

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
<p>symptôme, en tant que, le symtôme, il en donne l'appareil, l'essence, l'abstraction. Car si quelque chose rend compte du fait noté par Clive Hart, qu'à suivre ses pas, on s'en trouve à la fin, fatigué, c'est bien ceci qui prouve que vos symptômes à vous, c'est la seule chose qui chez chacun porte l'intérêt. Le symptôme chez Joyce est un symptôme qui ne vous concerne en rien. C'est le symptôme en tant qu'il n'y a aucune chance qu'il accroche quelque chose de votre inconscient à vous. Je crois que c'est là le sens de ce que me disait la personne qui m'interrogeait sur pourquoi il l'avait publié.</p>		<p>always wanted to be Joyce the symptom – as the - , for he does provide us with all the apparatus, essence, and abstraction of the symptom. Clive Hart says that following in Joyce's footsteps makes you tired, well, if this is true, it also proves that your own symptoms are the only thing worth bothering about. the symptom in Joyce's writing is a symptom that has nothing to do with you. It is the symptom In so far as there is no chance of anything in your unconscious to ever be hooked by it. I think that this is what the person who asked me why Joyce had his text published meant.</p>	<p>symptom, insofar as he gives the symptom its apparatus, its essence, its abstraction. Because if, as Clive Hart notes – one finds that, if one follows in Joyce's footsteps, one is, in the end, tired out – it only proves that your own symptoms are the only ones that carry interest for you. The symptom of Joyce is a symptom that does not concern you at all. It is the symptom insofar as there is no chance it will catch something of your unconscious. I believe that is the meaning of what that person said, who asked me about the reason for Joyce's publication.</p>	<p>convince him that he wanted to be Joyce the Symptom, inasmuch as he offers the apparatus, the essence, and the abstraction of the symptom. If there is one thing that accounts for the fact noted by Clive Hart – that in following him step by step, by the end one finds oneself tired out by it – then it is precisely that this proves how your own symptom, for you like everyone else, is the only thing that holds any interest for you. The symptom in Joyce is a symptom that concerns you in no respect whatsoever. It is the symptom inasmuch as it stands no chance whatsoever of hooking anything of your unconscious. I think this is the meaning behind what was said by the person who asked me about why he published it.</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
...bien que ne jouant que sur le langage*		...though only playing on language.	... though enjoying only the language	...although only playing on language*
<p>Il faudrait continuer ce questionnement de l'œuvre majeure et terminale, de l'œuvre à quoi en somme Joyce a réservé la fonction d'être [165] son escabeau. Car de départ, il a voulu être quelqu'un dont le nom, très précisément le nom, survivrait à jamais. À jamais veut dire qu'il marque une date. On avait jamais fait de littérature comme ça. Et pour, ce mot littérature, en souligner le poids, je dirai l'équivoque sur quoi souvent Joyce joue – <i>letter, litter</i>. La lettre est déchet. Or, s'il n'y avait pas ce type d'orthographe si spéciale qui est celui de la langue anglaise, les trois quarts des effets de <i>Finnegans</i> seraient perdus.</p>		<p>It would be good for you to question further Joyce's major and final work, the work Joyce nominated as [165] his ladder, so to speak. Because from the start, he wanted to be someone whose name, indeed, whose name, would survive forever. Forever means that it marks an anniversary. Never before had such literature been produced. And in order to highlight the import of the word literature I'll invoke the equivocality upon which Joyce often plays – <i>letter, litter</i>. the letter is a refuse. Now, were spelling not so peculiar in the English language, most of the effects in <i>Finnegans Wake</i> would be lost.</p>	<p>We should continue questioning this great and final work, the work which, for Joyce, functioned as [165] a stepping-stool. Because he was leaving, he wanted his name, very precisely his name, to survive forever. Forever means that it marks a date. No one ever made literature like this. And for this word 'literature' - to underline its weight - I would say the equivocation on which Joyce often puns - <i>letter, litter</i>. The letter is a bit of waste. However, were it not for this special sort of orthography of the English language, three quarters of the effect of <i>Finnegans</i> would be lost.</p>	<p>This questioning on the major and ultimate work needs to be continued. It is the work for which Joyce set aside the function of being [165] his <i>escabeau</i>⁶, because from the very start he wanted to be someone whose name – very precisely the name – would endure forever. <i>Forever</i> means that it marks a date. No one had ever made literature like that. And to underscore the weightiness of the word <i>literature</i>, I shall utter the equivocation that Joyce often plays on – <i>letter, litter</i>. The letter is litter. Now, were it not for this very special kind of spelling that is specific to the English language, a good three quarters of the effects of <i>Finnegans Wake</i> would be lost.</p> <p>⁶TN An <i>escabeau</i> is a low stepladder or footstool used as an individual platform or to facilitate individual access</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
				to a higher place. In the written version of Joyce le Symptôme, Lacan plays on <i>escabeau</i> and 'S.K. beau', thus foregrounding the letter and the notion of the beautiful. See 'A note threaded stitch by stitch. § 5.
Le plus extrême, je peux vous le dire – le devant d'ailleurs à Jacques Aubert – Who ails, après ça tongue, écrit comme langue en anglais, tongue, un mot ensuite, énigmatique, <i>coddeau</i> – [3] « <i>Who ails tongue coddeau a space of dumbillsilly?</i> » Si j'avais rencontré cet écrit, aurais-je ou non perçu – « Où est ton cadeau, espèce d'imbécile ? »		The most extreme example – I own it to Jacques Aubert, by the way, is perhaps Who ails, after tongue – as language, tongue, followed by the enigmatic word <i>coddeau</i> – “Who ails tongue <i>coddeau</i> aspace of dumbillsilly?” Had I encountered this écrit, I wonder if I would have perceived “Où est ton cadeau, espèce d'imbécile?” (Where is your present, you silly you?)	The most extreme one, I can tell you, care of Jacques Aubert: ‘Who ails tongue <i>coddeau</i> a space of dumbillsilly?’. If I had encountered this text in writing, would I or not perceive: ‘Où est ton cadeau, espèce d'imbécile?’ [where is your gift, you imbecile?]	The most extreme case, I can tell you, and I owe this to Jacques Aubert, is – <i>Who ails tongue coddeau, aspace of dumbillsilly?</i> If I had come across this piece of writing, would I have perceived or not – <i>Où est ton cadeau, espèce d'imbecile?</i> Where's your present, you imbecile?
L'inouï, c'est que cette homophonie en l'occasion translinguistique ne se supporte que d'une lettre conforme à l'orthographe de la langue anglaise. Vous ne sauriez pas que Who		What is amazing is that the translinguistic homophony is based on one single letter consonant with English spelling. You wouldn't know that Who can	The amazing thing is that this trans-linguistic homophony is supported by only one letter in conformity with the English language. You would not know that who	What is unprecedented in this is that the homophony, trans-linguistic homophony on this occasion, is sustained only by letters that conform to English-

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
<p>peut se transformer en où si vous ne saviez que Who au sens interrogatif se prononce ainsi. Il y a je ne sais quoi d'ambigu dans cet usage phonétique, que j'écrirais aussi bien <i>f.a.u.n.e.</i> Le faunesque de la chose repose tout entier sur la lettre, à savoir sur quelque chose qui n'est pas essentiel à la langue, qui est quelque chose de tressé par les accidents de l'histoire. Que quelqu'un en fasse un usage prodigieux, interroge en soi ce qu'il en est du langage.</p>		<p>become où if you didn't know that such is the pronunciation of Who in a question. There is something ambiguous in this phonetic usage that I feel like writing <i>f.a.u.n.e.</i> The faun-like aspect of the thing relies entirely on the letter, that is on something which is not essential to language, something which is woven by the accidents of history. That someone should use this prodigiously, is an examination of what language is about from within.</p>	<p>can change into où if you did not know that who in the interrogative sense is pronounced that way. There is a sort of ambiguity in this phonetic usage, which I would write <i>f.a.u.n.e</i> ['phon'-etic]. The faunesque of the thing rests entirely on the letter, that is, on something that is inessential to language, something woven by the accidents of history. That somebody makes an extraordinary use of the letter questions how much it has to do with language.</p>	<p>language spelling. You wouldn't know that <i>who</i> can transform into <i>où</i> if you didn't know that who is pronounced that way in the interrogative. There is some kind of ambiguity in this phonetic usage, which I would also spell <i>f.a.u.n.</i> The faunesque aspect of the thing leans squarely upon the letter, namely upon something that is not essential to a tongue, a tongue being something woven by the accidents of history. That someone should make such prodigious use of this enquires, in and of itself, into the very nature of language.</p>
<p>J'ai dit que l'inconscient est structuré comme un langage. Il est étrange que je puisse dire aussi <i>désabonné de l'inconscient</i> quelqu'un qui ne joue strictement que sur le langage – quoiqu'il se serve de la langue entre autres qui est, non pas la</p>		<p>I said that the unconscious is structured like a language. It is odd that I should say "unsubscribe to the unconscious" of someone who plays strictly upon language – although he uses a language which is not his own – for his own</p>	<p>I said that the unconscious is structured like a language. It is strange that I can also say 'unsubscribed from the unconscious' of someone who plays only with language – even if he uses a language which is not his own – precisely because</p>	<p>I have said that the unconscious is structured like a language. It is odd that I am also able to speak in terms of a <i>cancellation of subscription to the unconscious</i> for someone who plays strictly on language, though he did</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
<p>sienne – car la sienne est justement une langue effacée de la carte, à savoir le gaélique, dont il savait quelques petits bouts, assez pour s’orienter, mais pas beaucoup plus – non pas la sienne donc, mais celle des envahisseurs, des oppresseurs. Joyce a dit qu’en Irlande on avait un maître et une maîtresse, le maître étant l’Empire britannique, et la maîtresse la Sainte Église catholique, apostolique et romaine, les deux étant du même genre de fléau. C’est bien ce qui se constate dans ce qui fait de Joyce le symptôme, le symptôme pur de ce qu’il en est du rapport au langage, en tant qu’on le réduit au symptôme – à savoir, à ce qu’il a pour effet, quand cet effet on ne l’analyse pas – je dirai plus, qu’on s’interdit de jouer d’aucune des équivoques qui émouvrait</p>		<p>language is in point of fact one that has been wiped off the map, i.e., gaelic, which he only knew tiny bits of, just enough to find his way around, but not a lot more, - not his own, then, but the invader’s, the oppressor’s language. Joyce said somewhere that in Ireland one knows one master and one mistress, the master being the imperial British state, and the mistress the Holy Roman catholic and apostolic church; both derive from the same kind of scourge. This is exactly what is noticeable in what turns Joyce into the symptom, the pure symptom of what makes his relation with language when reduced to the symptom – that is to the effect it has when the effect isn’t being analyzed – I’d go as far as saying that one forbids oneself to play on any equivocality that is likely to move</p>	<p>his is an effaced language, to wit Gaelic, of which he knew a few small bits, enough to orient himself, but not much more – a language that is not his own but that of the invaders, the oppressors. Joyce said that Ireland has a master and a mistress, the master being the British Empire and the mistress the Catholic Church – apostolic and Roman – both being the same sort of plague. That is what makes itself heard, in what makes Joyce the symptom, the pure symptom of the relation to language, insofar as one reduces it to a symptom – reduces it to that which it has for an effect, when one does not analyze that effect – I would say more, that one is forbidden from playing with any of the equivocations that would move one’s own unconscious. [166]</p>	<p>use one particular tongue among others, one that is not his own – for his own is precisely a tongue that had been wiped off the map, to wit, Gaelic, of which he had a smattering, enough to get by, but hardly much more – not his own, then, but the tongue of the invaders, the oppressors. Joyce said that in Ireland they had one master and one mistress, the former being the imperial British state and the latter the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church, each as baneful as the other. This is precisely what can be seen in what makes of Joyce the Symptom, the pure symptom of what is involved in the relationship to language, in so far as this is reduced to the symptom – namely, to what it produces by way of effect, when one does not analyse this effect – I shall say, furthermore, in</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
l'inconscient chez quiconque. [166]		anyone's unconscious. [166]		so far as one forbids oneself from playing on any of those equivocations that would stir anybody else's unconscious. [166]
<i>La jouissance, non l'inconscient</i>		Jouissance, not the unconscious	Jouissance, not the unconscious	<i>Jouissance, not the unconscious</i>
Si le lecteur est fasciné, c'est de ceci que, conformément à ce nom qui fait écho à celui de Freud, après tout, Joyce a un rapport à (5)joy, la jouissance, s'il est écrit dans lalangue qui est l'anglaise – que cette jouasse, cette jouissance est la seule chose que de son texte nous puissions attraper. Là est le symptôme.		What fascinates the reader is that in accordance with the name that echoes Freud's – after all Joyce has a certain affinity with joy, jouissance, when written in the English language – the joy at play, this jouissance, is the only thing in the text that can be caught. Here is the symptom..	If the reader is fascinated, in accordance with a name that echoes Freud's own (Freude = joy), it is because Joyce has a relation to joy, to jouissance, if he is written in the English lalangue. This joy'ed, this jouissance is the only thing we can catch of his text. There is the symptom,	If the reader is fascinated, then it is on account of the fact that, in keeping with this name that echoes the name of Freud – after all, Joyce bears some relation to joy, jouissance when written in lalingua that is English – that this <i>jouasse</i> , this jouissance, is the sole thing in his text on which we can get a purchase. There lies the symptom.
Le symptôme en tant que rien ne le rattache à ce qui fait lalangue elle-même dont il supporte cette trame, ces stries, ce tressage de terre et d'air dont il ouvre <i>Chamber Music</i> , son premier livre publié, livre de poèmes. Le symptôme est purement		The symptom as detached from anything in the weft of language which it actually supports, the ridges and ripples, the intervening of earth and air at the opening of <i>Chamber Music</i> , his first published book, a book of poems. The symptom is	the symptom insofar as nothing ties it to what makes lalangue, for which the symptom acts as this screen, these scratches, this braiding of ground and air with which Joyce opens <i>Chamber Music</i> , his first published book, a book of poems. The	The symptom, in so far as nothing ties it to what makes for lalingua itself, by which this weft is sustained, these stria, these <i>strings in the earth and air</i> with which he opens <i>Chamber Music</i> , his first published book, a chapbook of poems, the

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
ce que conditionne la langue, mais d'une certaine façon, Joyce le porte à la puissance du langage, sans que pour autant rien n'en soit analysable		purely what conditions language, but in a way, Joyce raises it to the status of language, which nonetheless precludes any analysis	symptom is, purely, that which conditions language, but in a certain way, Joyce takes the symptom to the very power of language - without making any of it analysable.	symptom is purely what is conditioned by language, but in a certain fashion Joyce lifts the symptom to the power of language, without for all that any of it being analysable.
C'est ce qui frappe, et littéralement interdit – au sens où l'on dit – je reste interdit.		of the symptom. This is what strikes and disconcerts the reader	It is what strikes and literally forbids [interdit],	This is what strikes you, and literally renders you <i>interdit</i> ,
Qu'on emploie le mot <i>interdire</i> pour dire <i>stupéfaire</i> a toute sa portée. C'est là ce qui fait la substance de ce que Joyce apporte, et par quoi d'une certaine façon, la littérature ne peut plus être après lui ce qu'elle était avant.		The fact of using the word disconcert (interdire in French: literally "inter-say", though meaning either to prohibit or to amaze) in order to say amaze is of particular import. This is what gives substance to Joyce's contribution whilst depriving literature of its former status thereafter.	in the sense that one says, I am dumbfounded [je reste interdit] - one uses this word forbidden to say dumbfounded in all its range.- one uses this word forbidden to say dumbfounded in all its range. That is the substance of what Joyce does, and due to which, in some sense, literature can no longer be what it was before.	in the sense that means <i>I was rendered speechless</i> . *That one uses the word <i>interdire</i> to say <i>stupefy</i> is something that holds great import. This is what makes for the substance of what Joyce brings along, whereby in a certain way literature after him can no longer be what it was before.
Ce n'est pas pour rien que <i>Ulysse</i> aspire, aspire un quelque chose d'homérique, bien qu'il n'y ait pas le moindre rapport, quoique Joyce ait lancé les commentateurs sur ce		Not for nothing has Ulysses something homeric about it, though there isn't the least resemblance, despite the fact that Joyce put some commentateurs on the	It is not for nothing that Ulysses aspires, aspires to something Homeric, although there is not the least relation: Joyce led the commentators in this direction - between what	It is no accident that <i>Ulysses</i> aspires, that it draws in a Homeric something or other, even though there isn't the faintest relationship between what happens in

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
<p>terrain, entre ce qui se passe dans <i>Ulysse</i> et ce qu'il en est de <i>L'Odyssée</i>. Assimiler Stephen Dedalus à Télémaque... On se casse la tête à porter le faisceau du commentaire sur <i>L'Odyssée</i>. Et comment dire que Bloom soit en quoi que ce soit, pour Stephen, qui n'a rien à faire avec lui, sauf de le croiser de temps en temps dans Dublin, son père ? – Si ce n'est que déjà Joyce pointe, et se trouve dénoter que toute la réalité psychique, c'est-à-dire le symptôme, dépende, au dernier terme, d'une structure où le Nom-du-Père est un élément inconditionné.</p>		<p>homerick track, between what happens in Ulysses on the one hand and The Odyssey on the other. Just imagine identifying Stephen Dedalus with Telemachus. . . One racks one's brains with commentaries about The Odyssey. And how does one reach the conclusion that Bloom, who has nothing to do with Stephen whatsoever apart from bumping into him from time to time in Dublin, is in fact his father? If not by taking Joyce's hint that all psychical reality, i.e., the symptom, ultimately depends on a structure where the Name-of-the-Father is an unconditional constituent.</p>	<p>happens in Ulysses and what happens in the Odyssey. To compare Dedalus to Telemachus, one would break one's back carrying the stack of commentaries on the Odyssey. And how to say that Bloom would be for Stephen, who does not have anything to do with him, except to cross him from time to time in Dublin, his father? It is only that Joyce already points out, and so indicates, that all psychic reality – that is, the symptom itself – depends in the end on a structure in which the Name-of-the-Father is an unconditional element.</p>	<p><i>Ulysses</i> and what is involved in <i>The Odyssey</i>. Joyce did send some commentators down that path, though, assimilating Telemachus into Stephen Dedalus. People fret over carrying the torch of the commentary on <i>The Odyssey</i>. Moreover, how can it be said that Bloom is in any respect a father for Stephen, who has nothing to do with him save bumping into him now and then in Dublin? Except that Joyce is indicating, and finds himself denoting, how psychic reality as a whole, which means the symptom, depends in the final analysis on a structure in which the Name-of-the-Father is a non-conditioned element.</p>
Le Père borroméen*		The borromean Father	The borromean father	The borromean father*
Le père comme nom et comme celui qui nomme, ce n'est pas pareil. Le père est cet élément quart –		The father as name or as the one who names are two different things. The father is this fourth	The father – as a name and he who names – is not the same thing. The father is that fourth element – I	The father as a name is not the same thing as the father as he who names. The father is this fourth

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
<p>j'évoque là quelque chose dont seulement une partie de mes auditeurs peuvent avoir le délibéré – cet élément quart sans lequel rien n'est possible dans le nœud du symbolique, de l'imaginaire et du réel.</p>		<p>element. (element quart) – I'm referring to something quite specific which I expect only a few of you to be aware of – the quarter component without which nothing is possible in the knot of symbolic, imaginary and real.</p>	<p>evoke something which only some of my audience can have considered – that fourth element without which nothing is possible in the knot of the symbolic, imaginary and real.</p>	<p>element – here I'm evoking something whose deliberation only a part of my audience may have access to – without which nothing is possible in the knot of the symbolic, the imaginary and the real.</p>
<p>Mais il y a une autre façon de l'appeler, et c'est là que je coiffe aujourd'hui ce qu'il en est du Nom-du-Père au degré où Joyce en témoigne – de ce qu'il convient d'appeler le sinthome. [167]</p>		<p>But there is another name for it. I therefore redefine the Name-of-the-Father at the level of the evidence found in Joyce, notably, what should be called the sinthom. [167]</p>	<p>But there is another way to name it, and that is where I will stop today, in order to show you what all this has to do with the Name-of-the-Father to which Joyce testifies, what we can call the sinthome. [167]</p>	<p>There is, however, another term for this. This is where today I'm going to crown what is involved in the Name-of-the-Father, at the very degree to which Joyce bears it out, with what it would be most suitable to call <i>the sinthome</i>. [167]</p>
<p>C'est en tant que l'inconscient se noue au sinthome, qui est ce qu'il y a de singulier chez chaque individu, qu'on peut dire que Joyce, comme il est écrit quelque part, s'identifie à l'<i>individual</i>. Il est celui qui se privilégie d'avoir été au point extrême pour incarner en</p>		<p>Thus it can only be said, as is written somewhere, that Joyce identifies with the individual in so far as the unconscious becomes entwined with the sinthome, which is inherently specific to each individual. He is the privileged one who experienced the point of</p>	<p>It is insofar as the unconscious knots itself into a sinthome, which is what there is singularly in each individual, that one can say that Joyce, as it is written somewhere, identifies with the individual. He has made himself privileged enough to have, at the extreme</p>	<p>It is in so far as the unconscious is knotted to the sinthome, which is that which is singular to each individual, that we may say that Joyce, as has been written somewhere, identifies with the individual. He is one who has earned the privilege of having reached the</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
<p>lui le symptôme, ce par quoi il échappe à toute mort possible, de s'être réduit à une structure qui est celle même de lom, si vous me permettez de l'écrire tout simplement d'un <i>l.o.m.</i></p>		<p>no return and who incarnated the symptom that made him immune to death, for he thereby reduced himself to the very structure of theman (lom), which I'd rather write m.a.n (l.o.m.)</p>	<p>point, incarnated in himself the symptom, that by which he escapes any possible death, by reducing himself to a structure that is precisely that of LOM [l'homme, man], if you will permit me to write it quite simply as l.o.m.</p>	<p>extreme point of embodying the symptom in himself, by which he eludes any possible death, on account of being reduced to a structure that is the very structure of LOM, if you will allow me to spell it quite simply L.O.M.⁷ ⁷ TN LOM is homophonic with l'homme ('the man' or 'mankind').</p>
<p>C'est ainsi qu'il se véhicule, comme quelque chose qui met un point final à un certain nombre d'exercices. Il met un terme. Mais comment entendre le sens de ce « terme » ?</p>		<p>And so Joyce circulates as something that puts a period after a series of exercises with a period. He puts a period. But how should this "period" be heard and understood?</p>	<p>Thus he carries himself, like something that puts a final point to a certain number of exercises. He puts a limit. But how should one hear the meaning of this limit?</p>	<p>This is how he conveys himself, as something that puts a full stop to a certain number of exercises. He sets down an end point, but how are we to understand the meaning of this end point?</p>
<p>Il est frappant que Clive Hart mette l'accent sur le cyclique et sur la croix comme étant substantiellement ce à quoi Joyce se rattache. Certains d'entre vous savent qu'avec ce cercle et cette croix, je dessine le nœud borroméen. Interroger Joyce sur ceci,</p>		<p>It is striking that Clive Hart should put so much emphasis on the cyclical and the cross as fundamental to an understanding of Joyce. Some might recall that my own borromean knot is made up of a circle and a cross too. Just imagine asking Joyce what the</p>	<p>It is striking that Clive Hart emphasizes the cyclic and the cross as that to which Joyce substantially attaches himself. Some among you know that with this circle and cross, I draw the borromean knot. To interrogate Joyce on this, what this knot produces, namely the ambiguity of</p>	<p>It is striking that Clive Hart should lay the emphasis on the cyclical aspect and on the cross as being what Joyce substantially attaches himself to. Some of you know that with this circle and this cross I have been tracing out the Borromean knot. Examining Joyce at the</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
<p>que ce nœud produit, à savoir l’ambiguïté du 3 et du 4, à savoir ce à quoi il restait collé, attaché, à l’interrogation de Vico, à des choses pires, à la conversation avec les esprits, qu’Atherton range d’ailleurs sous le titre général de <i>spiritualism</i>, ce qui m’étonne, car j’avais appelé ça jusqu’à présent spiritisme. Il est assurément surprenant de voir qu’à l’occasion, cela contribue dans <i>Finnegans</i> au titre du symptom.</p>		<p>borrowed knot produces, that is, the ambiguity of 3 and 4, that is that which he was stuck to: Vico’s questioning, and worse, the habit of chatting with spirits – what Atherton roughly labels spiritualism, which I find surprising, as I would have said spiritism. It is utterly amazing that this should occasionally contribute to what amounts to the symptom in <i>Finnegans Wake</i> – I think.</p>	<p>three and four, namely that to which he remains stuck: to the interrogation of Vico, to worse things, to conversations with spirits, what Atherton throws together under the general title of spiritualism, which surprises me, since I had called it spiritism. It is certainly surprising to see that, this time, it contributes in <i>Finnegans</i> to the title of the symptom, I believe.</p>	<p>level of the product of this knot, namely the ambiguity between 3 and 4, namely that to which he remains stuck, attached, to examining Vico, and things that are worse still, to conversing with spirits – moreover, Atherton files all that under the general heading of spiritualism, which rather surprised me, because thus far I’ve been calling that Spiritism – it is most certainly surprising to see that, on occasion, this is a contributing factor in <i>Finnegans Wake</i> in the guise of the symptom.</p>
<p>Ce n’est pas tout, car il est difficile de ne pas tenir compte de cette fiction qu’on peut mettre sous la rubrique de l’initiation. En quoi consiste ce qui se véhicule sous ce registre et sous ce terme ? Combien d’associations qui se font arme de drapeaux dont ils ne comprennent pas le sens ? Que Joyce se soit délecté à <i>Isis Unveiled</i> de</p>		<p>And that’s not all, for it would be hard not to take into account the fiction that could be pigeonholed as initiation. What passes as the stuff of this register as well as the term for it? How many associations are there under meaningless labels? I was bowled over when Atherton told me that Joyce had a great time</p>	<p>That’s not all, because it is difficult not to take account of this fiction: one can put it under the rubric of initiation. In what does that which carries itself under this register and under this limit consist? How many associations arm themselves with flags whose meanings they do not understand? That Joyce delighted in the Isis</p>	<p>This is not all, for it is hard not to take into account the fiction that may be placed under the heading of initiation. What is the make-up of all that is conveyed in this register and under this term? How many associations arm themselves with banners whose meaning they do not comprehend? That Joyce delighted in</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
<p>Mme Blavatski est une chose que j'apprends d'Atherton, et qui me sidère. La forme de débilité mentale que comporte toute initiation est ce qui, moi, me saisit d'abord, et me la fait peut-être sous-estimer.</p>		<p>reading Mme Blavatski's <i>Isis Unveiled</i>. The kind of mental retardation involved in any process of initiation is what gets me, and that's probably why I underestimate the book so much.</p>	<p>Unveiled of Mrs Blavatski is something I learned from Atherton, which strikes me. The form of mental debility that any initiation entails is something that I perhaps underestimate.</p>	<p>Madame Blavatsky's <i>Isis Unveiled</i> is something I learnt from Atherton and which I found quite staggering. The form of feeble-mindedness that all initiation entails is what hits me at first, and perhaps leads me to underestimate it</p>
<p>Il faut dire que, peu après le temps où j'avais fait, grâce au ciel, la rencontre de Joyce, j'allais trouver un nommé René Guénon qui ne valait pas plus cher que ce qu'il y a de pire en fait d'initiation. <i>Hi han a pas</i>, à écrire comme celui de l'âne à quoi Joyce fait allusion comme au point central de ces quatre termes qui sont le Nord, le Sud, l'Est et l'Ouest, comme au point de croisée de la croix – c'est un âne qui le supporte, Dieu sait que Joyce en fait état dans <i>Finnegans</i>.</p>		<p>I must say that, shortly after my brief encounter with Joyce I was to meet a certain René Guénon who was worth his weight in gold when it comes to the worst kind of initiation possible. Hee haw a pas, spelled like the transcript of the donkey's utterance Joyce refers to at the centre of those four terms called north, south, east, and west, as well as at the intersection of the cross – supported by a donkey, God knows that Joyce hammers it in in <i>Finnegans</i>.</p>	<p>It has to be said that shortly after the time when, thank heavens, I met Joyce, I was to come across a certain René Guénon, who was worth no more than the worst of initiation. Hi han a pas, to be written like the hee-haw of the jackass to which Joyce alludes as the central point of the four terms North, South, East and West, as the intersection of the cross – borne by a jackass, goodness knows Joyce makes enough of this in <i>Finnegans Wake</i></p>	<p>It should be said that, shortly after I had, thank heavens, met Joyce, I was going to find a certain Rene Guenon, who was not worth more than the worst initiation. '<i>Hi han a pas</i>' [il y en a pas: there's none], to write like the hee-haw of the jackass to which Joyce alludes as the central point of the four terms: North, South, East and West, as the intersection of the cross – borne by a jackass, goodness knows Joyce makes enough of this in <i>Finnegans Wake</i>.⁸ ⁸TN <i>Hi han a pas</i> is homophonic with <i>Y'en a pas</i>, the contracted form of <i>Il n'y en a pas</i> ('there isn't any' or</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
				'there are none'). Here, in our translation, 'he-haw' designates both the donkey's bray and, in keeping with Central Scottish vernacular, 'nothing' or 'next to nothing'.
<p>Mais quand même <i>Finnegans</i>, ce rêve, comment le dire fini, puisque déjà son dernier mot ne peut se rejoindre qu'au premier, le <i>the</i> sur lequel [168] il se termine se raccolant au <i>riverrun</i> dont il se débute, ce qui indique le circulaire ? Pour tout dire, comment Joyce a-t-il pu manquer à ce point ce qu'actuellement j'introduis du nœud ?</p>		<p>However, how could the dream, <i>Finnegans</i> be over, since the last word links to no other than the first, the "the" of the [168] end connecting back to its very origin <i>riverrun</i>, which suggests circularity? To be blunt, how could Joyce miss what I'm introducing as inherent in the knot?</p>	<p>But nevertheless, <i>Finnegans</i>, this dream, how can one call it finished, since already its last word cannot but rejoin to its first, the 'the' on which it [168] ends connects to the 'riverrun' with which it begins – which indicates that it is circular? All this is to say, how was Joyce able to miss this point, which I currently introduce, of the knot?</p>	<p>Even so, how can <i>Finnegans</i>, this dream, be said to be finished, since already its last word cannot help but join back up with the first, the the by which it [168] ends soliciting the <i>riverrun</i> by which it starts, which indicates circularity? To spell it right out, how did Joyce manage to miss, right here, what I am at present introducing by way of the knot?</p>
<p>Ce faisant j'introduis quelque chose de nouveau, qui rend compte non seulement de la limitation du symptôme, mais de ce qui fait que c'est de se nouer au corps, c'est-à-dire à l'imaginaire, de se nouer aussi au réel, et comme tiers à l'inconscient, que le symptôme a ses limites.</p>		<p>Thus I'm introducing something which explains not only the limitation of the symptom, but also the limits of the symptom. The symptom is entwined with the body, i.e., the imaginary, with the real too, and as third element, with the unconscious. This intertwining determines its limits. Thus it is</p>	<p>By doing this I introduce something new, which gives an account not only of the limitation of the symptom, but also of that which knots itself to a body, so to speak, to the imaginary, which knots itself as well to the real, and like a third to the unconscious – the symptom has its limits. It is</p>	<p>In so doing, I am introducing something new which accounts not only for the limitation of the symptom but also for what means that it is by tying itself to the body, i.e. the imaginary, and by thus tying itself to the real, and to the unconscious as a third term, that the symptom takes on its</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
C'est parce qu'il rencontre ses limites qu'on peut parler du nœud.		because the symptom encounters its own limits that there is what can be called a knot,	because it meets its limits that one can speak of the knot,	limits. It is because it meets its limits that one can speak in terms of the knot.
Le nœud est assurément quelque chose qui se chiffonne, qui peut prendre la forme d'un peloton, mais qui, une fois déplié, garde sa forme – sa forme de nœud – et du même coup son existence.		which is something that indeed can get all crumpled or bundled, but once unfolded it does keep its shape – the shape of a knot, which also means its ex-sistence.	which is something that undoubtedly crumples, that can be rolled into a ball, but that once unfolded, keeps its form, the form of the knot, and at the same time, the form of its ex-sistence.	The knot is certainly something that can be scrunched up, that can be rolled up into a ball of twine, but which, once unravelled, maintains its knot shape, and by the same token its ex-sistence.
C'est ce que je me permettrai d'introduire dans mon cheminement de l'année prochaine, en prenant appui sur Joyce, entre autres. [169]		This is what I intend to introduce next year, taking Joyce, among others, as reference point. [169]	This is what I will allow myself to introduce in my path of next year, by taking Joyce, among others, as my support. [169]	This is what I am going to permit myself to introduce into my development for the coming year, by leaning, amongst others, on Joyce.
				Glossary of neologisms [page and paragraph in Seuil edition noted in square brackets] purstiche. For poursticher [161, 3]. Combination of poursuivre ('pursue') and pastiche. protspers. For pourspère [161, 4]. Combination of pourriture ('rot') and prospère ('prosper'). In the Seuil edition, line-end hyphenation has been

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
				<p>introduced, accentuating (perhaps deliberately) the final syllable père ('father'). drearly broadshit. For la journiture [161, 4]. Combination of journal ('daily newspaper') and pourriture ('rot'). Rhymes with nourriture. ptom. For ptôme [161, 5]. The Latinized suffix of symptôme, from the Greek πιπτω ('fall'). bol. For bole [161, 5]. The Latinized suffix of symbole, from the Greek βαλλω ('throw'). the pot-pourrotten. For le tout-pourri [161, 5]. Rhymes loosely with potpourri. a dogsbody's life. For bonneriche [161, 5]. Contraction of bonne et riche ('hearty and wealthy'). Rhymes loosely with boniche ('skivvy'). eturnity. For étournité [161, 5]. Introduces tour ('turn', or 'round') into éternité. p'titom. [161, 6]. Combination of ptôm and petit homme ('little man'). symptraumatizes. For symptraumatise [162, 3]. Combination of symptôme and traumatise ('traumatize'). lalingua. For lalangue</p>

Jacques Lacan		Dominique Hecq translation	Aaron Benanav translation	Adrian R. Price translation
				<p>[167, 1-2]. Contraction of la langue ('the tongue' or 'the language'). Reminiscent of 'lallation' (as Lacan himself remarks; cf. (1989) 'Geneva lecture on the symptom', Analysis 1:14). LOM.</p> <p>[168, 1]. Homophonic with l'homme ('the man' or 'mankind'). Hi han a pas.</p> <p>[168, 5]. Homophonic with Y'en a pas, the contracted form of Il n'y en a pas ('there isn't any' or 'there are none'). Here, in our translation, 'hee-haw' designates both the donkey's bray and, in keeping with Central Scottish vernacular, 'nothing' or 'next to nothing'.</p> <p>[169]</p>