

**ADDENDA TO INDEX OF LACAN'S SEMINAR XI, Sheridan Translation  
Richard G. Klein**

**Alain, 93** pseudonym of French philosopher *Émile-auguste Chartier 1868-1951*  
**Alienation, 188, 203-221, 225, 235-6, 239, 246, 252-3, 257-8, 264, 266, 268, 274,**  
**Audouard, Xavier 77**  
**awakening 59, 60, 70**  
**Begriff, 26, 43** see **Grundbegriff (fundamental concept)**  
**binary signifier as Vorstellungsrepräsentanz 218, 236**  
**Breuer (case of Anna O) 11, 30** in addition to 157-8  
**Cartesian subject 126**  
**catalogue of catalogues 139, 210, 249**  
**chance (Zufall) 39-40, 42, 45, 52**  
**clinamen 63**  
**cross-cap 156**  
**cry 26, 62, 209**  
**daVinci, Leonardo 86**  
**deception 30, 33, 36, 37, 39, 61**  
**den (δεν) 64**  
**desire of scientist 10, 160, 237**  
**effigie 50.54 354**  
**fantasy as support of desire, 183**  
**fantasy protects the real 41**  
**Dolto, Françoise . 64**  
**eidos 146**  
**einziger Zug 141, 216, 256**  
**en (έν) 64**  
**Father can't you see I'm burning? 34, 37, 58, 68, 70, 259** see *The Interpretation of Dreams*-pages 509-11, 533-4, 542, 550, 571  
**field, furrowed 126**  
**field 10, 20, 21, 33, 34, 43, 44, 126, 189**  
**fever-sins of father, 34, 58**  
**Freud, Anna 153**  
**Freud, desire of 13, 27, 34, 48, 54**  
**fucking, I am not, I am talking to you 165**  
**ganze, Seuxualstrebung, 188-9**  
**Gewissheit (certainty) 35, 44-45** (*The Interpretation of Dreams*- 514- "es gibt nichts Willkürliches")  
**gap 22-3, 29, 35, 51, 57, 62**  
**gap, topological unity of gaps: gaps in chain of signifiers and gaps in the body 176, 181, 200**  
**gesamt Ich, in Freud, is a hapax (see below), 190**  
**Green, (with envy), André, 170, 215, 227**  
**Gordon knot 129, 131, 134**

Grundbegriffe (fundamental concept) 26, 163  
hapax (legomenon) ( name for a term used only once in an author's entire work)  
Freud's gesamt Ich is a hapax 190  
Heraclitus quote page 174-Eng, page 159-Fr; is lacking the first word in the quote-  
see Diehls DKB48 see <http://www.heraclitusfragments.com/Tour.html>  
βίος τῷ τόξῳ ὄνομα βίος ἔργον δὲ θάνατος  
see also: <http://www.heraclitusfragments.com/files/g.html>

hieroglyph 199  
holophrase 227, 236-7  
horizon 70  
in effigie, in absentia 54, 254  
I think therefore I am 35  
Kaufmann, Pierre. 41, 90, 259  
lamella 197, 200, 205  
larvatus prodeo (Latin, for I go forward bewitched/masked) 222 'Larva' means both  
'ghost' and 'mask' and 'larvare' means 'to bewitch, enchant', 'larvatus' being the masculine  
perfect passive participle of this verb. There is a pun here and the notion conveyed is of a  
ghost issuing from the grave, just as an actor issued masked from the sides or back of the  
stage.  
Lemberg-Cracow joke, 139  
levis 26 From Late Latin *levis*, "light (in weight)".  
lining, turning inside out of 71, 80, 83, 90, 126, 190, 198  
logical time 39-40, 117  
lozenge 181, 209  
Lust-Ich 191,240  
mantic 176 (of, relating to, or having the power of divination; prophetic.[Greek  
mantikos, from mantis, seer.]  
Mathesis, the Beloved of --is a mistranslation of "l'Aimée de mathèse". The Aimée  
of my doctoral thesis, vii  
μηδέν 64  
μήϝν 134  
Miller, Jaques-Alain, xi, 29, 119, 160, 184-5, 215, 277  
mycelium 26 (*The Interpretation of Dreams*-525)  
Mathis, Dr. Dominique 172  
mitre 156  
oblivium (forgetfulness) 26, 265 (*The Interpretation of Dreams*-518)  
ocelli 73  
ϝν 64, 134  
ontic 31-2, 34  
ontology 29,72  
οὐκ 134  
passage a l'acte 38  
perception, identity of 154  
-φ 18 (correspondence between various forms of objet a (Sem X, Nov.14, 1962) 18,  
81, 89,104-5

Preisschätzung, p37-Freud didn't use this word in his entire opus—he did use the word “Geringschätzung, *The Interpretation of Dreams*-p.516 “If any doubt (Geringschätzung=scorn, contempt), is thrown upon the value of the element in question...”

psychosomatic 227, 237

punctiform 43, 77, 96

real lack 205

Realich-Lustich 164, 175, 184-5, 198, 240

Real, tracing in the 127, 163

rectification 143

refusal (uncs=), 18, 23, 43 125

Rosolato, Dr. Guy 146

rim 172, 206, 209

Russell, Bertrand 102-9

Rusellian paradox Antinomies of Reason and Russellian Paradox

Chapter 1—Freud's desire is unanalyzed (who analyzed the first analyst?)

Chapter 2 –page 20—Subject has to recognize himself as he who counts

Chapter 11—I'm lying : Lemberg-Krakow

Chapter 20?—Things that do not exist: The sexual relation---La femme—The Phallus of the Mother

Safouan, Moustafa 103, 242

scientist, desire of the 10, 160

shades 23, 32, 47 (*The Interpretation of Dreams*-249)

sign-signifier 157, 199-200

signifier, relation of subject to, 138

signifier, definition of, 207, 236

signifier, the primal repressed is a, 176, 251

signifiers, pure 40

signifiers=Wahrnehmungszeichen 46

Signorelli 27

slag 126,134-135

sliding away (glissement) 61, 129

stain 74, 97-8

subject, resistance of the 51, 68

suture 317

synchrony 46

three brothers 20

tattoo 141, 146, 206

temporal pulsation of the Unconscious 43, 125, 127, 130,143, 154, 188, 207

teriotos ( teraotios) 69 see Liddell p 1776

Tort, Michel 13, 116-7, 134

Tracing in the Real 127, 163

**transference** 33, 54, 143

**transference** is not repetition 33, 54, 69,129,143

**transference** is the enactment of the unconscious 146-7, 149, 174

**unconscious** is structured like a language 20, 149, 203

**unconscious**, is constituted by the effects of speech on the subject, 47, 149  
**unconscious**, status of the, is ethical 33  
 Unbegriff . the limit of the Unbewusste 26, 43  
 unReal 205  
 Vappereau, JeanMichel, topological themes of 31, 36, 45, 68, 82, 216, 226  
 vertigo 71, 210, 260, 268  
 Vorstellungsrepräsentanz 59-60, 63, 110, 216-7, 222-236  
 Vorstellungsrepräsentanz as binary signifier 218, 236  
**Wiederholung (repetition)** 50, 67  
 Wiederkehr (return) 48  
 Wahl, François. 89-90, 118, 134, 200  
 Wahrnehmungszeichen=signifiers 46  
 Willkür *mistranslated as chance*, 39 the arbitrary, free-will, option, choice)  
 Willkürliches (es gibt da nichts Willkürliches-*The Interpretation of Dreams*-514)  
 Zelem Elohim 113 (image of God) Gen 1:26–27, Gen 5:1–3, Gen 9:6  
 Zufall, *mistranslated as the arbitrary*, 39; Zufall means chance  
 Zwang 6, 56, 67

page	Lacan's cogito
44	Wo Es war, soll Ich werden; <i>Écrits The Instance of the Letter</i> , page 524
44	Wo es war soll Ich werden ; <i>New Introductory Lectures, S.E. XXXI</i> page 80
44	Here in the field of the dream, you are at home; <i>The Interpretation of Dreams</i> page 549
45	Where it was, the Ich--the subject, not psychology, must come into existence
45	But the subject is there to rediscover <i>where it was</i>
33	<i>Whatever it is, I must go there</i> , because, somewhere, this unconscious reveals itself
45	Where it was, the subject must come into existence

“Where It was, I must come into being.

This goal is one of reintegration and harmony, I might even say of reconciliation [Versöhnung].” (*Écrits-The Instance of the Letter*, 524).

In Seminar VI Lacan explains his choice of alternative translation and presents Freud's maxim as an ethical matter – a duty – to put oneself in the place where one's desire is articulated. This place is the place wo Es war, where It was – namely, where unconscious desire has been spoken:

“I must come to be where it was'. It is very precise, it is this Ich which is not das Ich which is not the ego, which is an Ich, the Ich used as subject of the sentence. Where it has been, the place where it speaks. Where it speaks, namely where a moment before there was something which is unconscious desire, I must designate myself there, there I must be this I which is the goal, the end, the term of analysis before it is named, before it is formed, before it is articulated, if indeed it ever is, because as well in the Freudian formula this soll Ich werden, this 'it must be, this I must become', is the subject of a becoming, of a duty which is proposed to you.

We must re-conquer the lost field of the being of the subject as Freud says in the same sentence in a nice comparison, like the re-conquest by Holland from the Zuider Zee of lands which could be peacefully conquered. This field of the unconscious which we must win in the great analytic work is indeed what is in question. But before this is done there where it has been, what designates for us the place of this I which must come to birth? .... Very exactly the function and the term of what is in question in the unconscious.”  
(Seminar VI-Desire & Its Interpretation, 20.05.1959.)

## SEM XI FFC Excerpts on Names of the Father and desire.

Chapter-page	quote
I-12	<p>“So hysteria places us, I would say, on the track of some kind of original sin in analysis. There has to be one. The truth is perhaps simply one thing, namely, the desire of Freud himself, the fact that something in Freud, was never analysed.</p> <p>What I had to say on the Names-of-the-Father had no other purpose, in fact, than to put in question the origin, to discover by what privilege Freud’s desire was able to find the entrance into the field of experience he designates as the unconscious.</p> <p>It is absolutely essential that we should go back to this origin if we wish to put analysis on its feet.”</p>
I-13	<p>“Freud’s desire, however, I have placed at a higher level. I have said the Freudian field of analytic practice remained dependent on a certain original desire, which always plays an ambiguous, but dominant role in the transmission of psychoanalysis.”</p>
II-27	<p>“Furthermore, do we not see, behind this, the emergence of that which forced Freud to find in the myths of the death of the father the regulation of his desire?”</p>
II-28	<p>“As far as Freud and his relation to the Father are concerned, let us not forget that, despite all of his efforts to understand, he was forced to admit, to a woman of his acquaintance, that, for him the question—<i>What does a women want?</i> –remained unanswered.”</p>
III-34	<p>“It is precisely a reality which incompletely transferred, seems here to be shaking the dreamer from his sleep? Why, if not to suggest a mystery that is simply the world of the beyond, and some secret or other shared by father and the son who says to him, <i>Father, can’t you see I’m burning?</i> What is he burning with, if not with that which we see emerging at other points designated by the Freudian topology, namely, the weight of the sins of the father, borne by the ghost in the myth of Hamlet, which Freud couples with the myth of Oedipus? The father, the Name-of-the-father, sustains the structure of desire with the structure of the law—but the inheritance of the father is that which Kierkegaard designates for us, namely, his sin.”</p>
IV-48	<p>“ It is not only <i>Wiederkehr</i> in the sense of that which has been repressed—the very constitution of the field of the unconscious is based on <i>Wiederkehr</i>. It is there that Freud bases his certainty. But it is quite obvious that it is not from there that it comes to him. It comes to him from the fact that he recognizes the law of his own desire. He would not have been able to advance with this bet of certainty if he had not been guided in it, as his writings show, by his self-analysis.</p> <p>And what is his self-analysis, if not the brilliant mapping of the law of desire suspended in the Name-of-the-Father. Freud advances, sustained by a certain relation to his desire, and by his own achievement, namely, the constitution of psychoanalysis.”</p>
V-54	<p>“If you wish to understand what is Freud’s true occupation as the function of phantasy is revealed to him, remember the development, which is so central for us, of the Wolf Man. He applies himself, in a way that can almost be described as anguish, to the question—what is the first encounter, the real, that lies behind his phantasy? We feel that throughout this analysis, this real brings with it the subject, almost by force, so directing the research that, after all, we</p>

	can today ask ourselves whether this fever, this presence, this desire of Freud is not that which, in his patient, might have conditioned the belated accident of his psychosis.”
V-58	“Is there not more reality in this message than in the noise by which the father also identifies the strange reality of what is happening in the room next door. Is not the missed reality that caused the death of the child expressed in these words? Freud himself does not tell us that we must recognize in this sentence what perpetuates for the father those words forever separated from the dead child that were said to him, perhaps, Freud supposes, because of the fever—but who knows, perhaps these words perpetuate the remorse felt by the father that the man he has put at his son’s bedside to watch over him may not be up to his task:”
V-59	<p>“Thus the encounter forever missed, has occurred between dream and awakening, between the person who is still asleep and whose dream we will not know and the person who has dreamt merely in order not to wake up,  For it is not that, in the dream, he persuades himself that the son is still alive. But the terrible vision of the dead son taking the father by the arm designates a beyond that makes itself heard in the dream, Desire manifests itself in the dream by the loss expressed in an image at the most cruel point of the object. It is only in the dream that this truly unique encounter can occur. Only a rite, an endlessly repeated act, can commemorate this not very memorable encounter—for no one can say that the death of a child is, except the father <i>qua</i> father, that is to say, no conscious being,</p> <p>For the true formula of atheism is not <i>God is dead</i>—even by basing the origin of the function of the father upon his murder, Freud protects the father—the true formula for atheism is <i>God is unconscious.</i>”</p>
IX-113	<p>“Icons—the Christ in triumph in the vault at Daphnis or the admirable Byzantine mosaics—undoubtedly have the effect of holding us under their gaze. We might stop there, but were we to do so we would not really grasp the motive that made the painter set about making this icon, or the motive it satisfies in being presented to us. It is something to do with the gaze, of course, but there is more to it than that. What makes the value of the icon is that the god it represents is also looking at it. It is intended to please God. At this level, the artist is operating on the sacrificial plane—he is playing with those things, in this case images, that may arouse the desire of God.</p> <p>Indeed, God is the creator of certain images—we see this in <i>Genesis</i>, with the <i>Zelem Elohim</i>. And iconoclastic thought itself still preserves this when it declares there is a god that does not care for this. He is certainly alone in this. But I do not want to go too far today in a direction that would take us right to the heart of one of the most essential elements of the province of the Names-of-the-Father: a certain pact may be signed beyond every image. Where we are, the image remains a go-between with the divinity—if Jaweh forbids the Jews to make idols, it is because they give pleasure to the other gods. In a certain register it is not God who is not anthropomorphic, it is man who is begged not to be so. But that’s enough of that.”</p>
XIX-248	“If this year I had done the seminar I intended doing on the Names-of-the-Father—but the Lord with unpronounceable name is precisely he who sends children to barren women and old men. The fundamentally transbiological character of paternity, introduced by the tradition of the destiny of the chosen people, has something that is originally repressed there,”
XIX-258	<p>P.Kaufmann: “<i>Is there not some kind of connection between what you have said again, on the subject of Booz and Theodore Reik, and that you have said, elsewhere, concerning the father at the beginning of chapter seven of ‘The Interpretation of Dreams’</i></p> <p>Lacan: It’s quite clear, he is asleep—that’s all there is to it. He is asleep so that we should sleep too, that is to say, so that we should understand only what there is to be understood. I wanted to bring in the Jewish tradition, in order to take things up where Freud left them, because after all it is not for nothing that the pen fell from Freud’s hands when he had reached the division of the subject [RK note-probably Freud’s paper “Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defense, 1940e [1938] ], and that just previously he had written, in <i>Moses and Monotheism</i>, one of the most radical critiques of the Jewish tradition.”</p>