

## RADIOPHONIE

Lacan read the first four questions and his provisional or tentative answers to Robert Georjin, who will later interview him on Belgian radio, in his Seminar XVII on Thursday, April 9, 1970, the date which the official version of his seminar has assigned it. Staferla, École lacannienne, Version Monique Chollet, Valas etc. give the date of this seminar meeting as Wednesday, April 8, 1970.

The interview with Robert Georjin was recorded on June 1, 1970 and broadcast in Belgium on R.T.B. on June 5, 10, 19 and 26, 1970 (the first 4 questions and responses). Later, presumably in the following weeks, the remaining 3 questions and responses were broadcast in France on O.R.T.F. The journal, *Scilicet 2/3*, published the entire Radiophonie interview in September 1970, pages 55-99. *Autres écrits* republished it in 2001, pages 403-447. There are differences in his responses to the first 4 questions which he read in his Seminar XVII and in the published version in *Scilicet 2/3* and *Autres écrits*.

The questions addressed to Lacan were the following:

**QUESTION I :** In the *Écrits*, you affirm that Freud anticipates, without being aware of it, the researches of Saussure and the Prague Circle. Can you explain yourself on this point?

**QUESTION II :** Linguistics, psychoanalysis, and ethnology have in common the notion of structure; beginning with this notion, can one not imagine the statement (*énoncé*) of a common field that will one day reunite psychoanalysis, ethnology, and linguistics?

**QUESTION III :** Would not one of the possible articulations between psychoanalysis and linguistics be the privilege accorded to metaphor and to metonymy, by Jakobson on the linguistic plane, and by you on the psychoanalytic plane?

**QUESTION IV :** You say that the discovery of the unconscious led to a second Copernican revolution. How is the unconscious a key notion that subverts every theory of knowledge (*connaissance*)?

**QUESTION V :** What are its consequences on the plane: a) of science, b) of philosophy, c) more particularly, of Marxism, even of Communism?

**QUESTION VI :** How are *savoir* and truth incompatible?

**QUESTION VII :** To govern, to educate, to psychoanalyse are three wagers impossible to make. However, the psychoanalyst must indeed hook onto this perpetual contestation of every discourse, and notably his own. He hooks onto a *savoir*--analytic *savoir*--the one which by definition he contests.

How do you resolve--or not--this contradiction? Status of the impossible? The impossible is the real

**My apologies for the extended notes—Richard G. Klein, December 2018, New York City.**

<b>Radiophonie</b>	<b>Radiophonie</b>	<b>Radiophonie</b>
<p>In Scilicet 2/3, Paris, Seuil, 1970, pp. 55-99. The page numbers in brackets refer to the page numbers at the bottom of the page in the Scilicet 2/3 volume.</p> <p>QUESTION I : <i>Dans les Écrits, vous affirmez que Freud anticipe, sans s'en rendre compte, les recherches de Saussure et celles du Cercle de Prague. Pouvez-vous vous expliquer sur ce point?</i></p>	<p>Anthony Chadwick Translation</p> <p>Question I : In the Écrits you affirm that Freud anticipates, without realizing it, the research of Saussure and the Prague Circle. Can you explain yourself on this point?</p>	<p>Jack W, Stone Translation</p> <p>QUESTION I : In the Écrits, you affirm that Freud anticipates, without being aware of it, the researches of Saussure and the Prague Circle<sup>rgk1</sup>. Can you explain yourself on this point?</p> <p>Rgk1 The 'Prague Circle' is not mentioned even once in the entire Écrits, but is perhaps alluded to on p.799 (In Subversion du sujet et dialectique du désir; Écrits (fr.), p.799. "I cannot trace here, but of which the names Ferdinand Saussure and Roman Jakobson stand for its dawn and its present-day culmination, not forgetting that the pilot silence of structuralism in the West has its roots in Russia, where formalism first flourished. Geneva 1910 and Petrograd 1920 suffice to explain why Freud did not have this particular instrument at his disposal." It was the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (the OPOJAZ group) of prominent linguists and literary critics in Petrograd founded in 1916 or October 1917 by Roman Jakobson that Lacan is referring to. In 1915, Roman Jakobson and others founded the Moscow Linguistic Circle. It</p>

appears that it was the merging of these two groups that founded the Prague Circle. Roman Jakobson moved from Moscow to Prague in 1920 to continue his doctoral studies. It was that year that Jakobson read Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics* for the first time. There he met Vilem Mathesius and other Czech and Russian linguists, including his colleague, Nikolai Trubetzkoy. Also among them was Sergei Kartsevsky, a professor of Russian at Geneva University along with Roman Jakobson who introduced the work of the influential Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure to Prague. These linguists were soon joined by others including Jan Mukarovsky. They decided to establish a discussion group and, on Tuesday, October 26, 1926, following a lecture by Henrik Becker entitled *Der europaische Sprachgeist*, the Prague Linguistic Circle held its first official meeting. (Doubravová 1999 and Roudinesco 1993).

<p>RÉPONSE : Votre réponse me surprend d'emporter une pertinence qui tranche sur les prétentions à l' « entretien » que j'ai à écarter. C'est même une pertinence redoublée, -- à deux degrés plutôt. Vous me prouvez avoir lu mes <i>Écrits</i>, ce qu'apparemment on ne tient pas pour nécessaire à obtenir de m'entendre. Vous y choisissez une remarque qui implique l'existence d'un autre mode d'information que la médiation de masse : que Freud anticipe Saussure, n'implique pas qu'un bruit en ait fait prendre conscience à l'un non plus qu'à l'autre.</p>	<p>RESPONSE : Your response [sic] surprises me by winning first prize in pertinence which cuts across the claims concerning the "interview" that I have to set aside. It is even a redoubled pertinence -- or rather to two degrees. You prove to me that you have read my <i>Écrits</i>, which apparently is not deemed necessary to get to understand me. You choose from there a remark which implies the existence of a mode of information other than mass mediation: that Freud anticipates Saussure does not imply that a rumour made one take more notice of it than the other.</p>	<p>ANSWER : Your question surprises me by conveying a pertinence that cuts into the pretentions to an "interview" that I have to put aside. It is even a redoubled pertinence--at two degrees, rather. You prove to me that you have read my <i>Écrits</i>, which apparently is not held for necessary to obtain an understanding of me. You choose a remark that implies the existence of another mode of information than the mediation of a mass: that Freud anticipates Saussure does not imply either of them had ever heard of each other<sup>rgk</sup> (<i>qu'un bruit en ait fait prendre conscience à l'un non plus qu'à l'autre</i>).</p> <p>rgk: Strangely enough, Freud analyzed Ferdinand Saussure's son, Raymond de Saussure in 1920 for five months. He was one of the founding members of the Paris Psychoanalytic Society (SPP)</p>
<p>De sorte qu'à me citer (vous), j'ai répondu déjà à votre citation avant de m'en rendre compte : c'est ce que j'appelle me surprendre.</p>	<p>So that by (your) quoting me, I have already replied to your quotation before I realized it: that's what I call surprising me.</p>	<p>Such that, in citing me (you), I have already responded to your citation before being aware of it: this is what I call surprising me.</p>
<p>Partons du terme d'arrivée. Saussure et le Cercle de Prague produisent une linguistique qui n'a rien de commun avec ce qui avant s'est couvert de ce nom, retrouvât-elle ses clefs entre les mains des stoïciens, -- mais qu'en faisaient-ils?</p>	<p>Let's start from the end term. Saussure and the Prague Circle produce a linguistics which has nothing in common with what before them was covered by that name, even if it found its keys in the hands of the Stoics -- but what did they do with them?</p>	<p>Let us begin with the term we have arrived at. Saussure and the Prague Circle produce a linguistics having nothing in common with what was covered by this name before. Did they rediscover its keys between the hands of the Stoics--but what did they do with it?</p>

<p>La linguistique, avec Saussure et le Cercle de Prague, s'institue d'une coupure qui est la barre posée entre le signifiant et le signifié, pour qu'y prévale la différence dont le signifiant se constitue absolument, mais bien effectivement s'ordonne d'une autonomie qui n'a rien à envier aux effets de cristal : pour le système du phonème par exemple qui en est le premier succès de découverte.</p>	<p>Linguistics, with Saussure and the Prague Circle, is instituted with a cut which is the bar placed between the signifier and the signified, in order that the difference with which the signifier is absolutely constituted be more important, but very effectively is set in order according to an autonomy which leaves nothing to envy in the process of crystallization: in the case of the system of the phoneme for example which is the first success to result from the discovery.</p>	<p>Linguistics, with Saussure and the Prague Circle, was instituted from a cut which is the bar posed between the signifier and the signified, so that the difference from which the signifier is constituted prevails there absolutely, but also orders itself with an autonomy that has nothing to envy in the effects of the crystal: for the system of the phoneme, for example, which is its first successful discovery.</p>
<p>On pense étendre ce succès à tout le réseau du symbolique en [55]</p>	<p>It was thought to extend this success to the whole symbolic network [55]</p>	<p>One thinks to extend this success to the whole network of the symbolic in [55]</p>
<p>1, De ces réponses les quatre premières ont été diffusées par la R.T.B. (3<sup>e</sup> programme) les 5, 10, 19 et 26 juin 1970. Elles ont été reprises par l'O.R.T.F. (France-Culture) le 7 juin 1970. [55]</p>	<p>1. Of these responses the first four were disseminated by R.T.B. (3rd program) June 5, 10, 19 and 26, 1970. The broadcasts were resumed by O.R.T.F. (France-Culture) on June 7, 1970.</p>	<p>1. The first four of these answers were broadcasted by the R.T.B.<sup>rgk1</sup> (3<sup>rd</sup> program) on the 5th, 10th, 19th, and 26th of June 1970. They were re-broadcasted by 'O.R.T.F.<sup>rgk2</sup>(France-Culture) on June 7, 1970. <i>rgk1-RTBF (Radio-Télévision belge de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles) is a public-service broadcasting organization delivering radio and television services to the French-speaking Community of Belgium, in Wallonia and Brussels</i> <i>rgk2-The Office de Radiodiffusion-Télévision</i></p>

		Française (ORTF) was the national agency charged, between 1964 and 1974, with providing public radio and television in France [55]
n'admettant de sens qu'à ce que le réseau en réponde, et de l'incidence d'un effet, oui, -- d'un contenu, non	by admitting into meaning only that which the network could be responsible for, and for the incidence of an effect, yes --for a content, no.	only admitting a sense inasmuch as the network responds to it, and from the incidence of an effect, yes--of a content, no.
C'est la gageure qui se soutient de la coupure inaugurale.	It's the wager which is sustained by the inaugural cut.	This is a wager sustained by the inaugural cut.
Le signifié sera ou ne sera pas scientifiquement pensable, selon que tiendra ou non un champ de signifiant qui, de son matériel même, se distingue d'aucun champ physique par la science obtenue.	The signified will or will not be scientifically thinkable, depending on whether a field of the signifier holds or not, which, through its very material, is distinguished from any physics field obtained by science.	The signified will or will not be scientifically thinkable, depending on whether or not a field of the signifier will hold, which, even in its material, distinguishes itself from no physical field obtained by science.
Ceci implique une exclusion métaphysique, à prendre comme fait de désêtre. Aucune signification ne sera désormais tenue pour aller de soi : qu'il fasse clair quand il fait jour par exemple, où les stoïciens nous ont devancé, mais j'ai déjà interrogé : à quelle fin?	This implies a metaphysical exclusion, to be taken as a fact of unbeing. No signification will be taken henceforth as being self-evident.: that it is light during the day for example, where the Stoics have preceded us, but as I have already asked: to what end?	This implies a metaphysical exclusion, to be taken as a fact of a de-being ( <i>désêtre</i> ). No signification will henceforth be held to go by itself: that it make clear when it comes to light for example, where the Stoics have preceded us, but I have already queried: to what end?

<p>Dussé-je aller à brusquer certaines reprises du mot, je dirai sémiotique toute discipline qui part du signe pris pour objet, mais pour marquer que c'est là ce qui fait obstacle à la saisie comme telle du signifiant.</p>	<p>Were I to go so far as to go against certain recent senses of the word, I would call "semiotic" any discipline which starts with the sign taken as object, but in order to make the point that it is that which creates an obstacle to the seizing as such of the signifier.</p>	<p>If I have had to bandy about certain reprises of the word, I will call semiotic any discipline that starts from the sign taken for an object, but to mark that this is what creates an obstacle to the grasping of the signifier as such.</p>
<p>Le signe suppose le quelqu'un à qui il fait signe de quelque chose. C'est le quelqu'un dont l'ombre occultait l'entrée dans la linguistique.</p>	<p>The sign supposes the someone to whom it makes a sign of something. It's the someone whose shadow darkened the entrance into linguistics.</p>	<p>The sign supposes the someone to whom it makes a sign of something.<sup>rgk</sup> This is the someone whose shadow occulted the entry into linguistics.  rgk: Lacan here is referring to Charles Saunders Peirce who defined the sign. as a triadic relation as "something that stands for something, to someone in some capacity"</p>
<p>Appeler ce quelqu'un comme vous voudrez, ce sera toujours une sottise. Le signe suffit à ce que ce quelqu'un se fasse du langage appropriation, comme d'un simple outil; de l'abstraction voilà le langage support, comme de la discussion moyen, avec tous les progrès de la pensée, que dis-je? de la critique, à la clef.</p>	<p>Call this someone what you like, it will always be a silliness. The sign is enough for someone to appropriate language, as if it were a simple tool; there you have language as a support for abstraction, as a means for discussion, with all the progress in thought, what am I saying?, of criticism, as the key.</p>	<p>Call this someone what you like, this will always be a stupidity. The sign suffices for this someone to make an appropriation of language, as of a simple tool; of the abstraction, there it is, that language supports, as of average discussion, with all the progress of thought, what do I say? of the critique, into the bargain.</p>
<p>Il me faudrait « anticiper » (repreant le sens du mot de moi à moi) sur ce que je compte introduire sous la graphie de l'achose, l, apostrophe, a, c, h, o etc pour fair sentir en quel effet prend position la linguistique.</p>	<p>I should have to "anticipate" (taking up again my sense of the word) what I count on introducing under the writing of the a-thing ([in French] l, apostrophe, a, c, h, o etc) to make you feel in what effect linguistics takes up its position.</p>	<p>I must "anticipate" myself (taking up again the sense of the word from me and for me) on what I count on introducing in the written form of <i>l'achose</i> [the athing] , l, apostrophe, a, c, h, etc. to make felt in what effect linguistics takes position.</p>

<p>Ce ne sera pas un progrès : une régression plutôt. C'est ce dont nous avons besoin contre l'unité d'obscurantisme qui déjà se soude aux fins de prévenir l'achose.</p>	<p>It will not be a progress, rather a regression. It's what we need against the unit(y) of obscurantism which is already fusing itself with a view to warding off the a-thing.</p>	<p>This will not be a progress: a regression, rather. This is what we have need of against the unity of obscurantism that already fuses itself for the ends of fending off <i>l'achose</i>.</p>
<p>Personne ne semble reconnaître autour de quoi l'unité se fait, et qu'au temps de quelqu'un où se recueillait la « signature des choses », du moins ne pouvait-on compter sur une bêtise assez cultivée, pour qu'on lui accroche le langage à la fonction de la communication.</p>	<p>No-one seems to recognize around what the unity is made, and that at the time of someone when the "signature of things" was being gathered, at least one could not count on such a cultivated stupidity, in order that one could through it hang language on to the function of communication.</p>	<p>No one seems to recognize around what unity is made, and that in the times when someone gathered the "signature of things"<sup>rgk</sup>, " at least one could not count on a stupidity enough cultivated for one to hook language to the function of communication for it.  <a href="#">rgk:Paracelsus</a> (1493–1541) developed the concept, writing that "Nature marks each growth ... according to its curative benefit",<sup>l</sup> and it was followed by <a href="#">Giambattista della Porta</a> in his <i>Phytognomonica</i> (1588). The writings of <a href="#">Jakob Böhme</a> (1575–1624) spread the doctrine of signatures. He suggested that God marked objects with a sign, or "signature", for their purpose.</p>
<p>Le recours à la communication protège, si j'ose dire, les arrières de ce que périmé la linguistique, en y couvrant le ridicule qui y rapplique <i>a posteriori</i> de son fait. Supposons-la montrer dans l'occultation du langage la figure du mythe qu'est la télépathie. [56]</p>	<p>The recourse to communication protects, if I may put it this way, the backsides of what linguistics makes out-of-date, by covering there the ridicule which applies itself there a posteriori from its fact. Let's suppose that it [linguistics] shows in the occultation of language the figure of the myth that is telepathy. [56]</p>	<p>The recourse to communication protects, dare I say, the rear of what outmodes linguistics, in covering over the ridicule that re-applies a posteriori on its basis. Let us suppose it shows in the occultation of language the figure of the myth that is telepathy. [56]</p>

Freud lui-même se laisse prendre à cet enfant perdu de la pensée : qu'elle se communique sans parole. Il n'y démasque pas le roi secret de la cour des miracles dont il ouvre le nettoyage. Telle la linguistique reste collée à la pensée qu'elle (la pensée) se communique avec la parole. C'est le même miracle invoqué à faire qu'on télépâtisse du même bois dont on pactise : pourquoi pas le « dialogue » dont vous appâtent les faux jetons, voire les contrats sociaux qu'ils en attendent. L'affect est là bon pied bon œil pour sceller ces effusions.

Freud himself gets sucked in by that lost child of thought, that thought is communicated without words. He does not unmask the royal secret of the courtyard of miracles whose cleansing he begins. Linguistics remaining stuck to thought is like thought being communicated without words. It's the same miracle that is invoked when making that one telepathises with the same material that one agrees on a pact: why not the "dialogue" with which the hypocrites lure you, or even the social contracts that they expect from them. Affect is there as right as rain to set the seal on those effusions.

Freud himself lets himself be taken by this lost child of thought: that it communicates itself without speech. He does not unmask there the secret king of the court of miracles of which he begins the scouring. Such that linguistics remains stuck to the thought that it (thought) is communicated through speech. This is the same miracle invoked to make it so that one telapathizes from the same wood from which one makes a pact: why not the "dialogue" with which we force-feed the false offspring, indeed the social contracts they await from it? Affect is there the right foot, the right eye, to seal these effusions.

Tout homme (qui ne sait ce que c'est?) est mortel (rassemblons-nous sur cette égalité communicable entre toutes). Et maintenant parlons de « tout », c'est le cas de le dire, parlons ensemble, passant muscade de ce qu'il y a sous la tête des syllogistes (pas d'Aristote, notons-le) qui d'un seul cœur (depuis lui) veulent bien que la mineure mette Socrate dans le coup. Car il en ressortirait aussi bien que la mort s'administre comme le reste, et par et pour les hommes, mais sans qu'ils soient du même côté pour ce qui est de la télépathie que véhicule une télégraphie, dont le sujet dès lors ne cesse pas d'embarrasser.

All men (who doesn't know how it goes?) are mortal (let's get together on this equality which is communicable among all others). And now let's start with "all", that's appropriate, let us speak together, agreeing on what there is in the syllogists' head (not Aristotle's, take note) who with a single voice (since him) want the minor to place Socrates in the game. For he would get out of it just as well if death is administered like the rest, both by and for men, but without their being on the same side as far as telepathy is concerned that a telegraphy conveys, whose subject from then on does not cease to be an embarrassment.

All man (*Tout homme*) (who does not know what this is?) is mortal (let us gather together over this equality communicable between alls [*toutes*]). And now let us speak of "all," let us speak together, it is the case to say, passing the conjurers ball of what is under the nose (*tête*) of syllogists (not of Aristotle, let us note) who with a single heart (since him) indeed wish that the minor premise put Socrates in the mix. For there would emerge from it also that death is administered like the rest, and by and for men, but without their being on the same side for what there is of the telepathy borne by a telegraphy, which the subject from then on does not cease to trouble.

<p>Que ce sujet soit d'origine marqué de division, c'es ce don't la Inguistique prend force au-delà des badinages de la communcation.</p>	<p>That this subject is from the start marked with division, is that from which linguistics draws strength beyond the bantering of communication.</p>	<p>That this subject is from the origin marked by a division, is what linguistics takes its strength from beyond banterings of communication.</p>
<p>Oui, force à mettre le poète dans son sac. Car le poète se produit d'être... (qu'on me permette de traduire celui qui le démontre, mon ami Jakobson en l'espèce)... se produit d'être mangé des vers, qui trouvent entre eux leur arrangement sans se soucier, c'est manifeste, de ce que le poète en sait ou pas. D'où la consistance chez Platon de l'ostracisme dont il frappe le poète en sa <i>République</i>, et de la vive curiosité qu'il montre dans le <i>Cratyle</i> pour ces petites bêtes que lui paraissent être les mots à n'en faire qu'à leur tête.</p>	<p>Yes, strength to put the poet in its bag. For the poet produces himself by being (allow me to translate the one who demonstrates this, my friend Jakobson as it turns out) ...produces himself by being eaten by worms/lines, which find amongst themselves their arrangement without bothering, it's clear, whether the poet knows anything about them or not. Whence the consistency in Plato of the ostracism with which he strikes the poet in his Republic, and the lively curiosity that he shows in the Cratylus for those little animals that words seem to him to be who do what they like.</p>	<p>Yes, the strength to put the poet in his sack. For the poet is produced from being . . . (if one permit me to translate one who demonstrates it, my friend Jakobson in this particular case) . . . is produced from being eaten by worms (<i>vers</i>)<sup>1</sup>, which find their arrangement amongst themselves without worrying, it is manifest, whether the poet knows it or not. Whence the consistency for Plato of the ostracism with which he strikes the poet in his Republic, and the lively curiosity he shows in the Cratylus for those little animals that appear to him to be words in only doing so on their heads. 1.TN :This can perhaps be read as a pun:</p>

		vers can be translated either as "worms" or as "verses"
On voit combien le formalisme fut précieux à soutenir les premiers pas de la linguistique.	One can see how precious formalism was in sustaining the first steps of linguistics.	One sees how precious formalism was in sustaining the first steps of linguistics.
Mais c'est tout de même de trébuchements dans les pas du langage, dans la parole autrement dit, qu'elle a été « anticipée ».	But it is all the same from stumblings in language's steps, in speech in other words, that linguistics has been "anticipated."	But it was all the same from the stumblings in the steps of language, of speech in other words, that it had been "anticipated."
Que le sujet ne soit pas celui qui sache ce qu'il dit, quand bel et bien se dit quelque chose par le mot qui lui manque, mais aussi dans l'impair d'une conduite qu'il croit sienne, cela ne rend pas [57] aisé de loger dans la cervelle dont il semble s'aider surtout à ce qu'elle dorme (point que l'actuelle neurophysiologie ne dément pas), voilà d'évidence l'ordre de faits que	That the subject is not the one who knows what he is saying, when indeed something is said by the word which is lacking, but also in the oddness of a behaviour that he believes his own, that does not make it [57] easy to get into your brain which it seems to help it to sleep (a point which current neuropsychology does not deny) there, clearly, is the order of facts that Freud calls the unconscious.	That the subject is not the one who knows what he says, when well and good something is said by the word that fails him ( <i>qui lui manque</i> ), but also in the odd ( <i>impair</i> ) of a conduct he believes his own, this does not render it [57] easy to lodge him in the brain by which he seems helped above all when it sleeps (a point that current neurophysiology does not deny), there obviously is the order of facts Freud calls

Freud appelle l'inconscient.		the unconscious.
Quelqu'un qui l'articule, au nom de Lacan, dit que c'est ça ou rien d'autre.	Someone who articulates that, a man called Lacan, says that it is that or nothing else.	Someone who articulates it, by the name of Lacan, says it is that or nothing else.
Personne, après lui maintenant, ne peut manquer à le lire dans Freud, et qui opère selon Freud à psychanalyser, doit s'y régler sauf à le payer du choix de la bêtise.	No-one, after him now, can fail to read it in Freud, and whoever operates according to Freud in psychoanalysing must govern himself according to that, unless he wants to pay for it with his choice of stupidity.	No one, after him now, can fail to read it in Freud, and whoever, according to Freud, works to psychoanalyze, must behave himself there lest he pay for it with the choice of stupidity.
Dès lors à énoncer que Freud anticipe la linguistique, je dis moins que ce qui s'impose, et qui est la formule que je libère maintenant : l'inconscient est la condition de la linguistique.	From then on, to state that Freud anticipates linguistics, I am saying less than what is necessary, and which is the formula I set out now: the unconscious is the condition of/for linguistics.	Henceforth in stating that Freud anticipates linguistics, I say less than what imposes itself, and which is the formula I now liberate: the unconscious is the condition of linguistics.

<p>Sans l'éruption de l'inconscient, pas moyen que la linguistique sorte du jour douteux dont l'Université, du nom des sciences humaines, fait encore éclipse à la science. Couronnée à Kazan par les soins de Baudouin de Courtenay, elle y fût sans doute restée.</p>	<p>Without the eruption of the unconscious, there is no way that linguistics can emerge from the murky light with which the University, in the name of the social sciences, is still eclipsing science. Crowned in Kazan through the work of Baudouin de Courtenay, it would doubtless have stayed in the shadows.</p>	<p>Without the eruption of the unconscious, there is no means for linguistics to emerge from the doubtful light by which the University, by the name of human sciences, still eclipses science. Crowned at Kazan by the cares of Baudouin de Courtenay<sup>rgk</sup>, it has no doubt remained there.</p> <p>rgk:Jan Nieciśław Ignacy Baudouin de Courtenay (13 March 1845 – 3 November 1929) was a Polish linguist and Slavist, best known for his theory of the phoneme and phonetic alternations. Three major schools of 20th-century phonology arose directly from his distinction between <i>physiophonetic</i> (phonological) and <i>psychophonetic</i> (morphophonological) alternations: the Leningrad school of phonology, the Moscow school of phonology, and the Prague school of phonology</p>
<p>Mais l'Université n'a pas dit son dernier mot, elle va de ça faire sujet de thèse : influence sur le génie de Ferdinand de Saussure du génie de Freud; démontrer d'où vint à l'un le vent de l'autre avant qu'existât la radio.</p>	<p>But the University has not had its final say, it will make of that the subject of a thesis: influence on the genius of Ferdinand de Saussure of Freud's genius; to show from where came wind of the other before the existence of radio.</p>	<p>But the University has not said its last word, it is going to make that the subject of a thesis: influence on the genius of Ferdinand de Saussure of the genius of Freud; demonstrating where the one got wind of the other before radio existed.</p>

<p>Faisons comme si elle ne s'en était pas passé de toujours, pour assourdir autant.</p>	<p>Let's make as if the university had not done without it for ever, in order to deafen us the more.</p>	<p>Let us make as if it was not always done without, deafening us all as much.</p>
<p>Et pourquoi Saussure se serait-il rendu compte, pour emprunter les termes de votre citation, mieux que Freud lui-même de ce que Freud anticipait, notamment la métaphore et la métonymie lacaniennes, lieux où Saussure <i>genuit</i> Jakobson.</p>	<p>And why would Saussure have taken notice of it, to borrow the terms of your quotation, better than Freud himself of what Freud was anticipating, especially Lacanian metaphor and metonymy, places where Saussure <i>genuit</i> Jakobson.</p>	<p>And why would Saussure have been aware, to borrow the terms of your citation, better than Freud himself of what Freud anticipated, notably Lacanian metaphor and metonymy, places where Saussure <i>genuit</i> Jakobson.</p>
<p>Si Saussure ne sort pas les anagrammes qu'il déchiffre dans la poésie saturnienne, c'est que ceux-ci jettent bas la littérature universitaire. La canaillerie ne le rend pas bête; c'est parce qu'il n'est pas analyste.</p>	<p>If Saussure does not publish the anagrams that he deciphers in Saturnian poetry it's because the latter throw out university literature. The mob does not make him mad; it's because he is not an analyst.</p>	<p>If Saussure does not bring out the anagrams he deciphers in Saturnian poetry, it is because they throw down university literature. Roguery does not render him stupid; this is because he is not an analyst.</p>
<p>Pour l'analyste au contraire, tremper dans les procédés dont s'habille l'infatuation universitaire, ne vous rate pas son homme (il y a là comme un espoir) et le jette droit dans une bourde comme de dire que l'inconscient est la condition du langage : là il s'agit de se faire auteur aux dépens de ce que j'ai dit, voire seriné, aux intéressés : à savoir que le langage est la condition de l'inconscient.</p>	<p>For the analyst on the contrary dipping into the procedures with which university infatuation dresses itself does not miss its man (there is there some hope) and throws him straight into a state as by saying that the unconscious is the condition of language; there it is a question of making oneself an author at the expense of what I have said, chirped repeatedly even, to interested parties, namely that language is the condition of the unconscious.</p>	<p>For the analyst, on the contrary, dipping into the procedures in which university infatuation is clothed always finds its man (there is this as a hope) and throws him right into a blunder like saying that the unconscious is the condition of language<sup>rgk</sup>: there it is a question of making oneself an author at the expense of what I have said, even drummed in, to those interested: to wit, that language is the condition of the unconscious.  <a href="#">rgk: the thesis of Lacan's pupil and</a></p>

		<p>analysand, Jean Laplanche put forward at the VI Colloquium of Bonneval under the direction of Henri Ey (Oct 30-Nov 2, 1960) in the paper by Jean Laplanche and Serge Leclaire. Lacan himself was at this conference, did not like what he heard, and gave a response that same day (Sunday, Oct 30, 1960) which was later published in his <i>Écrits</i> as <i>Position de l'inconscient</i>, pages 829-850. For the next ten years following the Bonneval conference Lacan would remain embittered and critical of Laplanche and Leclaire's view of the unconscious, and what he saw as their misuse of his work. Whether this demonstrates the importance of the topic, or the extent of the slight Lacan felt he had received, we find him penning a sustained attack on his former students in January 1970 as a preface to Anika Lemaire's book <i>Jacques Lacan</i>.</p>
<p>Ce qui me fait rire du personnage est un stéréotype: au point que deux autres, eux à l'usage interne d'une Société que sa bâtard- [58] dise universitaire a tué, ont osé définir le passage à l'acte et l'acting out exactement des termes dont à leur adresse expresse j'avais opposé l'un à l'autre, mais à intervertir simplement</p>	<p>What make me laugh about the character is a stereotype, to the point where two others, for internal use of a Society whose bastard [58] status in the university killed it, dared to define <i>passage to the act</i> and <i>acting out</i> exactly in the terms which I had expressly opposed one to the other, but simply in order to swap over what no-one had been able to articulate before.</p>	<p>What makes me laugh at this character is a stereotype: to the point that two others, those being used internally by a Society killed by its university bastardry [58], have dared define the <i>passage to the act</i> and <i>acting-out</i> exactly in the terms with which, explicitly addressing them, I had opposed them to each other, but in simply inverting what I attribute to each.</p>

<p>ce que personne n'avait su en articuler avant.</p>		<p>A fashion, they thought, of appropriating for themselves what no one had known how to articulate before.</p>
<p>Si je défailtais maintenant, je ne laisserais d'œuvre que ces rebuts choisis de mon enseignement, dont j'ai fait butée à l'information, dont c'est tout dire qu'elle le diffuse.</p>	<p>If I were to fade away now, I would leave no other work than these chosen fag-ends of my teaching, with which I have made a booty of information about which it is saying everything that the information diffuses the teaching.</p>	<p>If I succumbed now, the only work I would leave would be these scraps chosen from my teaching, of which I have made a buttress against the news (l'information), of which it is to say everything that it diffuses it.</p>
<p>Ce que j'ai énoncé dans un discours confidentiel, n'en a pas moins déplacé l'audition commune, au point de m'amener un auditoire qui m'en témoigne d'être stable en son énormité.</p>	<p>What I have stated in a confidential speech, has none the less gone into common circulation to the point of bringing me an audience which is proving to be stable in its enormous size.</p>	<p>What I have stated in a confidential discourse, has nonetheless displaced common audition, to the point of leading to me an audience that gives me evidence of being stable in its enormity.</p>
<p>Je me souviens de la gêne dont m'interrogeait un garçon qui s'était mêlé, à se vouloir marxiste, au public fait de gens du Parti (le seul) qui avait afflué (Dieu sait pourquoi) à la communication de ma « dialectique du désir et subversion du sujet dans la psychanalyse ».</p>	<p>I remember the embarrassment with which a boy questioned me, who had joined, considering himself a Marxist, the audience made up of people from the Party (the one and only) who had crowded in (God knows why) to hear me talk on my "dialectic of desire and subversion of the subject in psychoanalysis."</p>	<p>I remember the annoyance with which a boy interrogated me, who was mixed in, in wishing himself a Marxist, with a public made up of people from the Party (the only one) who had rushed (God knows why) to the communication of my "dialectic of desire and subversion of the subject in psychoanalysis."<sup>rgk</sup>  <a href="#">rgk A Conference on "La Dialectique"</a>,</p>

		held at Royaumont from September 19 to 23, 1960. "The conference was organized by the "Colloques philosophiques internationaux. And I was invited to participate by Jean Wahl." It was at this conference that Lacan put forward for the first time the famous formula, "A signifier is that which represents the subject for another signifier". It was written up in <i>Écrits</i> as <i>Subversion du sujet et dialectique de désir dans l'inconscient freudien</i> , pages 793-827.
J'ai gentiment (gentil comme je suis toujours) pointé à la suite dans mes <i>Écrits</i> , l'ahurissement qui me fit réponse de ce public.	I politely (polite as I always am) pointed to the horrified astonishment, following the publication of my <i>Écrits</i> , which this public gave as its response.	I gently (gentle as I always am) pointed out what followed in my <i>Écrits</i> , the daze that answered me from this public.
Pour lui, « croyez-vous donc, me disait-il, qu'il suffise que vous ayez produit quelque chose, inscrit des lettres au tableau noir, pour en attendre un effet? ».	"Do you think, he said to me, that it is enough that you have produced something, written letters on a blackboard, in order to expect a result from them?"	As for him, "Do you believe then, "he said to me, "that it suffices that you have produced something, inscribed with letters on a blackboard, to expect an effect?"
Un tel exercice a porté pourtant, j'en ai eu la preuve, ne serait-ce que du rebut qui lui fit un droit pour mon livre, -- les fonds de la Fondation Ford qui motivent de telles réunions d'avoir à les éponger, s'étant trouvés alors impensablement à sec pour me publier.	Such an exercise had its effect however, I had proof of it, if only in the rebuff which was given my book -- the funds in the Ford Foundation, which motivate such meetings by soaking up the costs, finding itself inexplicably short of cash to publish me.	Such an exercise has carried however, and I have had proof of it, were this only that from the scrap that made for it a right for my book--the funds of the Ford foundation that motivate such meetings from having to sponge them up, being then found unthinkably dried up for publishing me.

C'est que l'effet qui se propage n'est pas de communication de la parole, mais de déplacement du discours.	It's that the effect which is propagated is not communication of speech, but displacement of discourse.	It is that the effect that is propagated is not of a communication of speech, but of a displacement of discourse.
Freud, incompris, fût-ce de lui-même, d'avoir voulu se faire entendre, est moins servi par ses disciples que par cette propagation : celle sans quoi les convulsions de l'histoire restent énigme, comme les mois de mai dont se déroutent ceux qui s'emploient à les rendre serfs d'un sens, dont la dialectique se présente comme dérision. [59]	Freud, misunderstood, even by himself, for having wanted to make himself heard is less served by his disciples than by this propagation, that without which the convulsions of history remain an enigma, like the months of May with which are derailed those who set about making them serfs of a meaning, whose dialectic is presented as derisory. [59]	Freud, misunderstood, were this by himself, from having wanted to make himself heard, is served less by his disciples than by this propagation: this without which the convulsions of history remain an enigma, like the months of May by which those who are employed at rendering them slaves to a sense are perplexed, by which the dialectic presents itself as a mockery. [59]