication with Him! Starting from speech, something surges in the world that is new, and which introduces powerful</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | introduces there powerful transformations. | transformations. |
| Cela, nous le savons. Seulement, nous nous imaginons depuis quelque temps que cette espèce de remue-ménage que nous introduisons dans le monde, c'est l'action. Tout homme moderne a le cœur tourmenté par ce problème: «Au commencement était le Verbe», mais quand même, «Au commencement était l'action»! Entre les deux son cœur balance. Il n'a vraiment pas besoin de tant se tourmenter, pour la raison que l'action humaine par excellence, c'est précisément la parole. | We know that. Only we imagine for some time that this kind of bustle that we introduce in the world, is action. All modern man has his heart tormented by this problem: "In the beginning was the Word", But still, "In the beginning was the Action"! His heart swings between the two. He really does not need to torment himself so much, for the reason that human action par excellence, is precisely speech.<parole> | We know that. Only we imagine for some time that this kind of bustle that we introduce in the world, is action. Any modern man has his heart tormented by this problem: "In the beginning was the Word", But still, "In the beginning was action"! Between the two his heart swings. He really does not need to torment himself so much, for the reason that human action par excellence, is precisely speech. <parole> |
| Naturellement, pour nous aider à nous retrouver dans l'ordre des vérités métaphysiques, il y a toujours eu, à travers tous les temps, de ces divers humanismes chatoyants qui nous ramènent le bon sauvage, le huron. Aussi voyons-nous M. Leenhardt aller chercher très, très loin, du côté des Canaques, l'homme propre à nous rappeler que l'action 60 | Naturally, to help us find in the order of metaphysical truths, there has always been, through all times, these various shimmering humanisms which bring us the good savage, the Huron. So let's see Mr. Leenhardt go search very, very far, on the side of the Kanaks, the unique human to remind us of that action. 60 | Naturally, to help us find ourselves in the order of metaphysical truths, there has always been, through all time, these various shimmering humanisms which bring us the good savage, the Huron. So we see Mr. Leenhardt go searching very, very far, over among the Kanaks, the very man to remind us of that action 60 |
| et la parole, pour lui c'est la même chose, que fabriquer un petit instrument de pêche d'une forme spéciale, pour lui c'est une parole. Qu'est-ce à dire? Il est bien vrai que ce qu'il sait n'est pas vraiment distinct de ce qu'il fait, mais est-il besoin d'aller si loin pour savoir que l'action et la parole, c'est la même chose? — alors qu'il en va ainsi chaque fois que nous faisons quelque chose, et que notre savoir est identique à notre action. | and the word <parole>, for him it is the same thing, that manufacture of a small fishing instrument, for him it is a word <parole> What does that suggest? It is true that what he knows is not really distinct from what he does, But is it necessary to go so far to know that action and speech is the same thing? -that is the case every time we do something, and that our knowledge is identical to our action. | and speech<parole>, for him it is the same thing, that the manufacture of a small fishing instrument of a particular kind, for him is speech <parole> What does that mean? It is true that what he knows is not really distinct from what he does, But is it necessary to go so far to know that action and speech is the same thing? - That is the case every time we do something, and that our knowledge is identical to our action. |
| Seulement, autre chose est de savoir ce qu'on fait, et autre chose de | Only, another thing is to know what we do, and something else stops us from knowing it. At that moment, vertigo/ | Only, it's quite another thing to know what we do, and something else to stop in order to know it. At that |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>s'arrêter pour le savoir. À ce moment-là, le vertige vous prend, et la distinction se fait entre le savoir et l'action. Or, Dieu sait que, justement, plus une action est humaine, plus elle est intégrée à la fonction de la parole, et plus cet arrêt est source de vertige mortel.</p> | <p>dizziness grabs you, and the distinction is made between knowledge and action. But, God knows, precisely, that an action is human, the more it is integrated into the function of the speech <parole>, and further this stop is the source of a deathlike dizziness.</p> | <p>moment, vertigo/dizziness seizes you, and the distinction is made between knowledge and action. Now, God knows that, precisely, the more an action is human, the more it is integrated into the function of speech <parole>, and the more this stop is the source of a deadly vertigo..</p> |
| <p>Je le dis d'autant plus volontiers que je fais partie de la curieuse Out-La[w] des psychanalystes. Or, le drame de la psychanalyse est d'être une action humaine tellement fondatrice, tellement intégrée à l'action même de la parole, qu'elle comporte une responsabilité suprême, totale, presque intolérable à ceux qui en sont les supports. 6l</p> | <p>I say this all the more readily because I am part of the curious 'Out-Law' of psychoanalysts. Now, the drama of psychoanalysis is to be a human action so fundamental, so integrated with the very action of the word <parole>, that it involves a supreme responsibility, total, almost intolerable to those who are in support of it. 6l</p> | <p>I say this all the more readily because I am part of the curious <i>Out-Law</i> of psychoanalysts. Now, the drama of psychoanalysis is to be a human action so fundamental, so integrated with the very action of speech<parole>, that it involves a supreme responsibility, total, almost intolerable to those who are the pillars of it. 6l</p> |
| <p>C'est bien ce qui vous vaut d'entendre aujourd'hui de ma part un discours improvisé. Non pas que je me soumette de bon gré à une épreuve périlleuse, mais, implemment, si je n'ai rien pu, ou su, préparer à vous dire si ce n'est ce qui me vient à cette occasion, c'est en raison d'un sujet qui a absorbé ces temps-ci mes jours et mes nuits, celui des variantes du traitement psychanalytique. Cela signifie très précisément que, dans cette sorte de vertige où se tient le psychanalyste par rapport à son action, il a, dirai-je, tellement faim de savoir ce qu'il fait que, pour ne pas en dériver, il ne songe qu'à faire toujours formellement la même chose. ,Saint Augustin, qu'on lit de temps en temps, qu'on relit quelquefois, qu'on cherche dans les coins quand on a de bons tuyaux, a déjà fait des remarques</p> | <p>This is what you are hearing today from me is an improvised speech. Not that I willingly submit to a perilous trial, but, simply, if I nothing able or sorted out, to prepare to tell you if nothing comes of this occasion it is because of a subject which has absorbed these times--my days and my nights, that of the variants of the psychoanalytic treatment. This means very precisely that, in this kind of vertigo where the psychoanalyst keeps in relation to his action, he has, I will say, such hunger for knowing what he is doing that, in order not to be deflected from it, he does not consider that to always formally make always does formally the same., Saint Augustine, who people reread from time to time, one seeks In the corners when you have some good tips, already made</p> | <p>This is indeed what is worth your while to hear today an improvised speech from me. Not that I willingly submit to a perilous trial, but, simply, if I couldn't or didn't know how to prepare anything to say to you, except to tell you what occurs to me on this occasion it is because of a subject which has absorbed recently my days and my nights, that of the variants of the psychoanalytic treatment. This means very precisely that, in this kind of vertigo where the psychoanalyst finds himself in relation to his action, he has, I will say, such hunger for knowing what he is doing so that, in order not to drift away from it, he always does formally the same. Saint Augustine, whom one reads from time to time, whom one re-reads sometimes, whom</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>d'une valeur inestimable sur la parole en soulignant sa valeur de signe, mais il piétine à l'occasion des choses qui ne sont pas moins précieuses. Vous auriez tout à fait tort de croire que la parole est faite pour servir de signe, alors que, dans son essence, elle a pour fonction d'opérer ce dont très justement le Père Lucien est parti tout à l'heure, la reconnaissance du sujet par le sujet.</p> <p>62</p> | <p>remarks of inestimable value on speech by underlining the value of the sign, but it tramples on the occasion of things which are no less valuable. You would have been completely wrong to believe that the speech <parole> is made to serve as a sign, whereas in its essence, it has the function of operating very justly Father Lucien left at the time, the recognition of the subject by the subject.</p> <p>62</p> | <p>one seeks in the corners when you have some good tips, already made remarks of inestimable value on speech by underlining its value as sign, but he tramples on occasion things which are no less valuable. You would have been completely wrong to believe that speech <parole> is made to serve as a sign, whereas in its essence, it has the function of operating from the point that very justly Father Lucien, started just now, the recognition of the subject by the subject.</p> <p>62</p> |
| <p>Je ne dis rien de plus. Je n'ai pas dit «l'homme», parce que, moi, je ne sais pas tellement bien ce que c'est. La parole est fonction de reconnaissance, et c'est à l'intérieur de cette fonction qu'elle opère pour catégoriser, polariser, ordonner. Elle attire à elle des fonctions de connaissance qui sont d'une nature différente, mais qui sont pénétrées jusque dans leur fond par sa fonction de reconnaissance.</p> | <p>I say nothing more. I did not say "Man", because me, I do not know how good it is. Speech <parole> is a function of recognition, and it is within this function that it operates to categorize, polarize, and order. It attracts to it the functions of knowledge which are of a different nature but which are penetrated to their background/bottom by its function of recognition.</p> | <p>I say nothing more. I did not say "Man", because, I do not know really what that is. Speech <parole> is a function of recognition, and it is within this function that it operates to categorize, polarize, and order. It attracts to it the functions of knowledge which are of a different nature but which are penetrated to their bottom by its function of recognition.</p> |
| <p>La parole s'ordonne dans la dimension de la vérité, en tant que la vérité est autre chose que la réalité. La parole introduit une dimension différente dans la réalité, qui est celle de la vérité.</p> | <p>The word <parole> is ordered in the dimension of the truth, as truth is something else than reality. Speech <parole> introduces a dimension different in reality, which is that of the truth.</p> | <p>Speech <parole> is ordered in the dimension of the truth, as truth is something else than reality. Speech <parole> introduces a dimension different in reality, which is that of truth.</p> |
| <p>Quand il se trouve que cette vérité concerne des objets qui intéressent tout le monde et qui viennent à leur moment comme moyens dans la fonction de reconnaissance, il s'agit alors de vérifier la parole dans les choses. Si vous y réfléchissez, la vérification de la parole n'a que deux</p> | <p>When it turns out that this truth concerns objects that are of interest to the entire world and which come at their moment as a means in the function of recognition, it is then a question of verifying speech <parole> in things. If you think about it, verifying the speaker has only</p> | <p>When it turns out that this truth concerns objects that are of interest to everyone and which come at their moment as means in the function of recognition, it is then a question of verifying speech <parole> in things. If you think about it, verifying</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>modes possibles, ou bien la continuation du discours, pour autant que la parole peut se trouver en contradiction avec elle-même, ou bien ce que nous appelons communément l'expérience. 63</p> | <p>two possible modes, either the continuation of the discourse, provided that the speech <parole> may be in contradiction with itself, or what we commonly call experience. 63</p> | <p>speech has only two possible modes: either the continuation of the discourse, provided that the speech <parole> may be in contradiction with itself, or what we commonly call experience. 63</p> |
| <p>H- Nous croyons facilement que, dans l'expérience, nous manipulons vraiment le réel. Nous fabriquons volontiers des métaphores où nous nous transformons en êtres pourvus de toutes sortes de palmes, faisant le tour du tronc des arbres et des pierres, les flairant, comme si, à tâtons, tels des animaux, nous suivions la trace de la vérité pour percevoir ce qu'il en est du réel. Je fais ici appel, non pas aux expérimentalistes, qui sont pour la théorie, mais aux expérimentateurs.</p> | <p>H- We easily believe that in experience, we really manipulate reality. We freely make metaphors where we transform ourselves into beings equipped with all kinds of palms, traveling around the trunks of the trees and stones, sniffing them, as if, to be groping like animals, we were following the trace of the truth to perceive what is real in it. I appeal here, not to the experimentalists, who are for the theory, but to the experimenters.</p> | <p>H- We easily believe that in experience, we really manipulate reality. We freely make metaphors where we transform ourselves into beings equipped with all kinds of awards, traveling around the trunks of the trees and stones, sniffing them, as if, groping like animals, we were following the trace of the truth to perceive what is real. I appeal here, not to the experimentalists, who are for the theory, but to the experimenters.</p> |
| <p>Eux savent très bien qu'ils ne peuvent rien vérifier dans l'expérience qu'ils n'aient su donner aux choses une portée significative, c'est-à-dire y choisir préalablement des repères, ainsi portés à la fonction de signes. En tant que telle, la fonction humaine introduit dans le monde une grande perturbation fondamentale, qui est un nouveau registre, un nouvel ordre, celui de la parole et de la vérité, qui pénètre jusque dans son intime toute notre appréhension du réel.</p> | <p>They know very well that they cannot verify anything in the experience that they have been able to give to things a significant, that is to say, to choose in advance markers, thus brought to the function of signs. As such, the human function introduced into the world a great fundamental disruption/upheaval, which is a new register, a new order, that of speech <parole> and truth, which enters into its intimacy all of our apprehension of reality.</p> | <p>They know very well that they cannot verify anything in experience that they haven't been able to give to things a significant reach, that is to say to choose in advance markers, thus brought to the function of signs. As such, human function introduces into the world a major fundamental disruption, which is a new register, a new order, that of speech <parole> and truth, which penetrates into its heart all of our apprehension of reality.</p> |
| <p>Ça ne veut pas dire que c'est la même chose! Le symbolique est là [coup sur la table], et le réel est là [coup sur la table], et l'homme est dans le milieu [coup sur la table, suivi d'un silence]. 64</p> | <p>It does not mean that it's the same thing! The symbolic is there [blow on the table], and the reality is there [blow on the table], and man is in the middle [blow on the table, followed by a silence]. 64</p> | <p>It does not mean that it's the same thing! The symbolic is there [blow on the table], and reality is there [blow on the table], and man is In the middle [blow on the table, followed by a silence]. 64</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Il faut un certain génie, je dois le dire, pour trouver dans les choses ces points d'accrochage qui s'appellent des signes. Je ne suis pas du tout en train de déprécier ça, hein! Nous autres médecins, nous savons bien que découvrir un nouveau signe, donner une certaine valeur à un petit chatouillis de la plante du pied, s'apercevoir qu'un rôle crépissant n'est pas un rôle sous-crépissant, ce n'est pas donné à tout le monde! Il y a là un art, qui renvoie à une certain <i>signatura rerum</i>, à un certain rapport de l'homme avec la nature, je le veux bien, un certain rapport de co-naturalité, je vous l'accorde, de l'homme avec l'ensemble du réel.</p> | <p>There must be a certain genius, I must say it, for to find in things these points of attachment which are called signs. I am not at all in the process of depreciating that, eh! We different/other doctors, we know well that discovering a new sign, to give a certain value to the a little tickling of the soles of the foot, to perceive that a crackling rattle is not a rattle sub-crackling, it is not given to everyone in the world! There is an art, which refers to a certain <i>signatura rerum</i>, to a certain relation of man with nature, I admit, a certain relation of co-naturality, I grant you, of man with the whole of reality.</p> | <p>You must be a certain kind of genius, I must say, to find in things these points of attachment which are called signs. I am not at all In the process of depreciating that, eh! We doctors, we know that discovering a new sign, to give a certain value to the a little tickling of the soles of the foot, to perceive that a crackling rattle is not a sub-crackling rattle, it is not given to everyone! There is an art, which refers to a certain <i>signatura rerum</i>, to a certain rapport of man with nature, I admit, a certain relation of co-naturality, I grant you, of man with the whole of reality.</p> |
| <p>Mais il faut le mettre à sa place, et savoir que ça [un coup sur la table], c'est une histoire, et que [autre coup frappé sur la table] le symbole, c'est autre chose.</p> | <p>But we must put it in its place, and know that it [a blow on the table], it's a story, and that [another blow struck on the table] the symbol, this is another thing.</p> | <p>But we must put it in its place, and know that it [a blow on the table], it's a story, and it [another blow struck on the table] the symbol, this is another thing.</p> |
| <p>J'espère qu'on me suit. Si on ne me suit pas, si jamais il y a des personnes pour qui ça paraît trop abstrait, j'éclaire ma lanterne en donnant un exemple. Ce qui montre ce qu'est essentiellement une parole, c'est la parole donnée.</p> | <p>I hope they follow me. If you do not follow my step, if there are people for whom this seems too abstract, I illuminate my lantern in giving an example. This shows what is essentially a word <parole>, it is the given word <parole></p> | <p>I hope you are following me. If you are not following me, if there are people for whom this seems too abstract, I cast some light on the scene by giving an example. That which shows what is essentially a word <parole>, it is the given word</p> |
| <p>La parole donnée, j'ai proposé un jour à l'un de mes élèves, qui est ici présent, de m'en 65 donner la traduction latine. Il ne l'a pas fait. Je lui ai dit alors que je ne lui donnerais pas tout de suite la réponse. J'espère qu'il l'a trouvée depuis lors, ou bien il a donné sa langue au chat.</p> | <p>The given word <parole>, I proposed one day to one of my pupils, who is present here, to 65 give to me the Latin translation. He did not do it. I told him then that I would not give him the answer. I hope that he found it since then, or he has stopped guessing.</p> | <p>The given word, I proposed one day to one of my students here present to 65 give me the Latin translation. He did not do it. I told him then that I would not give him immediately the answer. I hope he has found it since then, or that he has given up guessing.</p> |
| <p>Eh bien, c'est <i>fides</i>. Cela nous mène assez loin, et j'espère que ça excite ici des retentissements</p> | <p>Oh well, it's <i>faith</i>. This brings us far enough, and I hope it excites here some</p> | <p>Oh well, it's <i>faith</i>. This brings us a fair distance, and I hope it excites here</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>congrus. La parole donnée, c'est par exemple cette chose absolument insensée qui est constituée par cet acte délirant qui consiste à dire à une femme, cet être curieusement flottant à la surface de la création, «Tu es ma femme».</p> | <p>congruent repercussions. The word <parole> given is, for example, an absolutely senseless thing that is constituted by this delusional act, which consists in saying to a woman, this being curiously floating in the surface of the creation, "You are my wife".</p> | <p>congruent repercussions. The given word <parole> is, for example, an absolutely senseless thing that is constituted by this delusional act, which consists in saying to a woman, that being curiously floating on the surface of creation, "You are my wife".</p> |
| <p>Ça par exemple! Vous êtes tous ici, je l'espère, assez adultes pour mesurer le caractère invraisemblable de ce saut dans l'inconnu, qui se fait pourtant tous les jours, dans une inconscience, Dieu merci, complète! [Rires.]</p> | <p>That for example! You are all here, I hope, adult enough to measure the unlikelihood of this leap into the unknown, which is done every day, in an unconsciousness, thank God, complete/perfect! [Laughter.]</p> | <p>What do you know! You are all here, I hope, adult enough to measure the unlikelihood of this leap into the unknown, which is done every day, in perfect unconsciousness, thank God! [Laughter.]</p> |
| <p>Le symbole est là.</p> | <p>The symbol is there.</p> | <p>The symbol is there.</p> |
| <p>Vous n'arriverez pas à vous en sortir si vous essayez de réduire cela au schéma moderne de ce que l'on appelle la science de la communication, qui se caractérise principalement par l'étude, dans ce qui est du verbal, de ce qui, très précisément, ne communique rien. Il est tout à fait impossible de donner sa place à la parole «Tu es ma femme» dans la science de 66</p> | <p>You will not be able to escape if you try to reduce this to the modern schema of what is called the science of communication, which is characterized mainly by the study, in what is verbal, of what, very precisely, communicates nothing. It is quite impossible to give a place to the phrase "You are my wife" in the science of 66</p> | <p>You will not be able to escape if you try to reduce this to the modern schema of what is called the science of communication, which is characterized mainly by the study, in what is verbal, of what, very precisely, communicates nothing. It is quite impossible to give its place to the "You are my wife" in the science of 66</p> |
| <p>la communication. Mais il serait aberrant de négliger pour autant que c'est l'une des paroles les plus importantes que l'on puisse prononcer. Je suis ici dans une enceinte où un certain nombre a donné, ou va donner, un certain nombre de paroles d'engagement essentielles qui sont exactement de la même densité. On aurait tout à fait tort de croire que c'est là quelque chose de mystique, de contingent, d'accidentel, qui surgirait d'une idée objective, d'une donnée de propension, voire d'une propension naturelle, toutes choses qui existent</p> | <p>communication. But it would be perverse to neglect as it is one of the words, the most important that can be pronounced. I am here in a chamber where a certain number has given, or will give, a certain number of essential commitment words which are exactly of the same density. We would be quite wrong to believe that there is there something of the mystical, contingent, accidental, which would arise from an objective idea, from a given propensity, or even from a natural propensity, all things</p> | <p>communication. But it would be aberrant to neglect all the same that it is one of the most important ones that can be pronounced. I am here in a enclosure where a certain number has given, or will give, a certain number of essential commitment words which are exactly of the same density. We would be quite wrong to believe that it is there something of the mystical, contingent, accidental, which would arise from an objective idea, of a given propensity, or even of a natural propensity, all</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>sans doute, mais c'est évidemment autre chose.</p> | <p>that exist no doubt, but it is evidently something else.</p> | <p>things that exist no doubt, but it is evidently something else.</p> |
| <p>Vous allez vous dire: «Vraiment, il est bien gentil, ce garçon, de nous raconter tout ça, mais après tout, il le fait au nom de quoi? Quelle est son autorité pour venir nous rappeler des vérités premières, auxquelles nous devons tendre, comme dit Courteline [manque ?]» Je vais vous dire ce qui m'y autorise.</p> <p>Dans le monde où nous vivons, nous avons réussi à faire parler tellement de choses! Comment y sommes-nous parvenus? Justement grâce au mécanisme que je vous ai suggéré tout à l'heure, par les questions que nous leur posons. Bien entendu, on oublie que c'est</p> <p>67</p> | <p>You will say to yourself: "Really, it is very nice of this boy, to tell us all of this, but after all, he does it in the name of what? What is his authority to come and remind us of the first truths, to which we must strive /struggle, as Courteline [missing] says? "I will tell you what authorizes me.</p> <p>In the world we live in, we have managed to make so many things talk! How did we get there? Exactly thanks to the mechanism I have suggested just now, by the questions that they pose to us. Of course, one forgets that it is</p> <p>67</p> | <p>You will say to yourself: "Really, it is very nice of this boy, to tell us all this, but after all, he does it in the name of what? What is his authority to come and remind us of the first truths, to which we must tender, as Courteline [missing] says? "I will tell you what authorizes me.</p> <p>In the world we live in, we have managed to make so many things talk! How did we get there? Exactly thanks to the mechanism I have suggested just now, by the questions that we ask of them. Of course, one forgets that it is</p> <p>67</p> |
| <p>nous qui les posons. Toutes les choses parlent, et nous voyons même depuis quelque temps un petit frémissement au fin fond des atomes, de ces curieuses choses dont les noms se multiplient, neutrons, mésons, etc. Tout ça rêve de répondre à nos questions, et même follement! Et du coup, nous commençons à oublier que la parole, c'est nous qui l'avons.</p> | <p>we who ask them. All things speak, and we have even seen for some time a small thrill /tremor at the depths/bottom of the atoms, Those curious things whose names multiply, neutrons, mesons, etc. All that dreams of answering our questions, and even madly! And so, we begin to forget that the word <parole>, it is we who have them..</p> | <p>we who ask them. All things speak, and we have even seen for some time a small tremor in the very depths of atoms, of those curious things whose names multiply, neutrons, mesons, etc. All those dream of answering our questions, and even madly! And so, we begin to forget that it is we who have speech.</p> |
| <p>Je dis «nous l'avons», je ne dis pas «nous la sommes». Toute la question est là, j'y reviendrai tout à l'heure.</p> | <p>I say "we have it", I do not say "we are it" The entire question is there, I will come back to it in a moment.</p> | <p>I say "we have it", I do not say "we are it" The entire question is there, I will come back to it in a moment.</p> |
| <p>Nous avons la parole, et je ne dirai pas que nous n'y pensons guère, car nous y pensons, et même beaucoup, mais nous tendons à en réduire l'importance. «Ce ne sont que des</p> | <p>We have the word <parole>, and I will not say that we believe in it with difficulty, because we think, and even a lot, but we tend to reduce the importance of it. "These are just words <paroles>, it is said,</p> | <p>We have speech <parole>, and I will not say that we do not think much about it, because we think about it, and even a lot but we tend to reduce the importance. These are just words <paroles>, it is</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>paroles, dit-on, cause toujours.» C'est là un propos caractéristique de l'atmosphère scientifique contemporaine, ou même, si l'on force un petit peu, du côté scientifique par où l'on tend à prendre les choses. Ça ne touche sans doute qu'un monde assez limité, mais ça n'en a pas moins toutes sortes de conséquences, don't précisément l'oubli de la portée de la parole. Il serait intéressant dans un milieu comme celui-ci que je vous en donne des témoignages</p> <p>68</p> | <p>keep talking” This is a characteristic of the contemporary scientific atmosphere or even, if one forces it a little bit, on the scientific side where one tends to take things. That only touches without doubt a fairly limited world, but it does have not least of all kinds of consequences, including precisely the forgetting of the scope of the word <parole>. It would be interesting in an environment like this one that I give you testimonies</p> <p>68</p> | <p>said, carry on talking.” This is a characteristic of the contemporary scientific atmosphere or even, if one forces it a little bit, on the scientific side where one tends to take things. . It touches without doubt only a fairly limited world, but that does not have any the less all kinds of consequences, including precisely the forgetting of the scope of speech <parole>. It would be interesting in an environment like this one that I give you testimonies</p> <p>68</p> |
| <p>provenant des collocations privées, très privées, très particulières, qu'il m'arrive d'avoir avec des gens qui sont revêtus de l'habit que porte ici la majorité d'entre vous. Je dois vous dire que j'ai quelquefois entendu de certains d'entre eux des déclarations surprenantes sur leur penchant dans le débat entre la parole et l'action..</p> | <p>coming from private collocations, very private, very particular, that I happen to have with people who are in the habit of being among us. I have to tell you that I have sometimes heard from some of you surprising statements about their inclination In the debate between speech <parole> and action..</p> | <p>coming from private collocations,very private, very particular, that I happen to have with people dressed in the habit here that the majority among you are wearing. I have to tell you that I have sometimes heard from some of you surprising statements about their inclination in the debate between speech <parole> and action..</p> |
| <p>À l'un de ces garçons pleins d'ardeurs qui sont dans le chemin de la vocation, j'ai été amené incidemment à faire remarquer, dans le cadre de quelque chose qui ressemblait à une analyse, qu'il y a quand même dans la vocation ce que le doit entendre, une parole, aussi secrète que vous voudrez, mais enfin, une parole.</p> | <p>To one of these boys full of ardor who is in the path of vocation, I was led incidentally to point out, in the context of something that looked like an analysis, That there is nevertheless in the vocation what the word <parole> is indicating, a call to be heard, a word <parole>, as secret as you please, but, finally, a word <parole>..</p> | <p>To one of these boys full of ardor who are on the path of vocation, I was led incidentally to point out, in the context of something that looked like an analysis, that there is nevertheless in vocation what the word indicates, a call to be heard, a word <parole>, as secret as you please, But, nonetheless, a word <parole>.</p> |
| <p>Ce garçon, qui avait pris pour moi, je dois le dire, une estime exagérée, a paru surpris de cette remarque, et il a vu là un stigmata d'idéalisme, comme une évasion. «Quand même, m'a-t-il dit, une parole, ça ne vaut que par ce qui suit, par ce qui le sanctionne.»</p> | <p>This boy, who had taken, I must say it, an exaggerated esteem of me, seemed surprised to find this remark, and he saw there a stigma of Idealism, like an evasion. When he said to me, a word <parole>, is only worth by what follows, its meaning is</p> | <p>This boy, who had taken for me, I must say it, an exaggerated esteem, seemed surprised by this remark, and he saw there a stigma of idealism, as an escape. "All the same, he said to me, a word <parole>, it is only</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Puis, de fil en aiguille — je m'en vais à des sujets brûlants, Père Bruno, vous me permettez? Oui? —, il a fini par me dire que la preuve de la divinité du Christ s'était strictement 69</p> | <p>determined by what follows it, by what sanctions it. Then, to thread a needle - I go to burning topics, Father Bruno, will you allow me? Yes? - he finally told me that the proof of the Divinity of Christ was strictly 69</p> | <p>valued by what follows, by what sanctions it. Then, one thing leading to another- I go to burning topics, Father Bruno, will you allow me? Yes? - he finally told me that the proof of the Divinity of Christ was strictly 69</p> |
| <p>localisée pour lui dans le fait de sa mort et résurrection. Je ne sais ce que les maîtres en théologie ici présents en diront, mais si je rappelle ce souvenir d'autant plus vif que frais dans ma mémoire, c'est peut-être aussi pour qu'ils me répondent. Mon sentiment à moi est que, s'il fallait faire des dieux de tous les gens qui sont ressuscités, où irions-nous? C'est bien pourquoi il est tout le temps rappelé dans le texte de l'Évangile que la mort et la résurrection dont il s'agit eurent lieu «selon ce qui fut prédit dans les Écritures».</p> | <p>localized for him in the fact of his death and resurrection. I do not know what the masters of theology here present will say, but if I recall the memory especially more live than fresh in my memory, it may also be for them to answer me. My own feeling is that if it were necessary to make the gods of all the people who are resuscitated, Where would it end? That's why it's all the time recalled in the text of the Gospel that the death and resurrection in question "according to what was predicted in the Scriptures".</p> | <p>localized for him in the fact of his death and resurrection. I do not know what the masters of theology here present will say, but if I recall the memory especially more alive than fresh in my memory, it may also be so that they answer me. My feeling is that if it were necessary to make gods of all the people who are resuscitated, where would we end up? That's why it's all the time recalled in the text of the Gospel that the death and resurrection in question took place "according to what was predicted in the Scriptures".</p> |
| <p>On est loin de l'atmosphère contemporaine! C'est ici précisément que réside la valeur de témoignage de ce que représente le psychanalyste. Si la découverte de Freud a un sens, elle ne peut en avoir qu'un. Quand l'homme oublie qu'il est le porteur de la parole, il ne parle plus. C'est bien en effet ce qui se passe: la plupart des gens ne parlent pas, ils répètent, ce n'est pas tout à fait la même chose. Quand l'homme ne parle plus, il est parlé.</p> | <p>We are far from the contemporary atmosphere! It is precisely here that resides the value of the testimony of what the psychoanalyst represents. If the discovery of Freud has any meaning <sens>, it can only have one. When man forgets that he is the bearer of the word <parole>, he does not speak any more. It is indeed what happens: most people do not speak, they repeat, it is not quite the same thing. When man no longer speaks, he is spoken.</p> | <p>We are far from the contemporary atmosphere! It is precisely here that resides the value of testimony of what the psychoanalyst represents. If Freud's discovery has any meaning <sens>, it can only have one. When man forgets that he is the bearer of the word <parole>, he does not speak any more. It is indeed what happens: most people do not speak, they repeat, it is not quite the same thing. When man no longer speaks, he is spoken.</p> |
| <p>Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire? À la différence de ces symptômes que j'ai évoqués tout à 70</p> | <p>What does this mean? Unlike these symptoms that I have alluded to 70 -v </p> | <p>What does it mean? Unlike these symptoms that I have alluded to 70 -v </p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| -v I | | |
| <p>l'heure en ayant l'air de faire une fioriture en passant alors que je préparais ma petite affaire, le symptôme névrotique n'est pas un signe, mais une parole, structurée comme un langage, avec ces deux fonctions essentielles, le signifiant — soit le support matériel, le vocable que je suis en train d'émettre sous la forme articulée, syllabique, par laquelle je me fais entendre — dans son rapport avec la signification.</p> | <p>a little while ago by pretending to make a flourish in passing while I was preparing my little affair, the neurotic symptom is not a sign, but a speech <parole>, structured like a language <langage> with these two essential functions, the signifier — namely, the material support, the vocable which I am in the train of emitting under the articulated form, syllabic, by which I make myself heard—in its relation with the signification.</p> | <p>a little while ago by pretending to make a flourish in passing while I was preparing my little affair, the neurotic symptom is not a sign, but speech <parole>, structured like a language <langage> with these two essential functions, the signifier - the material support, the vocable which I am in the process of emitting under the articulated form, syllabic, by which I make myself heard -- in its relation with signification.</p> |
| <p>Le symptôme est dans l'ordre scientifique une chose unique, en tant qu'il est surdéterminé. Il n'y a dans le monde humain qu'une seule chose qui soit surdéterminée en dehors du symptôme freudien, et c'est le langage, car il comporte deux chaînes parallèles, qui sont le sens et la forme. Il y a, d'une part, la grammaire, les lois de la rhétorique, et, d'autre part, ce que vous voulez dire, l'emploi des mots, et puis la signification unique de chaque phrase. Vous retrouvez dans le symptôme cette duplicité essentielle.</p> | <p>The symptom is a unique thing, in the scientific order in so far as it is overdetermined. There is in the human world only one thing that is overdetermined outside of the Freudian symptom, and this is language, for it has two parallel chains, which are the sense <sens> and the form. There is, on the one hand, grammar, the laws of rhetoric, and, on the other hand, what you intend to say, the use of words, and then the unique meaning of each sentence. You find in the symptom this essential duplicity.</p> | <p>The symptom is in the scientific order a unique thing, in so far as it is overdetermined. There is in the human world only one thing that is overdetermined outside of the Freudian symptom, and this is language, for It has two parallel chains, which are the sense and the form. There is, on the one hand, grammar, the laws of rhetoric, and, on the other hand, what you intend to say, the use of words, and then the unique meaning of each sentence. You find in the symptom this essential duplicity.</p> |
| <p>Cette duplicité, quand on la voit avec des lunettes brouillées, ou simplement avec un regard un peu myope, on l'appelle à l'occasion «ambivalence». Ce mot, vous le savez, se met à 71</p> | <p>This duplicity, when seen with blurred glasses, or simply with a rather shortsighted look, it is sometimes called "ambivalence". This word, you know it, 71</p> | <p>This duplicity, when seen with blurred glasses, or simply with a rather shortsighted look, it is sometimes called "ambivalence". This word, you know, 71</p> |
| <p>se met à toutes les sauces, et c'est là l'une des plus grandes sources de confusion qui existent dans cet honorable ensemble de savoir qu'est la psychanalyse. Le symptôme</p> | <p>puts on all the sauces /semblances, and this is one of the most significant sources of confusion which exist in this honorable collection/body of</p> | <p>is added to everything and this is one of the most major sources of confusion in this honorable set of knowledge that is psychoanalysis. The</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>comme tel est un langage, défini par sa structure. Le symptôme d'un sujet particulier, c'est une parole, parole bâillonnée, inconsciente au sujet. Le mode d'abord psychanalytique consiste à l'élaborer par la particularité de l'histoire de ce sujet, et c'est à cela qu'il faut s'arrêter pour connaître à la fois le sens et les limites de l'action analytique. «Une parole inconsciente», entendons nous. Là encore, toutes les ambiguïtés psychologiques interviennent. Il ne s'agit pas du caractère négatif «Ceci n'est pas conscient» [coup frappé sur la table]. Ce que veut dire par «inconscient» le sacré bonhomme qui a introduit ce nom dans l'affaire, c'est que le sujet parlant, en tant que parlant, dépasse et déborde de beaucoup le sujet conscient. C'est que le sujet parle, encore qu'il n'en sache absolument rien, avec tout lui-même, avec sa peau, avec sa chair, avec sa façon de trébucher, de faire un lapsus de langue, avec sa manière de se comporter dans la vie de façon à ce que tout se</p> <p>72</p> | <p>knowledge that is psychoanalysis. The symptom as such is a language, defined by its structure. The symptom of a particular subject, it is a word, a gagged word, unconscious to the subject. The psychoanalytic mode first consists in elaborating it by the particularity of the history of this subject, and it is to this That one must stop to know at the time both the sense <sens> and the limits of analytical action. "An unconscious word <parole>," we hear. There again, all the psychological ambiguities intervening. It is not the negative character "This is not conscious" [a blow hits the table]. What is meant by "unconscious" the sacred fellow who introduced this name in the matter is that of the speaking subject, In so far as it speaks, exceeds and overflows much of the conscious subject. This is because the subject speaks, although he knows absolutely nothing about it, his whole person with everything itself, with his/her skin, with his/her flesh, with his/her way of stumbling, of making a slip of the tongue, with his/her way of behaving In life in such a way that everything</p> <p>72</p> | <p>symptom as such is a language, defined by its structure. The symptom of a particular subject, is a word, a gagged word, unconscious for the subject. The psychoanalytic mode first consists in elaborating it by the particularity of the history of this subject, and it is on this that one must stop to know at the time both the sense <sens> and the limits of analytical action. "An unconscious word <parole>," we mean. There again, all the psychological ambiguities intervene. It is not a question of the negative character "This is not conscious" [a blow hits the table]. What is meant by "unconscious" the damned fellow who introduced this noun in the matter is that the speaking subject, in so far as it speaks, exceeds and overflows by so much the conscious subject. This is because the subject speaks, although he knows absolutely nothing about it, with all of himself, with his skin, with his flesh, with his way of stumbling, of making a slip of the tongue, with his way of behaving in life in such a way that everything</p> <p>72</p> |
| <p>termine toujours très mal. C'est là le sens, le seul sens que puisse avoir ce que Freud appelle les «pensées inconscientes».</p> | <p>always finishes very badly. This is the meaning <sens>, the only meaning of that what Freud calls the "unconscious thoughts".</p> | <p>always finishes very badly. This is the meaning <sens>, the only meaning of that which Freud calls "unconscious thoughts".</p> |
| <p>D'ailleurs, les formules paradoxales de Freud sont souvent si déroutantes au premier abord qu'elles ont été d'abord rejetées, et puis, comme c'est souvent le sort des choses d'abord rejetées, elles ont été</p> | <p>Moreover, the paradoxical formulas of Freud are often so confusing at first that they were first rejected, and then, as is often the fate of things first rejected, they were subsequently accepted, exactly</p> | <p>Moreover, the paradoxical formulas of Freud are often so confusing at first that they were first rejected, and then, as is often the fate of things first rejected, they were subsequently accepted,</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>ensuite acceptées, exactement comme elles avaient été rejetées, c'est-à-dire sans absolument rien y comprendre. [Rires.]</p> | <p>as they had been rejected, that is to say, without absolutely understanding them. [Laughter.]</p> | <p>exactly as they had been rejected, that is to say, without absolutely understanding them. [Laughter.]</p> |
| <p>Il ne suffit pas qu'on accepte quelque chose pour qu'on le comprenne pour autant, n'est-ce pas? Je dirais même plus, c'est encore la meilleure façon de n'en rien comprendre. Quand on a résolu d'accepter, on est désormais déchargé de tout examen! [Rires.] Voilà ce que veut dire que le symptôme est une parole.</p> | <p>It is not enough to accept something that we, for all that understand, is it not so? I would say even more, it is still the best way to understand nothing in/about it. When one has resolved to accept this, they are discharged from any examination! (Laughter.) This means that the symptom is a word. <parole></p> | <p>It is not enough to accept something so that we can understand it, no? I would say even more, it is still the best way to understand it. When one has resolved to accept, one is discharged from any examination! (Laughter.) This means that the symptom is a word. <parole></p> |
| <p>[S'adressant au président:] Qu'est-ce que j'ai encore pour finir et clore ce discours? Combien me donnes-tu? Dr Laforgue — Tu as dit beaucoup de choses. 73 ; J. L. — Il faut tout de même que j'en dise encore quelques-unes pour clore!! Dr Laforgue — Tu as parlé du langage, du symptôme, et de la souffrance...</p> | <p>[Addressing the Chair:] What do I have still to finish and close this speech? How much [time] do you give me? Dr. Laforgue – You have said a lot. 73 ; J. L. - I must nevertheless say still some things in order to close! Dr. Laforgue - You talked about language, the symptom, and of suffering ...</p> | <p>[Addressing the Chair:] What do I have still to finish and close this speech? How much [time] do you give me? Dr. Laforgue – You have said a lot. 73 ; J. L. - I must nevertheless say still some things in order to close! Dr. Laforgue - You talked about language, the symptom, and of suffering ...</p> |
| <p>J. L. — C'est simple, combien de temps me donnes-tu maintenant? Dr Laforgue — Cinq minutes! J. L. — Non, donne-m'en dix! [Rires.] Je veux en venir à l'un des problèmes qu'on méconnaît dans l'examen des dimensions du symbole.</p> | <p>J. L. - It is simple, how much time do you give me now? Dr. Laforgue - Five minutes! J. L. - No, give me ten! [Laughter.] I want to come to one of the problems disregarded in examining some of the dimensions of the symbol.</p> | <p>J. L. - It is simple, how much time do you give me now? Dr. Laforgue - Five minutes! J. L. - No, give me ten! [Laughter.] I want to come to one of the problems disregarded in examining the dimensions of symbol.</p> |
| <p>Le symbole existe à l'intérieur de son monde de symboles. Il ne saurait exister tout seul. Il n'y a pas un symbole. Le symbole ne subsiste en tant que tel qu'au sein d'un système. • Le moindre abord des questions qui se posent depuis la logique mathématique sur la nature du nombre devrait là-dessus ouvrir les</p> | <p>The symbol exists inside its world of symbols. It cannot exist all by itself. There is not one symbol. The symbol remains as such only within a system. • The slightest approach to the issues which pose themselves from the mathematical logic on the nature of the number</p> | <p>The symbol exists inside its world of symbols. It cannot exist all by itself. There is not one symbol. The symbol remains as such only within a system. • The slightest approach to the issues which pose themselves from the mathematical logic on the</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>yeux. J'espère que ceux d'entre vous qui s'y intéressent ont bien pris conscience qu'aucune déduction empirique de la notion de nombre</p> <p>74</p> | <p>should open their eyes on this. I hope that those of you who have become aware of the fact that no empirical deduction of the notion of number</p> <p>74</p> | <p>nature of the number should open your eyes on this. I hope that those of you who have become aware of the fact that no empirical deduction of the notion of number</p> <p>74</p> |
| <p>n'est possible. Je ne vais pas reproduire cette démonstration au tableau noir, je vous prie de tenir la chose pour acquise, car elle l'est pour tous ceux qui savent de quoi ils parlent en mathématiques.</p> | <p>is possible. I will not reproduce this demonstration on the blackboard, I ask of you to take these things for granted, because it is by all of those who know what they are talking about in mathematics.</p> | <p>is possible. I will not reproduce this demonstration on the blackboard, I ask of you to take these things for granted, since it is for all of those who know what they are talking about in mathematics.</p> |
| <p>Nous sommes là au cœur de notre problème du symbole, pour autant que le nombre, c'est le symbole par excellence. Je vous l'indique en passant, c'est le seul point où le signifiant et le signifié viennent se rejoindre d'une façon si curieuse qu'ils en deviennent à proprement parler indiscernables.</p> | <p>We are at the heart of our problem, provided that the number, it is the symbol par excellence. I indicate it for you in passing, it is the only point where the signifier and the signified come to join one another in a way so curious that they become in it properly speaking indistinguishable.</p> | <p>We are at the heart of our problem of the symbol, in as much as the number is the symbol par excellence. I indicate it for you in passing, it is the only point where the signifier and the signified come to join one another in a way so curious that they become properly speaking indistinguishable.</p> |
| <p>La systématique de l'univers du symbole est donc un élément absolument essentiel à notre sujet. L'univers symbolique existe d'abord, et l'univers réel vient se ranger à l'intérieur. ••• Sans doute le mot de «rée» pose-t-il beaucoup de questions, mais je les laisserai ici de côté pour vous parler d'un autre mot, «l'homme».</p> | <p>The system of the universe of the symbol is therefore an absolutely essential element to our subject. The symbolic universe exists first, and the real universe comes inside. ••• No doubt the word "real" poses a great deal of questions, but I will leave them here on the side to talk to you about another word, "the man".</p> | <p>The system of the universe of the symbol is therefore an absolutely essential element to our subject. The symbolic universe exists first, and the real universe comes to set itself up inside. ••• No doubt the word "real" poses a great deal of questions, but I will leave them here on the side, to talk to you about another word, "man".</p> |
| <p>Nous en avons plein la bouche, du problème de l'homme. C'est un mot que je préférerais ne pas entendre prononcer trop souvent, parce que, là aussi, on se gonfle, on se gausse, on dit: «L'homme! On s'occupe de l'homme!» Bon. Mais quand on s'occupe de l'homme,</p> <p>75</p> | <p>With the problem of man we have the mouth full. That's a word that I would not hear pronounced too often, because here, too, we swell, we gloat, They say, "Man! We occupy ourselves/take interest about man!" Good. But when we occupy ourselves/take interest</p> | <p>We are always talking of the problem of man. That's a word that I would prefer not hear pronounced too often, because here, too, we puff ourselves up, we gloat, They say, "Man! We take care of the man!" Good. But when we take care of man,</p> <p>75</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | about man, 75 | |
| on doit quand même réfléchir qu'il est très important que sa vie souffrante vienne témoigner spontanément de quelque chose à quoi il faudra bien finir par donner son nom, et qui s'appelle comment? Eh bien, mon Dieu, la Loi, avec un grand L. | we must still think that it is very Important that his suffering life come to testify spontaneously of something to which he will have to end up giving its name, and is called what? Well, my God, the Law, with a large L. | we must still think that it is very important that his suffering life come to testify spontaneously of something to which he will have to end up giving its name, and is called what? Well, my God, the Law, with a capital L. |
| Ce sont des banalités pour qui sait lire le texte de Freud en enlevant ses lunettes, puisque la première des choses qu'il a amenée à fleur de jour, c'est la fonction de la censure. Même si ce n'était qu'une métaphore, elle doit bien avoir sa portée. | These are trivialities for who knows how to read the text of Freud's by removing his glasses, since the first of the things he brought to daylight is the function of censorship. Even if this was only a metaphor, it must have its own scope | These are trivialities for who knows how to read Freud's text by removing his glasses, since the first of the things he brought to daylight is the function of censorship. Even if this was only a metaphor, it must have its own scope |
| On est en plein dans le langage, et puis, on s'arrête là [coup sur la table]. Plus moyen d'aller plus loin dans le sens de la parole! Tout au moins, la parole s'infléchit, se tord d'une certain façon. Ça tient à quoi? Très probablement aux nécessités du symbole. | We are right in the language <langage>, and then one stops there [blow on the table]. No way to go further in the direction <sens> of the word <parole>! At the very least, the speech bends, twists a certain way. What is it all about? Very probably to the necessities of the symbol. | We are right in language <langage>, and then one stops there [blow on the table]. No way to go further in the direction <sens> of the word <parole>! At the very least, the speech bends, twists a certain way. What is it all about? Very probably the necessities of the symbol. |
| C'est ce qu'on a rencontré sous le nom de la Loi primitive. On l'identifie, non sans confusion quelquefois, avec la fameuse histoire de l'inceste. Si l'on va dans le sens de ce qui apparaît à l'examen qu'on appelle ethnographique, on dira que ce sont les structures élémentaires de la parenté. Il s'agit d'une espèce de faille qu'on aperçoit 76 | This is what we encountered under the name of the original Law. One identifies it, not without confusion sometimes, with the famous story of incest. If we go in the direction /meaning of what appears on the examination as what people call ethnographic, it will be said that it is the elementary structures of kinship. It is a kind of fault that one sees 76 | This is what we encountered under the name of the original Law. One identifies it not without confusion sometimes, with the famous story of incest. If we go in the direction of sense of which appears on examination which one calls ethnographic, it will be said that it is the elementary structures of kinship. It is a kind of fault that one sees 76 |
| quelque part, entre la «nature» et ce qu'on appelle poliment la «culture». C'est là que se fait l'introduction de la Loi, la loi, combine minérale, de la parole. | somewhere, between "nature" and what one politely calls "culture". This is where is made the introduction of the Law, the | somewhere between "nature" and what one politely calls "culture". This is where is made the introduction of the |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | law, like mineral combines some speech <parole>. | Law, the law, like minerals mix, of speech. |
| Une grande question demeure, qui est l'équivoque autour de l'image. Nos penchants analogiques, nos archétypes, tout ce qui nous donne le sentiment que le symbole est quelque chose qui est déjà là et qui nous appelle, une espèce de préformation dans la nature de je ne sais quel ordre qui s'exhausse peu à peu, tout cela a quelque chose de confusionnel. On se permet d'interpréter tout sur le même plan. | A major question remains, however, which is the equivocation around the image. Our analogic tendencies, our archetypes, everything that gives us the feeling that the symbol is something that is already there and which calls us, a kind of preformation in nature of I know not which order which exhausts itself little by little, all of this has something confusing. One is allowed to interpret everything on the same level. | A major question remains, however, The ambiguity around the image. Our analogic tendencies, our archetypes, everything that gives us the feeling that the symbol is something that is already there and which calls us, a kind of preformation in nature of I know not which order which exhausts itself little by little, all this has something confusing. One is allowed to interpret everything on the same level. |
| Bien entendu, le monde de l'image existe, mais il ne nous intéresse que par son utilisation symbolique, en tant qu'il est pris dans l'univers du symbole et qu'il y remplit une fonction. Que saint Jean de la Croix parle de l'eau de même qu'en parle le magicien chamaniste, n'a aucune espèce de sens qui permette de les rapprocher comme si c'était du même ordre. | Of course, the world of the image exists, but it interests us only by its symbolic use, in so far as it is caught in the universe of the symbol and performs there a function. That St. John of the Cross speaks of the water just as the shamanist magician speaks, has no kind of meaning that makes it possible to bring them together as if they were of the same order. | Of course, the world of the image exists, but it interests us only by its symbolic use, in so far as it is caught in the universe of the symbol and performs a function. That St. John of the Cross speaks of water just as the shamanist magician speaks of it, has no kind of meaning that makes it possible to bring them together as if they were of the same order. |
| Quand saint Jean de la Croix se sert de l'eau pour exprimer quelque chose d'un certain ordre, comme il se sert aussi du mot «Père» ou du mot «Fils», il en fait un usage symbolique. 77 | When St. John of the Cross uses water to express something of a certain order, as he also uses the word "Father" or the word "Son," he makes a symbolic use of it. 77 | When St. John of the Cross uses water to express something of a certain order, as he also uses the word "Father" or the word "Son," he makes a symbolic use of it. 77 |
| Il n'y a aucune espèce de raison pour que l'identité matérielle des deux supports imaginaires serve quelque chose d'identique où se résumerait la radiation propre du symbole. Le croire est l'une des sources de confusion, qui pervertit au maximum tout ce que l'on peut dire du symbole. | There is no reason why the material identity of the two imaginary supports serve something identical where it would summarize the proper radiation of the symbol. Believing it is one of the sources of confusion, which perverts to the maximum all that one can say of the symbol. | There is no reason why the material identity of the two imaginary supports serve something identical where it would summarize the proper radiation of the symbol. Believing it is one of the sources of confusion, which perverts to the maximum all that one can say of the symbol. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C'est là ce qui distingue, de la façon la plus tranchante et la plus affûtée, la doctrine de Jung et celle de Freud. Je ne le développerai pas maintenant, car je ne veux pas conclure sur une question intéressant ma spécialité, mais sur le thème qui nous a réunis ici. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is what distinguishes, in the manner sharper and more sharpened, the doctrine of Jung and/from that of Freud. I will not development it now, because I do not want to conclude on a question of interest to my specialty, but on the theme that brought us here. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is what distinguishes in the most cutting and sharpest way, the doctrine of Jung from that of Freud. I will not develop it now, because I do not want to conclude on a question of interest for my specialty, but on the theme that brought us here. |
| <p>On nous a expliqué tout à l'heure 'usage du symbole chez saint Jean de la Croix en nous disant qu'il était ambivalent. Cela voulait simplement dire que, lorsqu'il parle de la nuit, il pense évidemment au jour. En effet, un usage symbolique de la nuit ne peut se faire que par référence à ce qu'il y a d'opposé, le jour. C'est la nature même du langage qui le veut, et il n'y a nul besoin de faire appel à une quelconque expérience crépusculaire pour les unir. C'est leur opposition qui fait leur valeur symbolique.</p> | <p>We were told earlier about the use of the symbol of St. John of the Cross in us saying that it was ambivalent. This meant simply to say that when he speaks of the night, he evidently thinks of the day. Indeed, a symbolic use of night can not be made only by reference to what it is opposed, the day. It is the very nature of language <language> that intends, and there is no need to call for any twilight experience to unite them. It is their opposition that makes their symbolic value.</p> | <p>We were told earlier about the use of the symbol in St. John of the Cross by telling us that it was ambivalent. This meant simply to say that when he speaks of night, he evidently thinks of the day. Indeed, a symbolic use of night can not be made only by reference to what it is opposed, the day. It is the very nature of language <language> that wants it that way, and there is no need to call for any twilight experience to unite them. It is their opposition that makes their symbolic value.</p> |
| <p>En raison de l'absence de temps à laquelle 78</p> | <p>Due to the lack of time which 78</p> | <p>Due to the lack of time which 78</p> |
| <p>j'ai fait allusion tout à l'heure, je me suis dit que je pouvais bien venir ici sans rien préparer, mais j'ai pensé que je ne pouvais pas y aller sans avoir rouvert saint Jean de la Croix. Aussi bien ai-je relu <i>La Nuit obscure</i>, et je vais vous dire mon sentiment.</p> | <p>I mentioned earlier, I said to myself I thought that I could come here without preparing anything, but I thought I could not go without having reopened St. John of the Cross. As well I have re-read <i>La Nuit obscure</i>, and I will tell you my feeling.</p> | <p>I mentioned earlier, I said to myself I thought that I could come here without preparing anything, but I thought I could not go without having reopened St. John of the Cross. As well I have re-read <i>La Nuit obscure</i> [<i>The dark Night</i>], and I will tell you my feeling.</p> |
| <p>Mon sentiment, c'est que le symbolisme y joue très peu de rôle. Je vais essayer de vous le démontrer.</p> | <p>My feeling, it is that the symbolism here plays a very small role. I will try to demonstrate it to you.</p> | <p>My feeling is that the symbolism here plays a very small role. I will try to demonstrate it to you.</p> |
| <p>C'est peut-être là-dessus que je regrette le plus que le Père Lucien ne nous ait apporté qu'un terme aussi</p> | <p>Perhaps what I most regret is that Father Lucien has only brought us a term as uncertain</p> | <p>Maybe that's what I'm sorry the most that Father Lucien has brought us only a term as</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>incertain que celui de « personnel», car ce sacré « moi», nous nous en occupons beaucoup en psychanalyse. Certes, nous ne sommes pas des apôtres, vous savez! Nous, psychanalystes, nous ne sommes pas des espèces de grandes générations d'ascètes modernes qui viennent pour dessiller les yeux des hommes sur le caractère fondamentalement illusoire des passions. Pourtant, nous en avons dit des sacrées choses, du moi! On ne les entend pas, bien entendu, mais il ne faut pas croire que nous sommes des tendres! Nous sommes des gens qui se sont très bien aperçus du caractère purement narcissique de la très, très grande majorité des</p> <p>79</p> | <p>as that of "the personal" because this sacred "ego", we occupy ourselves with it a lot in psychoanalysis. Certainly we are not apostles, you know! We, psychoanalysts, we are not some species of the great generations of modern ascetics who come to open men's eyes on the character of the basically illusory of passions. However, we have said of the sacred things, the ego <moi>! People do not hear them, of course, but we must not believe that we are tender/weak! We are people who have very well perceived the purely narcissistic nature of the very, very vast majority of the</p> <p>79</p> | <p>uncertain as that of "personal" because this damned "me", we occupy ourselves a lot with it in psychoanalysis. Certainly we are not apostles, you know ! We psychoanalysts are not some species of the great generations of modern ascetics who come to open men's eyes on the basically illusory nature of passions. However, we have said some damned things, about the ego! We do not hear them, of course, but we must not believe that we are wimps! We are people who have very well perceived the purely narcissistic nature of the very, very great majority of the</p> <p>79</p> |
| <p>passions dites amoureuses ! Nous connaissons ça, nous sommes là-dedans, on se promène là-dedans! [Rires.]</p> | <p>so-called love passions! We know we're in there, we're walking in there! [Laughter.]</p> | <p>so-called love passions! We know that, we're in there, we're walking around in there! [Laughter.]</p> |
| <p>Naturellement, c'est très, très difficile de se faire comprendre, mais il ne faut pas croire que le moi a toutes nos tendresses! Depuis quelque temps, bien entendu, il y a quelques gens qui essaient de le ramener, mais je crois que ceux-là commencent justement à sortir de la tradition analytique.</p> | <p>Naturally, it is very, very difficult to understand, but it is not necessary to believe that the ego <moi> has all our heart! For some time now, of course, there are a few people who try to bring back the ego, but I think they are just beginning to leave/get out of the analytic tradition..</p> | <p>Naturally, it is very, very difficult to make ourselves understood, but it is not necessary to believe that the ego has all our tenderness! For some time now, of course, there are a few people who try to bring it back, but I think those are just beginning to emerge from the analytic tradition..</p> |
| <p>Je sais bien que saint Jean de la Croix vit à une époque très ambiguë où le moi entre dans la théologie toutes voiles dehors. Quand M. Fénelon traite explicitement de Dieu, le moi est vraiment l'autre pôle, l'autre plateau de la balance. Il faut bien croire qu'il y a là quelque fascination pour le moi. Pourtant, tout nous indique au contraire que la porte d'entrée de l'expérience mystique est</p> | <p>I know well that St. John of the Cross lived in a very ambiguous time when the ego entered into theology full sail. When M. Fenelon deals explicitly with God, the ego is really the other pole, the other scale of the balance. It must be assumed that there is some fascination for the ego. Yet, for all of us on the contrary indicate that the gateway to the mystical experience is very precise the</p> | <p>I know well that St. John of the Cross lived in a very ambiguous time when the ego entered into theology full sail. When M. Fenelon deals explicitly with God, the ego is really the other pole, the other tray of the scales. It must be assumed that there is some fascination for the ego. Yet, everything indicates to us on the contrary that the gateway to the mystical</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| très précisément l'extinction complète, radicale jusque dans ses dernières racines, de toutes les passions de l'amour-propre. | complete radical extinction, even in its last roots, of all the passions of self love. | experience is very precisely the complete radical extinction, even in its last roots, of all the passions of self-love. |
| Alors, qu'est-ce qui reste? C'est évidemment quelque chose que nous avons à chercher dans l'ordre de l'unicité d'une existence. Je n'en dirai pas plus long aujourd'hui, mais il 80 | So, what's left? This is obviously something we have to look for in the order of the uniqueness of an existence. I will not speak about it much longer today, but it 80 | So, what's left? This is obviously something we have to look for in the order of the uniqueness of an existence. I will not say much more about it today, but it 80 |
| est certain que ce dont il s'agit est de l'ordre de l'être. Après nous avoir tellement démontré que l'homme est le support de la parole, et que celle-ci l'entraîne dans les endroits les plus inattendus auxquels il est le plus inégal, on finira par se demander où est l'essentiel. C'est l'être, enfin! | is certain that what is involved is of the order of being. After having shown ourselves so much that man is the medium of speech, and that it takes him to the most unexpected to which it is most unequal, we will finish by asking ourselves where is the essential. It is being, finally! | is certain that what is involved is of the order of being. After having shown us so much that man is the pillar of speech, and that It takes him to the most unexpected places to which he is most unequal, you will eventually ask where is the essential. It is being, finally! |
| La façon dont l'homme constitue son être dans la parole est tout un problème, car l'être dépasse l'ordre de la parole. | The way which man constitutes his being in speech <parole> is quite a problem, because being exceeds the order of speech <parole> | The way in which man constitutes his being in speech <parole> is quite a problem, because being exceeds the order of speech <parole> |
| Cela, on le savait dès le départ, puisque M. Parménide est venu nous rappeler que «l'être est, le néant n'est pas». Quand on a dit ça, il n'y a plus rien à dire. C'est à partir de là seulement que commence le discours, à savoir le domaine du symbole. Si l'on peut parler de l'être, c'est justement dans la mesure où il n'est pas quand vous en parlez, et que si l'on peut parler du non-être, c'est justement parce que vous le faites être par votre parole. Mais précisément, il ne s'agit pas de cela. Il s'agit de l'être particulier de saint Jean de la Croix et de son rapport avec l'Être suprême. Ici, nous sommes au-delà du domaine de la parole et du symbole. | This was known from the start, since Mr. Parmenides came to remind us that "being is, nothingness is not ". When we said that, there is nothing more to say. It is from here alone that the discourse begins, namely the domain of the symbol. If we can speak of being, it is precisely to the extent that it is not when you speak of it, and that if we can speak of non-being, it is precisely because you make being by your word. But precisely, it is not that. It is the particular being of St. John of the Cross and his relationship with the Supreme Being. Here we are beyond the realm of speech and symbol. In this 'dark Night' of which we have been reminded this | This was known from the start, since Mr. Parmenides came to remind us that "being is, nothingness is not ". When we've said that, there is nothing more to say. It is from here alone that the discourse begins, namely the domain of the symbol. If we can speak of being, it is precisely to the extent that it is not when you speak of it, and that if we can speak of non-being, it is precisely because you make being by your speech. But precisely, it is not that. It is the particular being of St. John of the Cross and his relationship with the Supreme Being. Here, we are beyond the realm of speech and symbol. In this 'dark Night' of |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Dans cette Nuit obscure dont on nous a rappelé ce matin les strophes admirables, quels 81</p> | <p>morning of the admirable strophes, what 81</p> | <p>whose admirable strophes we were reminded this morning, what 81</p> |
| <p>symboles trouvons-nous? À part celui de la «nuit», je vois les symboles d'«escalier secret» et de «déguisement». Réfléchissez que meme les trois vertus théologiques ne sont ici que des «déguisements de l'âme».</p> | <p>symbols do we find? Apart from that of the "night", I see the symbols of "secret staircase" and "disguise". Consider that even the three theological virtues are here only "disguises of the soul".</p> | <p>symbols do we find? Apart from that of the "night", I see the symbols of "secret staircase" and "disguises". Consider that even the three theological virtues are here only "disguises of the soul".</p> |
| <p>La Foi, vous nous l'avez rappelé tout à l'heure, Père Lucien, ce n'est pas simplement poser les objets de la Foi, car, inchoativement, il y a dans la Foi le pacte. Or, vous définissez la parole comme je la définis: la parole est en elle-même le pacte. C'est toute la question abordée par M. Massignon à un détour d'AlHallâj, autour du Coran: la parole est-elle créée ou incréée? Dans la Foi, la dimension de la parole est présente, ainsi que dans l'espérance et dans la charité. Nous ne parlerons pas aujourd'hui de la charité, bien qu'elle soit l'une des dimensions de notre problème et nous permettrait de le bien manifester. «Déguisements de l'âme», qu'est-ce que cela veut dire? — si ce n'est que dans toute son analyse de la Montée, ou dans sa description de cette rencontre, comme vous voudrez, saint Jean de la Croix nous indique qu'une espèce de contorsion est nécessaire pour s'évader du monde du symbole. Je vous le répète, 82</p> | <p>Faith, you reminded us just now, Father Lucien, it is not simply posing the objects of Faith, for, inchoately, there is in the faith the pact. Now, you define speech <parole> as I define it: speech <parole> is in itself the pact. This is the whole question raised by M. Massignon at a detour from Al Hallâj, surrounding the Koran: is the word created or uncreated? In Faith, the dimension of speech is present, as well as in hope and in charity. We will not speak today about charity, although it is one of the dimensions of our problem and would allow us some good demonstration. "Disguises of the soul", what does that mean? - if only in all of his analysis of the Ascent, or in his description of this meeting, as you will, St. John of the Cross tells us that a kind of contortion is necessary to escape from the world of the symbol. I repeat it to you, 82</p> | <p>Faith, you reminded us just now, Father Lucien, is not simply posing the objects of Faith, for, inchoately, there is in Faith the pact. Now, you define speech as I define it: speech is in Itself the pact. This is the whole question raised by M. Massignon at a detour from Al Hallâj, around the Koran: is the word created or uncreated? In Faith, the dimension of speech is present, as well as in hope and in charity. We will not speak today about charity, although it is one of the dimensions of our problem and would allow us to manifest it well. "Disguises of the soul", what does that mean? - if only in all his analysis of the Ascent, or in his description of this meeting, as you will, St. John of the Cross tells us that a kind of contortion is necessary to escape from the world of the symbol. I repeat it to you, 82</p> |
| <p>même l'ordre essentiellement symbolique des trois vertus théologiques est momentanément considéré comme le manteau sous lequel s'abrite la dernière essence,</p> | <p>even the essentially symbolic order of the three theological virtues is momentarily considered as the mantle under which shelter the last essence, which goes to the ineffable</p> | <p>even the essentially symbolic order of the three theological virtues is momentarily considered as the mantle under which shelter the last essence, which goes to the</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>qui va à l'union ineffable avec la divinité. Ce sont là des symboles d'évasion du symbole.</p> | <p>union with the divinity. These are symbols of escape from the symbol.</p> | <p>ineffable union with the divinity. These are symbols of escape from the symbol.</p> |
| <p>Voilà dans quel sens je comprends qu'il y a des registres symboliques dans les textes de saint Jean de la Croix que vous avez évoqués. En rappelant la dimension essentielle du problème, en évoquant ce qui se rapporte à la question particulière de cette réunion, en vous parlant de la Foi, je pense avoir assez fait pour attendre maintenant soit les imprécations, soit les malédictions, soit les questions qui pourront m'être posées. [Applaudissements nourris.]</p> | <p>Here in which sense I understand that there are the symbolic registers in the texts of St. John of the Cross, which you have mentioned. Recalling the essential dimension of the problem, by referring to the particular question of this meeting, in speaking of the Faith, I think I have done enough to wait now either for imprecations, or curses, or questions that may be asked to me [Continuous Applause.]</p> | <p>Here is in which sense I understand that there are the symbolic registers in the texts of St. John of the Cross, which you have mentioned. Recalling the essential dimension of the problem, by referring to the particular question of this meeting, in speaking of the Faith, I think I have done enough to wait now either for imprecations, or curses, or questions that may be asked of me. [Sustained applause.]</p> |
| <p>DISCUSSION Dr Laforgue — Notre ami Lacan a fait plus que parler du symbole, il a parlé de la parole, et il a parlé de la difficulté mentionnée déjà ce matin par M. Bazin, difficulté particulièrement grande pour les Français qui ont toujours besoin de mettre une chandelle quelque part, parce que sans chandelle ils se sentent perdus, 83</p> | <p>DISCUSSION Dr. Laforgue - Our friend Lacan has done more than speak about the symbol, he has spoken about the word <parole>, and he has spoken about the difficulty already mentioned this morning by Mr. Bazin, a difficulty especially for the French who still need to put a candle somewhere, because without candle they feel lost, 83</p> | <p>DISCUSSION Dr. Laforgue - Our friend Lacan has done more than speak of the symbol, he has spoken of speech <parole>, and he spoke of the difficulty already mentioned this morning by Mr. Bazin, a difficulty especially for the French who still need to put a candle somewhere, because without a candle they feel lost, 83</p> |
| <p>ils n'ont plus rien pour s'accrocher au bord de la cuvette. La difficulté d'approcher le symbole, de le comprendre, est due en partie au fait que le symbole est un langage dépersonnalisé [coup sur la table], c'est-à-dire que pour arriver à le comprendre, il faut dans une certaine mesure abandonner son moi, avec les notions courantes et le symbolisme courant du langage, et aller vers la nuit. . Et la nuit, c'est en quelque sorte la mort pour le moi, c'est l'union avec autre chose, c'est la transcendance, ça fait peur. Lacan nous a parlé aujourd'hui de cette</p> | <p>they have nothing left to cling to the edge of the bowl. The difficulty of approaching the symbol, to understand it, is partly due to the fact that the symbol is a depersonalized language [blow on the table], that is to say that in order to understand it, it is necessary in a certain measure to abandon one's ego <moi>, with current notions and the current symbolism of language <langage>, and go into the night. And at night, it's sort of death for the ego <moi>, it's union with something else, it's</p> | <p>They have nothing left to cling to the edge of the bowl. The difficulty of approaching the symbol, to understand it, is partly due to the fact that the symbol is a depersonalized language [blow on the table], that is to say that in order to understand it, you have, in a certain measure to abandon one's ego <moi>, with current notions and the current symbolism of language, and go into the night. And at night, it's a sort of death for the ego, it's the union with something else, it's transcendence, it's</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>peur qui étreint le savant qui essaie d'aborder cette question sur le plan rationnel. Je ne voudrais pas dire davantage, mais je crois qu'il était utile d'apporter cet éclaircissement à tout ce qu'il nous a dit. Je demande maintenant: qui veut prendre la parole pour répondre à Lacan? [Silence.]</p> | <p>transcendence, it's scary. Lacan has spoken to us today about this fear which embraces the scientist who tries to approach this question rationally. I do not want to say more, but I think it was helpful to bring that clarification to everything he said. I ask now: Who wants to speak to respond to Lacan? [Silence.]</p> | <p>scary. Lacan has spoken to us today about this fear which embraces the scientist who tries to approach this question rationally. I do not want to say more, but I think it was helpful to bring that clarification to everything he said. I ask now: Who wants to speak to respond to Lacan? [Silence.]</p> |
| <p>J. L. — Faut quand même que quelqu'un se jette à l'eau! Dr Laforgue — Monsieur Eliade? 84</p> | <p>J. L. - Nevertheless it is necessary that someone gets his feet wet! Dr. Laforgue - Mr. Eliade? 84</p> | <p>J. L. - Nevertheless it is necessary that someone take the plunge! Dr. Laforgue - Mr. Eliade? 84</p> |
| <p>Mircea Eliade — Je voudrais poser une question à M. Lacan. Il est très juste de dire que le symbolisme est un langage, parce que c'est une expression. Mais vous dites aussi «parole». J. L. — C'est pas pareil!</p> | <p>Mircea Eliade - I have a question for Mr. Lacan. It is very fair to say that symbolism is a language, because it is an expression. But you also say "word" <parole>. J. L. - It's not the same!</p> | <p>Mircea Eliade - I have a question for Mr. Lacan. It is very fair to say that symbolism is a language, because it is an expression. But you also say "word". J. L. - It's not the same!</p> |
| <p>Mircea Eliade — Non, justement, c'est pas pareil! Je pense que vous avez raison quand vous dites: «Le symbolisme est un langage.» C'est un langage, d'accord! comme les mathématiques sont un langage, comme la musique est un langage, comme l'architecture est un langage. Mais si vous dites «parole», «symbole», «symbolisme», je suis un peu étonné, parce que j'ai devant moi des cultures avec un vocabulaire restreint, avec une grammaire élémentaire, et avec un symbolisme d'une richesse métaphysique extraordinaire! Là, le symbole ne fait pas double emploi avec la parole. Il n'y a pas dans les langues ioniennes d'expression pur l'«être», ni pour le «non- être», ni pour le «devenir», mais il y a des normes symboliques, une ontologie de l'être. 85</p> | <p>Mircea Eliade - No, it's not the same! I think you're right when you say, "Symbolism is a language "It's a language, okay! As mathematics is a language, as music is a language, as architecture is a language. But if you say "word", "symbol", "symbolism", I am a little surprised, because I have before me cultures with a restricted vocabulary, an elementary grammar, and a symbolism of an extraordinary metaphysical richness! There, the symbol does not duplicate the word. In Ionic languages, there isn't some expressions for "being", nor for "non-being nor "becoming", but there are symbolic norms, an ontology of being. 85</p> | <p>Mircea Eliade - No, it's not the same! I think you're right when you say, "Symbolism is a language "It's a language, okay! As mathematics is a language, as music is a language, as architecture is a language. But if you say "word", "symbol", "symbolism", I am a little surprised, because I have before me cultures with a restricted vocabulary, an elementary grammar, and a symbolism of a extraordinary metaphysical richness! There, the symbol does not duplicate the word. There is no expression in Ionic languages for "being", nor for "non-being or "becoming", but there are symbolic norms, an ontology of being. 85</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>On voit très bien là que le symbolisme est un langage, mais que ce n'est pas la parole, don't vous avez admirablement bien fait l'analyse. Cette espèce de parole, c'est directement le symbole.</p> | <p>We see very clearly that symbolism is a language <langage>, but that it is not the speech, of which you have admirably well analyzed. This kind of speech is directly the symbol.</p> | <p>We see very clearly that symbolism is a language, but that it is not speech <parole> which you have admirably well analyzed. This kind of speech is directly the symbol.</p> |
| <p>Les documents sont encore plus précieux, parce qu'il y a des images, celle de la spirale par exemple. Il y a un symbolisme qui se lie à la spirale, la totalité d'image de la spirale est <i>in nuce</i> un symbole du «devenir». Alors, en tant qu'ethnologue, je crois qu'il est dangereux de faire s'équivaloir, comme vous le faites si bien, parole et symbolisme. À un certain niveau de culture, le langage articulé a sa fonction, mais le symbolisme le précède.</p> | <p>The documents are even more valuable, because there are images, that of the spiral for example. There is a symbolism that binds to the spiral, the entire image of the spiral is 'in embryo' a symbol of "becoming". So, as an ethnologist, I think it is dangerous to equate, as you do so well, word <parole> and symbolism. At a certain level of culture, articulated language has its function, but symbolism precedes it.</p> | <p>The documents are even more valuable, because there are images, that of the spiral for example. There is a symbolism that binds to the spiral, the entire image of the spiral is <i>in nuce</i> a symbol of "becoming". So, as an ethnologist, I think it is dangerous to equate, as you do so well, speech and symbolism. At a certain level of culture, articulated language has its function, but symbolism precedes it.</p> |
| <p>J. L. — Oui, mais, écoutez! Nous partons ici d'une expérience concrète, comme on dit, et éminemment qualifiée humainement parlant, celle de saint Jean de la Croix, et il s'agit de savoir quelle fonction y remplit le symbole. Sa parole est des plus authentiques, et elle essaie pourtant de nous expliquer comment l'unicité de l'être peut sortir du plan du symbole. Je voudrais que vous compreniez ça. Je n'ai pas dit que la parole et le symbole étaient</p> <p>86</p> | <p>J. L. - Yes, but listen! We begin here with a concrete experience, as we say, and eminently qualified humanly speaking, that of St. John of the Cross, and it is a question of knowing what function the symbol fills in it. His speech is most authentic, and yet she is trying however to explain to us how the uniqueness of being can leave the plane of the symbol. I want you to understand that. I did not say that the word <parole> and the symbol are</p> <p>86</p> | <p>J. L. - Yes, but listen! We begin here with a concrete experience, as we say, and eminently qualified humanly speaking, that of St. John of the Cross, and it is a question of knowing what function the symbol fills in it. His speech is most authentic, and yet it tries however to explain to us how the uniqueness of being can leave the plane of the symbol. I want you to understand that. I did not say that speech and the symbol were</p> <p>86</p> |
| <p>la même chose. Je les confonds si peu que j'ai dit que le symbole, sous la forme où nous, psychanalystes, le voyons incarné, au sens propre du terme, a chez le sujet parlant le sens d'une sorte de parole passive. Ceci est si vrai que cette parole-là porte habituellement la marque de toutes les paroles concrètes, de tous les</p> | <p>the same thing. I confuse them so little that I said that the symbol, in the form where we, psychoanalysts, see it incarnated, in the sense of the term, has in the speaking subject the meaning of a kind of passive word <parole>. This is so true that this word usually bears the mark of all the</p> | <p>the same thing. I confuse them so little that I said that the symbol, in the form in which we, psychoanalysts, see it incarnate, in the proper sense of the term, has in the speaking subject the meaning of a kind of passive word <parole>. This is so true that this word usually bears the</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>liens d'histoire et de parenté, de tout le discours vécu qui a déterminé la naissance du sujet. Vous ne l'ignorez pas, on naît aussi bien des paroles que du simple moment du couchage de ses parents, et les paroles de l'entremetteur, si je puis dire, y ont un rôle tout aussi génésique. Cela va jusqu'à se refléter dans ce qu'on appelle l'inconscient du sujet, à savoir dans ses symptômes, autrement dit, dans la maladie qui parle, dans le creux, si je puis dire, dans la faiblesse physiologique qui lui permet d'être intégrée dans cette parole.</p> | <p>concrete words <paroles>, all the ties of history and kinship, all the lived discourse that determined the birth of the subject. You are not unaware of this, you are born as much by the words as by a simple moment in the bed of his parents, and the words of the matchmaker, if I may say so, also have a reproductive role. This goes so far as to be reflected in what is called the unconscious of the subject, namely in its symptoms, in other words, in the disease which speaks, in the hollow, if I may say so, in the physiological weakness which enables it to be included in this word.<parole>.</p> | <p>mark of all the concrete words <paroles>, all the ties of history and kinship, all the lived discourse that determined the birth of the subject. You are not unaware of this, you are born as much of the words as a simple moment in the bed of his parents, and the words of the matchmaker, if I may say so, have an equally genius role. This goes so far as to be reflected in what is called the unconscious of the subject, namely in his symptoms, in other words, in the disease which speaks, in the hollow, if I may say so, in the physiological weakness which enables it to be integrated into this word.</p> |
| <p>Le symptôme, nous arrivons, Dieu merci, à le résoudre quand nous avons quelque bonheur, et que nous savons rester au niveau de la parole authentique. Le symptôme est en lui-même parole, pour autant qu'il est quelque chose du discours concret, dans les limites, 87</p> | <p>The symptom, we arrive, thank God, to solve it when we have some happiness, and know how to stay at the level of authentic speech. The symptom is in itself a word <parole>, insofar as it is something of the concrete discourse, within these limits, 87</p> | <p>The symptom, we manage, thank God, to solve it when we have some luck, and that we know how to stay at the level of authentic speech. The symptom is in itself speech, insofar as it is something of the concrete discourse, within the limits, 87</p> |
| <p>également concrètes, du sujet. Il vous le prouve en étant ce dont le sujet pâtit dans sa chair même, tout en n'étant pas à la portée de sa conscience, ni à la portée de son discours. Mais c'est quand même une parole, parce que c'est un langage assumé par un sujet. C'est ce qui fait la différence de la parole et du langage. Vous me parlez, en tant qu'ethnologue, du fait que vous voyez les symboles tout seuls, comme ça. Enfin, quand même, comment savez-vous leur sens? Parce que les sujets qui sont là vous l'expliquent. [Acquiescement de</p> | <p>also concrete, of the subject. He proves it to you by being what the subject suffers in its own flesh itself, while not being within the reach of his conscience, nor within the reach of his discourse. But it is still a word <parole>, because it is a language assumed by a subject. It's that which makes the difference between speech <parole> and language <langage>. You speak to me, as an ethnographer, of the fact that you see the symbols on their own, like that. Finally, how do you know their meaning? Because the subjects that are</p> | <p>also concrete, of the subject. He proves it to you by being what the subject suffers in his flesh itself, while not within the reach of his consciousness, nor within the reach of his discourse. But it is still a word, because it is a language assumed by a subject. It's that which makes the difference between speech and language. You speak to me, as an ethnographer, of the fact that you see the symbols on their own, like that. However, how do you know their meaning? Because the subjects that are</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>l'intéressé. I C'est pas ça qui est intéressant! Après tout, ils vous l'expliquent peut-être pour vous faire plaisir. C'est toujours là le danger, vous le savez bien vous-mêmes, et vous passez votre temps, comme chez les analystes, à vous reprocher entre vous de vous en être laissé accroire. Mais enfin, dans l'ensemble, on a bien le sentiment que ça joue un rôle essentiel dans la régulation de leur vie intersubjective. Nous n'avons pas parlé aujourd'hui de ce qu'il faut entendre par «intersubjectivité» et «intrasubjectivité», mais il est certain que si l'on représentait cela par des cercles, ils auraient des parties communes. Jusqu'à un certain point</p> <p>88</p> | <p>there explain it to you. [Acquiescence of the person concerned] is not that interesting! After all, they may explain it to you to please you. That is always the danger, you know yourselves well, and you spend your time, as among psychoanalysts, reproach yourself between yourself for letting yourself be taken in. But finally, on the whole, one has the feeling that it plays an essential role in the regulation of their intersubjective life. We have not discussed today what is meant by "intersubjectivity" and "intrasubjectivity", but it is certain that if they were represented by circles, they would have common parts. Up to a certain point</p> <p>88</p> | <p>there explain it to you. [Acquiescence of the person concerned] That is what is not interesting! After all, they may explain it to you to please you. That is always the danger, you know yourselves, and you spend your time, as among psychoanalysts, reproaching yourself between yourselves for letting yourself be taken in. But finally, on the whole, one has the feeling that it plays an essential role in the regulation of their intersubjective life. We have not discussed today what is meant by "intersubjectivity" and "intrasubjectivity", but it is certain that if they were represented by circles, they would have common parts. Up to a certain point</p> <p>88</p> |
| <p>je peux considérer qu'une partie de votre subjectivité à vous, Mircea Eliade, fait déjà partie de la mienne [acquiescement de l'intéressé] pour autant que nous dialoguons. Il s'agit de savoir ce que vous voulez dire en disant que le symbole dépasse tout à fait la parole. Tout primitives qu'ils soient, s'ils ont vraiment la fonction symbolique, comme nous pouvons nous en douter, ils participent des catégories de l'être et du devenir exactement comme nous. Pour moi, je ne crois absolument pas à la différence du primitif et du civilisé. Je pense que l'être et le devenir sont à la portée de toutes les bourses. C'est bien ce que vous nous apportez en nous montrant qu'une spirale a le même sens chez eux que chez nous «devenir», n'est-ce pas? Mircea Eliade — Oui, mais alors, je dirais «expression» au lieu de «parole».</p> | <p>I can consider that part of your subjectivity to you, Mircea Eliade, is already part of mine [acquiescence of the interested person] to as much as we talk. The question is to know what you mean by saying that the symbol goes far beyond the speech <parole>. Primitive as they are, if they really have the symbolic function, as we can suspect, they participate in the categories of being and becoming exactly like us. For me, I absolutely do not believe in the difference between the primitive and the civilized. I believe that being and becoming are within everyone's means. This is what you bring to us by showing us that a spiral has the same meaning for them as "to become" has for us, is that not it? Mircea Eliade - Yes, but then, I</p> | <p>I can consider that part of <i>your</i> subjectivity, Mircea Eliade, is already part of mine [acquiescence of the interested person] in as much as we are talking. The question is to know what you mean by saying that the symbol goes far beyond speech. Primitive as they are, if they really have the symbolic function, as we can suspect, they participate in the categories of being and becoming exactly like us. For me, I do not believe in the difference between the primitive and the civilized. I believe that being and becoming are within the reach of all classes. This is what you bring to us by showing us that a spiral has the same meaning for them as does for us "to become", is that not so?</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>- J. L. — Ah, mais je n'ai pas parlé d'expression un seul instant! Mircea Eliade — Mais vous avez dit que le symptôme est parlé, l'objet parlé, vous avez 89</p> | <p>would say "expression" instead of "word."<parole> - J. L. - Ah, but I did not mention expressions for a moment! Mircea Eliade - But you said that the symptom is spoken, the spoken object, you have 89</p> | <p>Mircea Eliade - Yes, but then, I would say "expression" instead of "word."<parole> - J. L. - Ah, but I did not mention expression for a moment! Mircea Eliade - But you said that the symptom is spoken, the spoken object, you have 89</p> |
| <p>retenu là certains mots de Freud, vous avez dit que c'était l'Es de Freud. J. L. — Non, non, non, j'ai dit: «il n'est pas». Mircea Eliade — Vous avez dit que, dans le cas de la psychanalyse, l'homme est parlé par le symptôme. J. L. — Non, non! J'ai dit que, dans le symptôme, dans le fait du symptôme, on peut considérer que l'homme est parlé. Mircea Eliade — On peut considérer que l'homme est parlé, mais. J. L. — Dans le symptôme, l'homme n'est pas l'agent de la parole, voilà ce que ça veut dire. Mircea Eliade — ... tout phénomène cosmique aussi est parlé, alors il exprime quelque chose. Vous l'avez dit justement tout à l'heure, la nuit et le jour, n'est-ce pas? En tant que phénomènes, ils... . 90</p> | <p>retained here some words <mots> of Freud, you said that it was Freud's Es. J. L. - No, no, no, I said "it is not". Mircea Eliade - You said that in the case of of psychoanalysis, man is spoken by the symptom. J. L. - No, no! I said that in the symptom, in the fact of the symptom, one can consider that man is spoken. Mircea Eliade - It can be considered that man is spoken, but. J. L. - In the symptom, man is not the agent of the word <parole>, that's what it wants/intends to say. Mircea Eliade - ... every cosmic phenomenon is also spoken, so it expresses something. As you said just now, night and day, is it not? As phenomena, they 90</p> | <p>retained here some words of Freud, you said that it was Freud's Es. J. L. - No, no, no, I said "it is not". Mircea Eliade - You said that in the case of psychoanalysis, man is spoken by the symptom. J. L. - No, no! I said that in the symptom, in the fact of the symptom, one can consider that man is spoken. Mircea Eliade - It can be considered that man is spoken, but. J. L. - In the symptom, man is not the agent of the word <parole>, that's what it means. Mircea Eliade - ... every cosmic phenomenon is also spoken, so it expresses something. As you said just now, night and day, is it not? As phenomena, they 90</p> |
| <p>J.L. — Oui! Mircea Eliade—... sont parlés. J.L. — Oui, je n'y mets pas d'obstacle, mais à la vérité, ce que vous nous dites n'a qu'une seule valeur, c'est de supposer une subjectivité cosmique. Personnellement, je n'y ai ni accès ni penchant, je ne la suppose pas. Mais vous me direz que le fait que je ne la suppose pas entraîne des difficultés métaphysiques tout</p> | <p>J.L. - Yes! Mircea Eliade -... are spoken. J.L.-Yes, I do not put obstacles in it, but the truth, what you are telling us has only one value, it is to assume a cosmic subjectivity Personally, I do not have access to it nor inclination, I do not suppose it. But you say to me that the fact that I do not suppose it entails</p> | <p>J.L. - Yes! Mircea Eliade -... are spoken. J.L.-Yes, I do not put obstacles in it, but in truth, what you are telling us has only one value is to assume a cosmic subjectivity Personally, I do not have access to it nor inclination, I do not suppose it. But you will say to me that the fact that I</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>aussi insurmontables que de la supposer. Mircea Eliade — L'homme archaïque considère que le Cosmos parle. C'est exactement comme pour vous, analystes, l'objet parlé. Alors, pour un homme archaïque comme pour le mystique, le Cosmos...</p> <p>J. L., interrompant avec véhémence dez ! Attendez! Attendez! AttenMircea Eliade — Oui! Oui!' J. L. —Vous dites «comme pour le mystique». Il n'est pas sûr du tout que pour saint</p> <p>91</p> | <p>metaphysical difficulties just as insurmountable as supposing it. Mircea Eliade - The archaic man considers the Cosmos to speak. It is exactly like for you, analysts, the spoken object. Then, for an archaic man like the mystic, the Cosmos ...</p> <p>J. L., interrupting with vehemence Dez! Wait! Wait! AttenMircea Eliade - Yes! Yes! ' J. L. -You say "as for the mystic." It is not at all sure that for Saint</p> <p>91</p> | <p>do not suppose it entails metaphysical difficulties just as insurmountable as to suppose it. Mircea Eliade - The archaic man considers that the Cosmos speaks. It is exactly like for you, analysts, the spoken object. Then, for an archaic man like the mystic, the Cosmos ...</p> <p>J. L., interrupting with vehemence Wait! Wait! Mircea Eliade - Yes! Yes! ' J. L. -You say "as for the mystic." It is not at all certain that for Saint</p> <p>91</p> |
| <p>Jean de la Croix, le Cosmos parlait. Ce sont des distinctions très importantes à introduire ici [acquiescement de Mircea Eliade], parce que la fonction du symbolisme chez saint Jean de la Croix, vous allez en chercher la clé chez M.Jung [dénégations du même. Vous impliquez que saint Jean de la Croix, comme M. Jung, croit que le Cosmos parle. Il ne le dit pas, mais, selon vous, tout ce qu'il dit implique en fin de compte que le Cosmos parle. Mircea Eliade — Les archaïques pensent que le Cosmos parle, même dans le langage. J. L. — Ecoutez, pour un abord méthodique de ces choses, il faudrait qu'on élimine un certain nombre de mots. Mais ça demanderait tout un chapitre, tellement de sacrifices! J'allais tout à l'heure demander qu'on élimine le mot «synthèse» de nos débats, et juste à ce moment-là M. Baudouin nous a dit que le symbole est la première forme de la synthèse! Je me suis dit: «En voilà bien une autre!» Il n'était plus question que je demande ça, vous</p> | <p>John of the Cross, the Cosmos spoke. Those are very important distinctions to be introduced here [Acquiescence of Mircea Eliade], because the function of the symbolism of St. John of Croix, you will find the key at the home of Mr. Jung [denials of the same. You imply that St. John of the Cross, like Mr. Jung, believes that the Cosmos speaks. He does not say it, but, according to you, everything he says implies at the end of account that the Cosmos speaks</p> <p>Mircea Eliade --The archaics think that the Cosmos speaks, even in language.<langage> J. L. - Listen, for a first methodical approach to these things, it would be necessary to eliminate a certain number of words. But it would demand a whole chapter, so many sacrifices! I was going request that one eliminate the word "synthesis" from our debates, and just then Mr. Baudouin told us that the symbol is the first form of</p> | <p>John of the Cross, the Cosmos spoke. Those are very important distinctions to be introduced here [Acquiescence of Mircea Eliade], because the function of the symbolism of St. John of Croix, you will find the key in Mr Jung [denials of the same] You imply that St. John of the Cross, like Mr. Jung, believes that the Cosmos speaks. He does not say it, but, according to you, everything he says implies at the end of account that the Cosmos speaks</p> <p>Mircea Eliade --The archaics think that the Cosmos speaks, even in language.<langage> J. L. - Listen, for a methodical approach of these things, it would be necessary to eliminate a certain number of words. But it would demand a whole chapter, so many sacrifices! I was going request that one eliminate the word "synthesis" from our debates, and just then Mr.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>comprenez. [Rires.] Maintenant, je voudrais par exemple vous demander de ne jamais dire le 92</p> | <p>synthesis! I said to myself : "There is another! "It was no longer a question to ask, you understand. [Laughter.] Now I would like for example to ask you to never say the 92</p> | <p>Baudouin told us that the symbol is the first form of synthesis! I said to myself : "There's another one! " It was no longer a question of my asking that, you understand. [Laughter.] Now I would like for example to ask you to never say the 92</p> |
| <p>mot de «pensée» sans supposer que les primitives ne pensent pas plus que nous, ou tout au moins très rarement. Mircea Eliade — Bon, alors je dis «comportement», c'est plus simple. Le comportement archaïque est parlé par lui-même, voilà ce que je voulais dire. J. L. — Oui, seulement, comme le Cosmos du primitif, c'est exactement ce que j'ai appelé tout à l'heure l'univers du symbole. Vous retombez dans la question, vous comprenez ? En d'autres termes, je crois que la différence entre le primitif et nous, c'est qu'il n'a pas commencé, comme nous l'avons fait avec la plus grande imprudence, à interroger avec son univers de symboles [coup sur la table] la réalité tangible! Nous avons commencé progressivement, en réduisant la question à la mesure de l'objet, et nous en sommes à obtenir des réponses, si j'ose dire, foudroyantes. Maintenant, que le primitif pense que le Cosmos parle, comme vous le dites, ça ne provoque chez moi aucune espèce de question qui me conduise à faire une différence radicale entre 93</p> | <p>word "thought" without assuming that the primitives do not think any more than we do, or at least very rarely. Mircea Eliade - Well, then I say "behavior" it's easier. The archaic behaviour is spoken by itself, this is what I meant. J. L. - Yes, only, like the Cosmos of the primitive, it is exactly what I called just now the universe of the symbol. You fall back into the question, you understand? In other words, I believe that the difference between the primitive and ourselves is that he did not begin, as we have done with the utmost imprudence, to question with his universe of symbols [blow on the table] the tangible reality! We began gradually, reducing the question to the measure of the object, and we are getting answers, if I may say so, staggering. Now, that the primitive thinks that the Cosmos speaks, as you say, it does not provoke in me any kind of question that leads me to make a radical difference between 93</p> | <p>word "thought" without assuming that the primitives do not think any more than we do, or at least very rarely. Mircea Eliade - Well, then I say "behavior" it's easier. The archaic behaviour is spoken by itself, this is what I meant. J. L. - Yes, only, like the Cosmos of the primitive, it is exactly what I called just now the universe of the symbol. You fall back into the question, do you understand? In other words, I believe that the difference between the primitive and ourselves is that he did not begin, as we have done with the utmost imprudence, to question with his universe of symbols [blow on the table] the tangible reality! We began gradually, reducing the question to the measure of the object, and we are getting answers, if I may say so, that are mind-blowing. Now that the primitive thinks that the Cosmos speaks, as you say, does not provoke in me any kind of question that leads me to make a radical difference between 93</p> |
| <p>sa mentalité et la nôtre pour la bonne raison que ce que vous appelez Cosmos au niveau du</p> | <p>his mentality and ours for the right reason that what you call Cosmos at the level of primitive has nothing to do with</p> | <p>his mentality and ours for the good reason that what you call Cosmos at the level of primitive has nothing to do</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>primitif n'a rien à faire avec la cosmologie copernicienne, à plus forte raison avec la dernière venue, celle des atomes d'Adrian. C'est une cosmologie symbolique, n'est-ce pas?</p> <p>Alors, ce n'est pas étonnant qu'elle parle, puisque c'est justement sa définition! De sorte que mon système retrouve assez son assiette, mon système qui a d'ailleurs justement pour caractéristique de n'être pas un système. N'attendez pas de moi que je vous explique l'émergence de la surprenante inspiration qui fait qu'au niveau des symboles, le Chien céleste est tout autant un chien que le chien terrestre. C'est comme ça. Nous arrivons là-dedans, et on nous apprend tout de suite à parler. Du seul fait qu'on nous apprend à parler, nous sommes introduits dans l'univers du symbole. Selon les divers accidents de notre existence, nous serons amenés ou pas à nous poser là-dessus des questions, ou même à ne pas les approcher du tout, peu importe. Enfin, c'est un fait que ce monde existe, et que nous le recevons tout fait! Nous ne le refabriquons pas avec nos images intérieures,</p> <p>94</p> | <p>a Copernican cosmology, even more so, the last coming, one of the atoms of Adrian. It is a symbolic cosmology, isn't it? So, isn't it surprising that it speaks, since that is precisely its definition! So that my system finds enough on its plate which has, moreover, the characteristic of not being a system. Do not expect me to explain to you the emergence of the surprising inspiration which makes that at the level of the symbols, the Celestial Dog is just as much a dog as the earthly dog. It's like that. We get to that, and we are taught to speak at once. By the very fact that we are taught to speak, we are introduced into the universe of the symbol. According to the various accidents of our existence, we will be led or not to ask ourselves questions about it, or even not to approach them at all, regardless. Finally, it is a fact that this world exists, and that we receive it all done! We do not remanufacture it with our inner images,</p> <p>94</p> | <p>with Copernican cosmology, let alone with the latest arrival, that of Adrian's atoms. It is a symbolic cosmology, is it not? So, it is not surprising that it speaks, since that is precisely its definition! So that my system finds its equilibrium more or less, my system which has, moreover, the characteristic of not being a system. Do not expect me to explain to you the emergence of the surprising inspiration which makes that at the level of the symbols, the Celestial Dog is just as much a dog as the earthly dog. It's like that. We land in that, and we are taught to speak at once. By the very fact that we are taught to speak, we are introduced into the universe of the symbol. According to the various accidents of our existence, we will be led or not to ask ourselves questions about it, or even not to approach them at all, whatever. Finally, it is a fact that this world exists, and that we receive it ready-made! We do not remanufacture it with our inner images,</p> <p>94</p> |
| <p>quand même! Faut pas essayer de nous faire croire ça! Saint Jean de la Croix, comme les autres, reçoit les symboles traditionnels, il emprunte au Cantique des cantiques des thèmes symboliques. Ce n'est pas pour rien qu'on trouve par exemple chez lui le thème de l'amour illicite, n'est-ce pas? C'est là par où, dans l'amour, l'être s'évade du monde du symbole. Ceci est peut-être justement fondateur d'un amour au-delà du symbole, et c'est pour</p> | <p>all the same! Do not try to make us believe that! Saint John of the Cross, like the others, receives the traditional symbols, he borrows from the Song of Songs symbolic themes. It is not for nothing that one finds for example in him the theme of the illicit love, is it not? This is where, in love, being escapes from the world of the symbol. This may well be the foundation of love beyond the symbol, and that is why it</p> | <p>anyway! Do not try to make us believe that! Saint John of the Cross, like the others, receives the traditional symbols, he borrows from the Song of Songs symbolic themes. It is not for nothing that one finds in him the theme of illicit love, is it? This is where, in love, being escapes from the world of the symbol. This may well be the foundation of love beyond the symbol, and that is why it</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>cela que ça prend la forme de l'amour illicite. Vous y êtes? Je crois que ce que je dis est très important. [Court silence.] Dr Laforgue — Oui. Est-ce que quelqu'un désire encore la parole? [Nouveau silence.] R. P. Bruno — Une minute, parce que nous devons prendre le thé, il est cinq heures passées. [Suivent des échanges qui n'ont pu être transcrits, puis une brève intervention de Mme X à 95</p> | <p>takes the form of illicit love. Are you there? I think what I am saying is very important. [Short silence.] Dr. Laforgue - Yes. Does anybody still wish to speak? [New silence.] R. P. Bruno - One minute, because we must have tea, it is five hours past. [Following are exchanges that could not be transcribed, followed by a brief intervention by Ms. X 95</p> | <p>takes the form of illicit love. Are you there? I think what I am saying is very important. [Short silence.] Dr. Laforgue - Yes. Does anybody still wish to speak? [New silence.] R. P. Bruno - One minute, because we must have tea, it is past five o'clock. [Following are exchanges that could not be transcribed, followed by a brief intervention by Ms. X 95</p> |
| <p>propos de la spirale, amenant des réponses caustiques du Dr Lacan et de plusieurs autres.] Mircea Eliade — Je ne suis ni psychologue, ni psychanalyste, je suis historien des religions, et je peux vous donner des photographies d'admirables dessins de spirales sous le paléolithique. J. L. — J'ai essayé de vous dire tout à l'heure que toute image vaut par son usage symbolique, mais, bien entendu, elle peut être prise dans n'importe quel circuit. Il est certain que l'eau n'est pas la même chose quand je me la verse là, dans le verre, et au moment où nous entrons dans le symbolisme sacré de l'eau. , - Mircea Eliade — Oui, mais il y a des mythes qui expliquent cette image. Il leur manque justement les termes «être», «non-être» et «devenir», et ils les expriment avec le symbole. Le vocabulaire manque, mais pas la notion. L'ontologie est là, mais pas le vocabulaire ontologique, qui commence avec le présocratique ou avec le [un mot manque]. 96</p> | <p>about the spiral, causing caustic responses from Dr. Lacan and several others.] Mircea Eliade - I am neither a psychologist, nor a psychoanalyst, I am a historian of religions, and I can give you photographs admirable drawings of spirals under the paleolithic. J. L. - I tried to tell you just now that every image gets its worth by its symbolic use, but, of course, it can be taken in any circuit. It is certain that water is not the same when I pour it there into the glass, and when we enter into the sacred symbolism of water. , - Mircea Eliade - Yes, but there are some myths that explain this image. They lack the words "being", "non-being", and "becoming", and they express them with the symbol. The vocabulary is missing, but not the notion. The ontology is there, but not the ontological vocabulary, which begins with the presocratic or with the [one missing word]. 96</p> | <p>about the spiral, causing caustic responses from Dr. Lacan and several others.] Mircea Eliade - I am neither a psychologist, nor a psychoanalyst, I am a historian of religions, and I can give you photographs admirable drawings of spirals under the paleolithic. J. L. - I tried to tell you just now that every image is valued by its symbolic use, but, of course, it can be taken in any circuit. It is certain that water is not the same when I pour it there into the glass, and when we enter into the sacred symbolism of water. , - Mircea Eliade - Yes, but there are some myths that explain this image. They lack the words "being", "non-being", and "become ", and they express them with the symbol. The vocabulary is missing, but not the notion. The ontology is there, but not the ontological vocabulary, which begins with the presocratics or with the [one missing word]. 96</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>J. L. — Mais je suis tout à fait d'accord, je n'y vois aucun obstacle, ça verse de l'eau dans mon moulin, ça va dans mon sens. On est d'accord, ou reste la difficulté [coup sur la table] sur laquelle vous m'avez posé une question? Est-ce qu'il reste une difficulté ou pas?</p> <p>Mima Eliade — Non, seulement, en tant que profane, j'ai été un peu impressionné par l'insistance de vos paroles. Pour moi, la parole, c'est...</p> <p>J. L. — La parole, c'est la parole du sujet parlant, qu'il parle sans savoir qu'il parle ou qu'il parle en le sachant. Voilà ce que c'est.</p> <p>Mima Eliade — ... qu'il parle en langage articulé, ou qu'il vous raconte un rêve, ou qu'il fasse un dessin parce que, justement, il ne peut pas parler. Un Australien ionien ne peut pas parler, il n'a pas les mots «être», «non-être» et «devenir».</p> <p>J. L. — Mais non! Enfin, je suis resté longtemps là-dessus! La parole s'inscrit dans la</p> <p>97</p> | <p>J. L. - But I totally agree, I do not see any obstacle, it pours water into my mill, it goes in my direction. We are in agreement, or does there still remain the difficulty [blow on the table] on which you asked me a question?</p> <p>Is there any difficulty or not?</p> <p>Mima Eliade - No, only, as a layman, I was somewhat impressed by the insistence of your words. For me, the word <la parole>, it is..</p> <p>J. L. — Speech <parole> is the word <la parole> of the speaking subject, that he speaks without knowing that he is speaking or that he speaks by knowing it. That's it.</p> <p>Mima Eliade - that he speaks in articulate language, that he tells you a dream, or that he makes a drawing because, precisely, he can not talk. An Ionian Australian can not speak, he does not have the words "being", "non-being", and "becoming".</p> <p>J. L. - But no! Finally, I stayed for a long time on it! The word/speech <la parole> is part of the</p> <p>97</p> | <p>J. L. - But I totally agree, I do not see any obstacle, it is grist to my mill, it goes in my direction. We are in agreement, or remains the difficulty [blow on the table] on which you asked me a question? Is there any difficulty or not?</p> <p>Mima Eliade - No, only, as a layman, I was somewhat impressed by the insistence of your words. For me, the word, it is..</p> <p>J. L. — Speech <parole> is the word of the speaking subject, that he speaks without knowing that he is speaking or that he speaks while knowing it. That is what it is.</p> <p>Mima Eliade - that he speaks in articulate language, that he tells you a dream, or that he makes a drawing because, precisely, he can not talk. An Ionian Australian can not speak, he does not have the words "being", "non-being", and "becoming".</p> <p>J. L. - But no! Finally, I stayed for a long time on it! Speech is part of the</p> <p>97</p> |
| <p>fonction de reconnaissance. On parle pour un autre sujet. . . .</p> <p>Dr Laforgue — Nous reviendrons tout à l'heure à cette question, j'aurai l'occasion de la traiter dans mon exposé.</p> <p>R. P. Bruno — M. Baudouin nous donnera sa communication aussitôt après.</p> <p>98</p> | <p>function of recognition. We speak for an other subject. . . .</p> <p>Dr. Laforgue - We will return later to that question, I will have the opportunity to deal with it in my presentation.</p> <p>R. P. Bruno - Mr. Baudouin will give us his communication shortly thereafter.</p> <p>98</p> | <p>function of recognition. We speak for an other subject. . . .</p> <p>Dr. Laforgue - We will return later to that question, I will have the opportunity to deal with it in my presentation.</p> <p>R. P. Bruno - Mr. Baudouin will give us his communication shortly thereafter.</p> <p>98</p> |