

<p>RADIOPHONIE Continued- Question II The page numbers in brackets refer to the page numbers at the bottom of the page in the Scilicet 2/3 volume.</p>	<p>Anthony Chadwick Translation</p>	<p>Jack W. Stone Translation</p>
<p>QUESTION II: <i>La linguistique, la psychanalyse et l'ethnologie ont en commun la notion de structure, à partir de cette notion, ne peut-on imaginer l'énoncé d'un champ commun qui réunira un jour psychanalyse, ethnologie et linguistique?</i></p>	<p>QUESTION II : Linguistics, psychoanalysis and ethnology have in common the notion of structure; starting from that notion can one not imagine the statement of a common field which will one day unite psychoanalysis, ethnology and linguistics?</p>	<p>QUESTION II : Linguistics, psychoanalysis, and ethnology have in common the notion of structure; beginning with this notion, can one not imagine the statement (<i>énoncé</i>) of a common field that will one day reunite psychoanalysis, ethnology, and linguistics?</p>
<p>REPONSE (à Pâques 70, en guise d'oeuf?) :</p>	<p>RESPONSE (at Easter '70, in the guise of an egg?)</p>	<p>ANSWER (at Easter '70^{rgk}, in the guise of an egg?): rgk: March 29, 2970. Lacan reads his initial responses to Georjin's questions to his Seminar XVII on Wednesday, April 8, 1970. (10 days later)</p>
<p>Suivre la structure, c'est s'assurer de l'effet du langage.</p>	<p>To follow structure is to be so sure of the effect of language.</p>	<p>Following structure is to assure oneself of the effect of language.</p>

<p>Ça ne se fait qu'à écarter la pétition de principe qu'il la reproduise de relations prises au réel. Au réel qui serait à entendre de ma catégorie.</p>	<p>That can be done only by setting aside the petition of principle that it reproduces from relations taken from the real. From the real that would be understood from my category.</p>	<p>This is only done in putting aside the petition of principle^{rgk} that it reproduces from relations taken at the real. At the real to be understood from my category. ^{rgk}: an informal fallacy. The Latin term "petitio principii" is translated literally into English as "begging the question." "Petitio" means to petition, or to appeal to, or to <i>beg</i>; "principii" is the principle which the reasoning seeks to explore, i.e. the issue in <i>question</i></p>
<p>Car ces relations font partie aussi de la réalité en tant qu'elles l'habitent en formules qui y sont aussi bien présentes. La structure s'attrape de là.</p>	<p>For these relations are also part of reality to the extent that they inhabit it in formulae which are also very present there. Structure is caught from there.</p>	<p>For these relations also make a part of reality inasmuch as they inhabit it in formulas that are also present there. Structure is captured from there.</p>
<p>De là, c'est-à-dire du point où le symbolique prend corps. Je vais revenir sur ce : corps.</p>	<p>From there, that is to say from the point where the symbolic takes body. I'm going to come back to this: body.</p>	<p>From there, this is to say from the point where the symbolic takes body. I am going to return to this: body.</p>

<p>Il serait étonnant qu'on ne voie pas qu'à faire du langage une fonction du collectif, on retourne toujours à supposer quelqu'un, grâce à qui la réalité se redouble de ce qu'il la représente, pour que nous n'ayons plus qu'à reproduire cette doublure : bref au guêpier de l'idéalisme.</p>	<p>It would be surprising that one could not see that by making language a function of the collective, one always returns to supposing a someone, thanks to whom reality is redoubled because that someone represents it, in order that we have only to reproduce this doubling : in short in the corset of idealism.</p>	<p>It would be astonishing that one not see that in making language a function of the collective, one returns always to supposing someone, thanks to whom reality is redoubled in that he represents it, so that we no longer have to do more than reproduce this lining: in brief, in the wasp nest of idealism.</p>
<p>J'en viendrai au terme à quelqu'un qui n'est pas de ce cru : quelqu'un à lui faire signe.</p>	<p>I will come finally to someone who is not of this class : someone to give him a sign.</p>	<p>I will come at the end to someone who is not of this vintage: someone to make a sign of it (<i>quelqu'un à lui faire signe</i>).</p>
<p>De la veine indiquée, la connaissance se motive qu'à faire adaptation d'un supposé dans l'existence, qui, quel qu'il se produise comme moi, organisme, voire espèce, n'en pourrait dire rien qui vaille.</p>	<p>From the vein indicated, knowledge is motivated only by adapting a supposed in existence which, whether he reproduces himself as self, organism or even species, could say nothing worthwhile about it.</p>	<p>From the indicated vein, knowledge (<i>la connaissance</i>) is only motivated in making an adaptation of a supposed in existence, about which, whoever is reproduced like me, an organism, even a species, could say nothing worthwhile.</p>
<p>Si la connaissance ne naît qu'à larguer le langage, ce n'est pas pour qu'elle survive qu'il faut l'y raccorder, mais pour la démontrer mort-née.</p>	<p>If knowledge is born only by setting language adrift, it is not in order that it [knowledge] survive that it has to be tied to it [language] again, but in order to demonstrate that it [knowledge] is</p>	<p>If connaissance is only born in jettisoning language, it is not so that connaissance (<i>elle</i>) will survive that it must be brought back into accord with it, but to demonstrate that it is born dead.</p>

	still-born.	
D'autre structure est le savoir qui, le réel, le cerne, autant que possible comme impossible. C'est ma formule qu'on sait.	Of a different structure is [scientific] knowledge which draws a circle around the real, as much the possible as the impossible. That's my formula as you know.	From another structure is the knowledge (<i>savoir</i>) that specifies the real (<i>le réel, le cerne</i>), as much as possible as impossible. This is my formula, as one knows.
Ainsi le réel se distingue de la réalité. Ce, pas pour dire qu'il soit inconnaissable, mais qu'il n'y a pas question de s'y connaître, mais de le démontrer. Voie exempte d'idéalisation aucune.	Thus the real is distinguished from reality. This, not to say that it is unknowable, but that there is no question of knowing oneself in it, rather of demonstrating it. Pathway exempt from any idealization.	Thus the real is distinguished from reality. This, not to say that it is unknowable, but that there is no question of knowing oneself there, but rather of demonstrating this real (<i>le démontrer</i>). A path exempt from any idealization.
Pas de raison pourtant de parquer les structuralistes, si ce n'est à se leurrer qu'ils prennent la relève de ce que l'existentialisme a si bien réussi : obtenir d'une génération qu'elle se couche dans le même lit dont elle est née. [60]	No reason however to enclose the structuralists, except to deceive oneself that they are taking up the baton where existentialism was so successful : getting a generation to get into the same bed from which it [the generation] was born. [60]	No reason however to pen in the structuralists, if it is not to delude oneself that they take over what existentialism so well succeeded at: getting a generation to sleep in the same bed where it was born. [60]

<p>Personne qui n'ait sa chance d'insurrection à se repérer de la structure, puisqu'en droit elle fait la trace du défaut d'un calcul à venir.</p>	<p>No one who has a chance of insurrection by locating himself on the basis of the structure, since in law it (already) maps out the fault of a calculation to come.</p>	<p>No one has his chance for insurrection in establishing himself from structure, since by rights it constitutes the trace of the defect of a calculus to come.</p>
<p>Que ceci préface l'accueil que je vais faire au <i>pool</i> que vous imaginez.</p>	<p>Let this preface the welcome that I am going to give to the pool that you are imagining.</p>	<p>Let this preface the greeting I am going to give to the <i>pool</i> [<i>in English</i>] you imagine.</p>
<p>Je reviens d'abord au corps du symbolique qu'il faut entendre comme de nulle métaphore. À preuve que rien que lui n'isole le corps à prendre au sens naïf, soit celui dont l'être qui s'en soutient ne sait pas que c'est le langage qui le lui décerne, au point qu'il n'y serait pas, faute d'en pouvoir parler.</p>	<p>I come back first of all to the body of the symbolic that one should understand in no way as a metaphor. The proof is that nothing but it isolates the body taken in the naïve sense, namely the one whose being which is supported by it does not know that it is language which grants it to him, to the point where he would not be there since he could not talk about it.</p>	<p>I return first to the body of the symbolic that must be understood as not at all metaphorical. As is shown by the fact that nothing isolates the body to be taken in the naïve sense, that in which the being sustained by it does not know that language is what discerns it for him, to the point that it would not be there if it were not able to be spoken of.</p>
<p>Le premier corps fait le second de s'y incorporer.</p>	<p>The first body makes the second by incorporating itself into it.</p>	<p>The first body makes the second from incorporating itself there.</p>

<p>D'où l'incorporel qui reste marquer le premier, du temps d'après son incorporation. Rendons justice aux stoïciens d'avoir su de ce terme : l'incorporel, signer en quoi le symbolique tient du corps.</p>	<p>Whence the incorporeal which remains to mark the first, from the time following its incorporation. Let's give credit to the Stoics for having known how to signal with this term , incorporeal, what the symbolic owes to the body.</p>	<p>Whence the incorporeal that remains to mark the first, from the time after its incorporation. Let us render justice to the stoics for having known with this term: the incorporeal, to sign how the symbolic holds to the body.</p>
<p>Incorporelle est la fonction, qui fait réalité de la mathématique, l'application de même effet pour la topologie, ou l'analyse en un sens large pour la logique.</p>	<p>Incorporeal is the function which makes reality of mathematics, the application of the same effect for topology, or analysis in the broad sense for logic.</p>	<p>Incorporeal is the function, which makes a reality from mathematics, the application of a same effect for topology, or analysis in a broad sense for logic.</p>
<p>Mais c'est incorporée que la structure fait l'affect, ni plus ni moins, affect seulement à prendre de ce qui de l'être s'articule, n'y ayant qu'être de fait, soit d'être dit de quelque part.</p>	<p>But it is incorporated that structure makes the affect, neither more nor less, affect only to be taken from that which is articulated of (the) being, having there only being in fact, namely by being said from somewhere.</p>	<p>But it is incorporated that structure makes affect, neither more nor less, affect only to be taken from what is articulated of being, only having there a de facto being, that is, from being said from somewhere.</p>
<p>Par quoi s'avère que du corps, il est second qu'il soit mort ou vif.</p>	<p>By which it may be averred that, of the body, it is secondary whether it be dead or alive.</p>	<p>By which it is affirmed of the body that it is second whether it be dead or alive.</p>
<p>Qui ne sait le point critique don't nous datons dans l'homme, l'être parlant: la sépulture, soit où, d'une</p>	<p>Who does not know the critical point from which we date in man the speaking being: burial,</p>	<p>Who does not know the critical point from which we date in man the speaking being: the</p>

<p>espèce, s'affirme au contraire d'aucune autre, le corps y garde ce qui au vivant donnait le caractère: corps. <i>Corpse</i> reste, ne devient charogne, le corps qu'habitait la parole, que le langage <i>corpsifiait</i>.</p>	<p>namely where, for one species, it is affirmed that, contrary to any other, the dead body keeps there that which when it was alive, gave character: body. <i>Corpse</i> remains, does not decompose, the body that the word inhabited, that language <i>corpsified</i>.</p>	<p>sepulcher is where, in a fashion, it is affirmed that contrary to any other, the dead body keeps what gave the living its character: body. A <i>Corpse</i> [in English] remains, does not become carrion, the body that speech inhabited, that language <i>corpsified</i>.</p>
<p>La zoologie peut partir de la prétention de l'individu à faire l'être du vivant, mais c'est pour qu'il en rabatte, à seulement qu'elle le poursuive au niveau du polypier.</p>	<p>Zoology can start from the claim of the individual's making being from the living, but that is in order for it (the individual?) to back down from that, by only pursuing it (being) at the level of the polypary [coral reef].</p>	<p>Zoology can take its departure from the pretension of the individual to make being from the living, but this is so that it might fold back on it, only if Zoology pursue it at the level of the polyper.</p>
<p>Le corps, à le prendre au sérieux, est d'abord ce qui peut porter la marque propre à le ranger dans une suite de signifiants. Dès cette marque, il est support de la relation, non éventuel, mais nécessaire, car c'est encore la supporter que de s'y soustraire.</p>	<p>The body, taking it seriously, is first of all that which can carry the proper mark to place it in a series of signifiers. From the time that mark is placed, it is support for the relation, not eventual but necessary support, for you are still supporting it when you subtract yourself from it.</p>	<p>The body, to take it seriously, is to start with what can carry the mark proper to range it in a sequence of signifiers. Starting from this mark, it is a support, not potential (<i>éventuel</i>), but necessary, of a relation, for it is still to support it to subtract itself from it.</p>

<p>D'avant toute date, Moins-Un désigne le lieu dit de l'Autre (avec le sigle du grand A) par Lacan. De l'Un-en-Moins, le lit est fait à l'intrusion qui avance de l'extrusion; c'est le signifiant même.</p>	<p>From time immemorial, Minus-One designates the place said to be of the Other (with the capital O) by Lacan. With the One-Less, the bed is made for the intrusion which advances from the extrusion; it's the signifier itself.</p>	<p>From before any date, Minus-One designates the place of the Other (<i>Autre</i>) (with the sigla big A) for Lacan. From the One-Short (<i>Un-en-Moins</i>), the bed is made for the intrusion that advances from the extrusion; this is the signifier itself.</p>
<p>Ainsi ne va pas toute chair. Des seules qu'empreint le signe à les négativer, montent, de ce que corps s'en séparent, les nuées, eaux [61] supérieures, de leur jouissance, lourdes de foudres à redistribuer corps et chair.</p>	<p>That is not the way of all flesh. From some alone, which the sign to make them negative imprints, rise, because bodies separate themselves from it, the clouds, [61] superior waters, out of their jouissance, heavy with lightning to redistribute body and flesh.</p>	<p>Not all fleshes go this way. From those alone that imprint the sign to negativize themselves, mount, in that bodies are separated from them, the clouds, the [61] upper waters, of their jouissance, heavy with thunders to redistribute body and flesh.</p>
<p>Répartition peut-être moins comptable, mais dont on ne semble pas remarquer que la sépulture antique y figure cet « ensemble » même, dont s'articule notre plus moderne logique. L'ensemble vide des ossements est l'élément irréductible dont s'ordonnent, autres éléments, les instruments de la jouissance, colliers, gobelets, armes : plus de sous-éléments à énumérer la jouissance qu'à la faire rentrer dans le corps.</p>	<p>Distribution perhaps less accountable, but about which one seems not to notice that the ancient burial features this very « set » with which our more modern logic is articulated. The empty set of bones is the irreducible element with which are set in order other elements, the instruments of jouissance, collars, gobelets, arms : more sub-elements to enumerate jouissance than to make it re-enter the body.</p>	<p>A perhaps less countable distribution, but of which one does not seem to notice that the ancient sepulcher figures this "set" itself, by which our most modern logic is articulated. The empty set of bones is the irreducible element by which other elements are ordered, the instruments of jouissance, necklaces, tumblers, weapons: more as sub-elements to enumerate jouissance than to make it re-enter the body.</p>

Ai-je animé la structure? Assez, je pense, pour, des domaines qu'elle unirait à la psychanalyse, annoncer que rien n'y destine les deux que vous dites, spécialement.

Have I animated structure? Enough I think to announce that, of the domains that it would allegedly unite with psychoanalysis, nothing destines the two that you mention to be joined to it especially.

Have I animated structure? Enough, I think, to announce that, of the domains it would reunite with psychoanalysis, nothing destines the two you say, especially.

La linguistique livre le matériel de l'analyse, voire l'appareil dont on y opère. Mais un domaine ne se domine que de son opération. L'inconscient peut-être comme je le disais la condition de la linguistique. Celle-ci n'en a pas pour autant sur lui la moindre prise.

Linguistics yields the material of analysis, even the apparatus with which one operates there. But a domain is not dominated solely by its operation. The unconscious may be, as I was saying, the condition for linguistics. The latter for all that does not have the slightest hold on the former.

Linguistics delivers the material of analysis, even the apparatus from which it operates. But a domain is only dominated from its operation. The unconscious might be, as I said, the condition of linguistics. The latter does not forasmuch have the least hold on it.

Car elle laisse en blanc ce qui y fait effet : l'objet a dont à montrer qu'il est l'enjeu de l'acte psychanalytique, j'ai pensé éclairer tout autre acte.

For it (linguistics) leaves blank that which has an effect there : the object a about which, by showing that it is the stake for the psychoanalytic act, I think I have illuminated every other act.

For it to leave blank what makes an effect there: the object a from which in showing that it is what is at stake in the psychoanalytic act, I have thought to clarify a completely other act.

Cette carence du linguiste, j'ai pu l'éprouver d'une contribution que je demandai au plus grand qui fût parmi les Français pour en illustrer le départ d'une revue de ma façon, si peu qu'elle en fût marquée dans son titre : la psychanalyse, pas moins. On sait le cas qu'en firent ceux qui d'une grâce de chiens battus m'y firent conduite, la tenant pourtant d'assez de cas pour saborder la chose en son temps.

This hole in the linguist, I have been able to experience it through a contribution that I asked from the greatest that ever was among the French to star in the launch of a periodical of mine, though it was not particularly marked in its title : *La Psychanalyse*, no less. You know the fuss that some made, some that had the grace of beaten dogs went part of the way with me, holding that that support was enough to justify sabotaging the thing when the time came.

This deficiency of the linguist, I might have experienced it from a contribution I asked of the greatest among the French to illustrate the beginning of my sort of revue^{rgk}, as little as it (*elle*) was marked in its title: psychoanalysis, no less. One knows the case those made of it who with the grace of whipped dogs conducted me to it, holding it however with enough of a case to scuttle the thing in its time.
rgk : Émile Beneviste (1902-1976), the leading representative of Linguistics of Enunciation, attacked Karl Abel's thesis *On the antithetical meanings of primal words*, which Freud wrote about in a paper with the same name. This really annoyed Lacan. Lacan later explains this discontent in the year of 1970 in Radiophonie by attacking Benveniste and his contribution to the first issue of *La Psychanalyse*. Noting that linguistics does not have any influence on the unconscious, by leaving blank what has an effect on it, the object *a*, expressed in this way: "This lack of the linguist, I could check it out when

		<p>I asked a contribution to the greatest one that existed among the French ones, to illustrate the launch of a magazine of my creation [...] – the psychoanalysis, nothing less.” Despite the evident dissatisfaction that Lacan later demonstrates to Benveniste’s contribution, as suggested by the expression lack of the linguist, the great Linguist of Enunciation remains recognized as the greatest that existed between French ones, demonstrating a probable mixture of admiration and contempt by Lacan.--_Bruno Focas Vieira Machado from <i>Benveniste, Lacan and Structuralism</i>.</p>
<p>C’est bien d’une autre – grâce est encore peu dire – que me fut accordée l’attention que méritait l’intérêt jamais relevé avant moi de Freud pour les mots antithétiques, tels qu’appréciés par un Abel.</p>	<p>It is indeed with another – grace is hardly the word for it – that was paid to me the attention that Freud’s interest deserved, never picked up before I did, in antithetical words, as appreciated by someone like Abel.</p>	<p>It is indeed from another--grace is still to say too little--that was accorded me the attention merited by the interest never brought up before me of Freud for antithetical words, such as were appreciated by an Abel.^{rgk} ^{rgk} See Freud’s 1910 essay, <i>The Antithetical Meaning of Primal Words</i></p>

<p>Mais si le linguiste ne peut faire mieux qu'il parut au verdict que le bon aise du signifié exige que les signifiants ne soient pas antithétiques, ceci suppose que d'avoir à parler l'arabe, où de tels signifiants abondent, s'annonce comme de parer à une montée de fourmilière.</p>	<p>But if the linguist can do no better than it appeared in the verdict that the comfort of the signified demands that signifiers are not antithetical, this supposes that by having to speak Arabic, where such signifiers abound, is announced as avoiding having to climb a molehill.</p>	<p>But if the linguist can do no better than it appears from the verdict that the good comfort (<i>bon aise</i>) of the signified requires that signifiers not be antithetical, this supposes that having to speak Arabic, where such signifiers abound, announces itself as guarding against a raising of an anthill.</p>
<p>Pour prendre un exemple moins anecdotique, remarquons que [62] le particulier de la langue est ce par quoi la structure tombe sous l'effet de cristal, que j'ai dit plus haut.</p>	<p>To take a less anecdotal example, let us note that [62] the particular of language is that through which structure falls under the crystal effect, that I said above.</p>	<p>To take a less anecdotal example, let us remark that [62] the particular of the tongue (<i>langue</i>) is that by which structure falls under the crystal effect, as I said above.</p>

<p>Le qualifier, ce particulier, d'arbitraire est lapsus que Saussure a commis, de ce qu'à contrecoeur certes, mais par là d'autant plus offert au trébuchement, il se « rempardait » là (puisqu'on m'apprend que c'est un mot de moi) du discours universitaire dont j'ai montré que le recel, c'est justement ce signifiant qui domine le discours du maître, celui de l'arbitraire.</p>	<p>To qualify this particular as arbitrary is a slip that Saussure committed, because, no doubt with a heavy heart, but all the more open to stumbling, he « ramparted himself » (since I'm told it is one of my expressions) with the university discourse about which I have shown that the receiving of stolen goods is precisely this signifier which dominates the master's discourse, that of the arbitrary.</p>	<p>To qualify it, this particular, as arbitrary is a slip (<i>lapsus</i>) that Saussure committed, in that, reluctantly, certainly, but by that all the more offered to the stumbling, he "ramparted" himself (<i>se « rempardait »</i>) there (since one tells me that this is my word) from university discourse where I have shown that what is harbored is precisely this signifier that dominates the discourse of the master, that of the arbitrary.</p>
<p>C'est ainsi qu'un discours façonne la réalité sans supposer nul consensus du sujet, le divisant, quoi qu'il en ait, de ce qu'il énonce à ce qu'il se pose comme l'énonçant.</p>	<p>It is thus that a discourse fashions reality without supposing any consensus from the subject, dividing the subject, whatever he may do, from what he enunciates, from the fact that he poses himself as enunciating it.</p>	<p>It is thus that a discourse fashions reality without supposing any consensus from the subject, dividing it, whatever there is of it, in that it states it in posing itself as stating it (<i>de ce qu'il l'énonce à ce qu'il se pose comme l'énonçant.</i>)</p>
<p>Seul le discours qui se définit du tour que lui donne l'analyste, manifeste le sujet comme autre, soit lui remet la clef de sa division, -- tandis que la science, de faire le sujet maître, le dérobe, à la mesure de ce que le désir lui fait place, comme à Socrate se met à</p>	<p>Only the discourse which defines itself according to the turn the analyst gives it manifests the subject as other, namely hands back to the subject the key of his division – whereas science, by making the subject master, steals it away, to the extent of what</p>	<p>Only the discourse that is defined from the turn the analyst gives it manifests the subject as other, that is, returns to it the key of its division--while science, by making the subject a master, hides it, to the extent that the desire that makes a place for it,</p>

<p>me le barrer sans remède.</p>	<p>desire makes room for it, as with Socrates who begins to shut me out of it without recourse.</p>	<p>as with Socrates as with me, takes to barring it without remedy.</p>
<p>Il n'y pas moindre barrière du côté de l'ethnologie. Un enquêteur qui laisserait son informatrice lui conter fleurette de ses rêves, se fera rappeler à l'ordre, à les mettre au compte du terrain. Et le censeur, ce faisant, ne me paraîtra pas, fût-il Lévi-Strauss, marquer mépris de mes plates-bandes.</p>	<p>There is no less a barrier over in ethnology. A researcher who would allow his informant to spin a tale about her dreams will find himself brought back into line, by putting them down to the field context. And the censor, in doing this, will not seem to me, even if it were Lévi-Strauss, to disdain my flower-beds.</p>	<p>There is not the least barrier on the side of ethnology. An inquirer who would let his informer murmur sweet nothings from her dreams will make himself called back to order, in accounting for them by the terrain. And the deputy headmaster (<i>le censeur</i>), doing this, will not appear to me, were he Lévi-Strauss, to mark contempt for my flowerbeds.</p>
<p>Où irait « le terrain » s'il se détrempait d'inconscient? Ça n'y ferait, quoi qu'on en rêve, nul effet de forage, mais flaque de notre cru.</p>	<p>Where would the « field » go if it got rid of the unconscious? It would not have, whatever dream one might have about it, any drilling effect, but a puddle of our vintage.</p>	<p>Where would "the terrain" go if it were soaked in the unconscious? This would not make, whatever one might dream, any effect of drilling, but a puddle of our own vinting.</p>
<p>Car une enquête qui se limite au recueil d'un savoir, c'est d'un savoir de notre tonneau que nous la nourririons.</p>	<p>For an inquiry which limited itself to gathering knowledge, it is with knowledge from our own barrel that we would nourish it.</p>	<p>For, an inquiry that limits itself to gathering from a knowledge, it is from a knowledge from our barrel that we will nourish it.</p>

<p>D'une psychanalyse elle-même, qu'on n'attende pas de recenser les mythes qui ont conditionné un sujet de ce qu'il ait grandi au Togo ou au Paraguay. Car la psychanalyse opérant du discours qui la conditionne, et que je définis cette année à le prendre par son envers, on n'en obtiendra pas d'autre mythe que ce qui en reste en son discours : l'Œdipe freudien.</p>	<p>Don't expect a psychoanalysis itself to draw up a list of the myths which have conditioned a subject on the grounds that he grew up in Togo or Paraguay. For psychoanalysis, operating from the discourse which conditions it, and that I am defining this year by turning the discourse inside out, one will get from psychoanalysis no other myth than that which remains of it in its discourse : the Freudian Oedipus.</p>	<p>From a psychoanalysis itself, let one not expect to inventory (<i>de recenser</i>) the myths that have conditioned a subject inasmuch as he has grown up in Togo or in Paraguay. For, psychoanalysis operating from the discourse that conditions it, and which I defined this year in taking it from its reverse side, one will not obtain from it any other myth than that which remains in its discourse: the Freudian Oedipus.</p>
<p>Du matériel dont se fait l'analyse du mythe, écoutons Lévi-Strauss énoncer qu'il est intraduisible. Ceci à bien l'entendre : car ce qu'il dit, c'est que peu importe en quelle langue ils sont recueillis : toujours de même analysables, de se théoriser des grosses unités dont une « mythologisation » définitive les articule. [63]</p>	<p>Concerning the material with which the analysis of the myth is made, listen to Lévi-Strauss as he states that it is untranslatable. This to understand him properly : for what he says is that it does not much matter in which language the myths are collected, still they are analysable based on the theory of the large units with which a definitive « mythologization » articulates them. [63]</p>	<p>Of the material of which the analysis of myth is made, let us hear Lévi-Strauss state that it is untranslatable. This is indeed to understand him: for what he says is that it little matters in which language they are gathered: always likewise analyzable, from being theorized from gross units from which the definitive "mythologization" articulates them. [63]</p>

<p>On saisit là le mirage d'un niveau commun avec l'universalité du discours psychanalytique, mais, et du fait de qui le démontre, sans que l'illusion s'en produise. Car ce n'est pas du jeu de mythes apologetiques que propagent les Instituts qu'un psychanalyste fera jamais interprétation.</p>	<p>You can seize there the mirage of a level that is common with the universality of psychoanalytic discourse, but, and from the fact which demonstrates it, without the illusion being produced by it. For it is not from the play of apologetic mythemes which the Institutes propagate that a psychoanalyst will ever make an interpretation.</p>	<p>One seizes there the mirage of a common level with the universality of psychoanalytic discourse, but, and from the fact of who demonstrates it, without the illusion being produced. For it is not from the game of apologetical mythemes propagated by the Institutes that a psychoanalyst will ever make an interpretation.</p>
<p>Que la cure ne puisse se passer que dans une langue particulière (ce qu'on appelle : positive), même à jouer de la traduire, y fait garantie « qu'il n'y a pas de métalangage », selon ma formule. L'effet de langage ne s'y produit que du cristal linguistique. Son universalité n'est que la topologie retrouvée, de ce qu'un discours s'y déplace. L'accès topologique y étant même assez prégnant pour que la mythologie s'y réduise à l'extrême.</p>	<p>That the cure can take place only in a particular language (what one calls « positive »), even playing at translating it, guarantees « that there is no metalanguage », according to my formula. The language effect is produced there only through the linguistic crystal. Its universality is only topology found again, as the result of a discourse moving about in it. The topological access being pregnant enough there in order that mythology is reduced there to the extreme.</p>	<p>That the cure can only happen in a particular language (which one calls: positive), even in playing at translating it, there constitutes a guarantee "that there is no metalanguage," according to my formula. The effect of language is only produced there from crystallinguistics. Its universality is only rediscovered topology, inasmuch as a discourse displaces itself there. The topological access being there even pregnant enough for mythology to reduce itself to it at the extreme.</p>

<p>Ajouté-je que le mythe, dans l'articulation de Lévi-Strauss, soit : la seule forme ethnologique à motiver votre question, refuse tout ce que j'ai promu de l'instance de la lettre dans l'inconscient. Il n'opère ni de métaphore, ni même d'aucune métonymie. Il ne condense pas, il explique. Il ne déplace pas, il loge, même à changer l'ordre des tentes.</p>	<p>I add that myth, in Lévi-Strauss' articulation, that is the only ethnological form to motivate your question, would refuse everything that I have promoted concerning the instance of the letter in the unconscious. Myth operates neither from metaphor, nor from any metonymy. It does not condense, it explains. It does not displace, it lodges, even if it changes the tent order.</p>	<p>Shall I add that myth, in Lévi-Strauss' articulation--that is: the only ethnological form to motivate our question--refuses all I promoted with the instance of the letter in the unconscious? It operates neither from metaphor, nor even from any metonymy. It does not condense, it explains. It does not displace, it lodges, even in changing the order of the tents.</p>
<p>Il ne joue qu'à combiner ses unités lourdes, où le complément, d'assurer la présence du couple, fait seul surgir un arrière-plan.</p>	<p>It only plays by combining its heavy units, where the complement, by assuring the presence of the couple, alone makes a background come to the fore.</p>	<p>It only comes into play in combining its heavy units, where the complement, from insuring the presence of the couple, only makes a background spring forth.</p>
<p>Cet arrière-plan est justement ce que repousse sa structure.</p>	<p>This background is precisely what its structure pushes back.</p>	<p>This background is precisely what pushes back its structure.</p>
<p>Ainsi dans la psychanalyse (parce qu'aussi bien dans l'inconscient) l'homme de la femme ne sait rien, ni la femme de l'homme. Au phallus se résume le point de mythe où le sexuel se fait passion du signifiant.</p>	<p>Thus in psychoanalysis (because equally in the unconscious) man of woman knows nothing, nor woman of man. In the phallus is summed up the myth point where the sexual becomes passionate about the signifier.</p>	<p>Thus in psychoanalysis (because also in the unconscious) the man knows nothing of the woman, nor the woman of the man. With the phallus is summed up the point of myth where the sexual is made passion of the signifier.</p>

<p>Que ce point paraisse ailleurs se multiplier, voilà ce qui fascine spécialement l'universitaire qui, de structure, a la psychanalyse en horreur. D'où procède le recrutement des novices de l'ethnologie.</p>	<p>That this point seems elsewhere to multiply itself, that's what fascinates especially the university man who, on the basis of structure is horrified by psychoanalysis. Whence proceeds the recruitment of novices into ethnology.</p>	<p>That this point seems moreover to multiply itself, this is what especially fascinates the academic who, from structure, has a horror of psychoanalysis. Whence proceeds the recruiting of the novices of ethnology.</p>
<p>Où se marque un effet d'humour. Noir bien sûr, à se peindre de faveurs de secteur.</p>	<p>At which point is marked a humorous effect. Black of course, by painting itself with favours from the sector.</p>	<p>Where an effect of humor is marked. Black, of course, in painting itself in sectarian favors.</p>
<p>Ah! faute d'une université qui serait ethnique, allons d'une ethnique faire université.</p>	<p>Ah! Lacking a university that would be an ethnic group, let's make of an ethnic group a university.</p>	<p>Ah! for lack of a university that would be an ethnic group, let us go make from an ethnic group a university.</p>
<p>D'où la gageure de cette pêche dont se définit le terrain comme le lieu où faire écrit d'un savoir dont l'essence est de ne se transmettre pas par écrit.</p>	<p>Whence the wager of that mistake with which is defined the field as the place where putting into writing a scientific knowledge whose essence is to not be transmitted by writing.</p>	<p>Whence the wager of this sin whose terrain is defined as the place to make a writing of a knowledge whose essence is to not be transmitted by a writing.</p>
<p>Désespérant de voir jamais la dernière classe, recréons la première, l'écho de savoir qu'il y a dans la classification. Le professeur ne revient qu'à l'aube... celle où se croit déjà la chauve-souris de Hegel. [64]</p>	<p>Despairing of ever seeing the last class, let's recreate the first, the echo of knowledge that there is in classification. The professor returns only at dawn...the one where Hegel's bat thinks it is already. [64]</p>	<p>Despairing of ever seeing the last class, let us recreate the first, the echo of knowledge there is in classification. The professor only returns to the dawn . . . the one where the bats of Hegel already believe themselves. [64]</p>

Je garderai même distance, à dire la mienne à la structure: passant le dernier comme psychanalyste à faire le tour de votre appellation.	I will keep the same distance, meaning mine, from structure: passing the last as psychoanalyst to do the tour of your domain.	I will keep a same distance, to say mine from structure: passing the last as a psychoanalyst to go around (<i>faire le tour de</i>) your interpellation.
D'abord que, sous prétexte que j'ai défini le signifiant comme ne l'a osé personne, on ne s'imagine pas que le signe ne soit pas mon affaire! Bien au contraire c'est la première, ce sera aussi la dernière. Mais il y faut ce détour.	First that, under the pretext that I defined the signifier as no one else has dared do, people have got it into their head that the sign is not my affair! On the contrary, it's the first order of business, and it will also be the last. But we have to take this detour.	First that, under the pretext that I have defined the signifier as no one has dared, one not imagine that the sign is not my affair! Indeed to the contrary, it is the first; it will also the last. But there has to be this detour.
Ce que j'ai dénoncé d'une sémiotique implicite dont seul le désarroi aurait permis la linguistique, n'empêche pas qu'il faille la refaire, et de ce même nom, puisqu'en fait c'est de celle à faire, qu'à l'ancienne nous le reportons.	What I have denounced as an implicit semiotics whose disarray alone would have allowed linguistics, does not prevent its having to be redone, and with this same name, since in fact it is starting with that one (linguistics) to be done, that we take it (the name) back to the ancient one	What I have denounced of an implicit semiotics of which only the disarray would have permitted linguistics, does not prevent that it must be redone, and by this same name, since in fact it is to do this that as of old we carry this name forward.

	(semiotics).	
Si le signifiant représente un sujet, selon Lacan (pas un signifié) et pour un autre signifiant (ce qui veut dire : pas pour un autre sujet), alors comment peut-il, ce signifiant, tomber au signe qui de mémoire de logicien, représente quelque chose pour quelqu'un?	If the signifier represents a subject, according to Lacan (not a signified) and for another signifier (which means : not for another subject), then how can it, this signifier, fall into the sign which, since logic began, represents something for someone?	If the signifier represents a subject, according to Lacan (not a signified), and for another signifier (which means: not for another subject), then how can it, this signifier, fall to the sign which as the logician remembers, represents something for someone?
C'est au bouddhiste que je pense, à vouloir animer ma question cruciale de son : Pas de fumée sans feu.	It's the Buddhist I'm thinking of, wishing to animate my crucial question with his « No smoke without fire. »	It is of the Buddhist I think, in wishing to animate my crucial question from his: No smoke without fire.
Psychanalyste, c'est du signe que je suis averti. S'il me signale le quelque chose que j'ai à traiter, je sais d'avoir à la logique du signifiant trouvé à rompre le leurre du signe, que ce quelque chose est la division du sujet : laquelle division tient à ce que l'autre soit ce qui fait le signifiant, par quoi il	As a psychoanalyst it's of the sign I that I take notice. If it signals to me that something that I have to treat, I know from having found in the logic of the signifier that I have to break the bait of the sign, that this something is the division of the subject, which division results from the fact that the other	A psychoanalyst, it is by the sign that I am warned. If it signals to me the something I have to treat, I know from having found out how to break the lure of the sign to the logic of the signifier that this something is the division of the subject: which division owes to the other being what makes

<p>ne saurait représenter un sujet qu'à n'être un que de l'autre.</p>	<p>is what makes the signifier, by which it could not represent a subject except by being neither one nor the other.</p>	<p>the signifier, by which it would only know how to represent a subject as not being one except from the other.</p>
<p>Cette division répercute les avatars de l'assaut qui, telle quelle, l'a affrontée au savoir du sexuel – traumatiquement de ce que cet assaut soit à l'avance condamné à l'échec pour la raison que j'ai dite, que le signifiant n'est pas propre à donner corps à une formule qui soit du rapport sexuel.</p>	<p>This division has repercussions for the avatars of the assault which, such as it (the division) is, made it face the knowledge of the sexual – traumatically since this assault is doomed to failure in advance for the reason I have said, that the signifier is not appropriate to giving body to a formula dealing with the sexual relationship.</p>	<p>This division echoes the avatars of the assault that, as such, have confronted it with the knowledge of the sexual--traumatically in that this assault is condemned in advance to failure for the reason I have said, that the signifier is not proper to give body to a formula that would be of the sexual rapport.</p>
<p>D'où mon énonciation : il n'y a pas de rapport sexuel, sous-entendu : formulable dans la structure.</p>	<p>Whence my utterance : there is no sexual relationship, implicitly : formulatable in the structure.</p>	<p>Whence my enunciation: there is no sexual rapport, to be understood: formulable in structure.</p>
<p>Ce quelque chose où le psychanalyste, interprétant, fait intrusion de signifiant, certes je m'exténue, depuis vingt ans à ce qu'il ne le prenne pas pour une chose, puisque c'est faille, et de</p>	<p>This something where the psychoanalyst, interpreting, brings in the signifier, certainly I have made every effort, for twenty years, for him not to take it as a thing, since it is a split, and</p>	<p>This something where the psychoanalyst, interpreting, makes an intrusion of a signifier, certainly I have strained myself for twenty years so that he not take it for a thing, since it is a</p>

structure.	structural.	fault (<i>faille</i>), and of structure.
Mais qu'il veuille en faire quelqu'un est la même chose : ça va à la personnalité en personne, totale, comme à l'occasion on dégueule.	But if he wants to make someone of it (signifier) it's the same thing : it goes to the personality, in person, total, as occasionally one throws up.	But his wanting to make of it someone is the same thing: this goes to the personality in person, total, as one pukes out on occasion.
Le moindre souvenir de l'inconscient exige pourtant de maintenir à cette place le quelque deux, avec ce supplément de Freud [65] qu'il ne saurait satisfaire à aucune autre réunion que celle logique, qui s'inscrit: ou l'un ou l'autre.	The slightest memory from the unconscious demands however that one maintain in that place the « two or so », with the supplement from Freud [65] that he could not satisfy any other reunion except that logical one that is written either one or the other.	The least memory of the unconscious requires, however, maintaining at this place some two, with Freud's supplement [65] that it would not know how to satisfy any reunion except that of logic, which is written: either the one or the other.
Qu'il en soit ainsi du départ dont le signifiant vire au signe, où trouver maintenant le quelqu'un, qu'il faut lui procurer d'urgence?	That it is thus from the departure with which the signifier turns to the sign, where are we to find the someone that we have to procure for him urgently?	If it is thus for the from the departure from which the signifier veers to the sign, where are we to now find the someone, who must be procured for it urgently?

<p>C'est le <i>hic</i> qui ne se fait <i>nunc</i> qu'à être psychanalyste, mais aussi lacanien. Bientôt tout le monde le sera, mon audience en fait prodrome, donc les psychanalystes aussi. Y suffirait la montée au zénith social de l'objet dit par moi petit <i>a</i>, par l'effet d'angoisse que provoque l'évidement dont le produit notre discours, de manquer à sa production.</p>	<p>It's the <i>hic</i> which only makes itself <i>nunc</i> by being a psychoanalyst, but also Lacanian. Soon everyone will be Lacanian, if my audience is anything to go by, and psychoanalysts too. For that to happen, it would be enough that the object, said by me to be object <i>a</i>, through the effect of anguish that the emptying provokes of which our discourse produces, climb to the height of society, by lacking in its production.</p>	<p>It is the <i>hic</i> that is only made a <i>nunc</i> in being a psychoanalyst, but also a Lacanian one. Soon everyone will be one, my audience makes its prodrome, therefore psychoanalysts also. The rising to the social zenith of the object called by me my petit <i>a</i> would suffice there, by the effect of anxiety provoked by the hollowing out from which our discourse produces it, from failing at its production.</p>
<p>Que ce soit d'une telle chute que le signifiant tombe au signe, l'évidence est faite chez nous de ce que, quand on n'y sait plus à quel saint se vouer (autrement dit : qu'il n'y a plus de signifiant à frire, c'est ce que le saint fournit), on y achète n'importe quoi, une bagnole notamment, à quoi faire signe d'intelligence, si l'on peut dire, de son ennui, soit de l'affect du désir d'Autre-chose (avec un grand A).</p>	<p>That it is from such a fall that the signifier falls into the sign, the evidence is made in our house from the fact that when one no longer knows which saint to make a vow to (in other words there isn't another signifier to fry, that's what the saint provides), you buy anything at all, a car notably, by which one can make a sign of intelligence, if I can put it that way, of one's boredom, namely of the affect of the desire of Other-thing (with a capital O).</p>	<p>That it is from such a fall that the signifier falls to the sign is made evident to us in that, when one no longer knows which saint to devote oneself to (in other words: when there is no longer a signifier to fry, which is what the saint furnishes), one buys no matter what, a hot-rod (<i>bagnole</i>) notably, to make a sign of intelligence, if one can say so, of his boredom, the affect of the desire for an Other-thing (with a big O [A]).</p>

<p>Ça ne dit rien du petit a parce qu'il n'est déductible qu'à la mesure de la psychanalyse de chacun, ce qui explique que peu de psychanalystes le manient bien, même à le tenir de mon séminaire.</p>	<p>This says nothing of objet a because it is not deducible except in the measure of each person's psychoanalysis, which explains that few psychoanalysts handle it well, even when they get it from my seminar.</p>	<p>This says nothing of the petit a, because it is only deductible in the measure of the psychoanalysis of each, which explains why few psychoanalysts manage it well, even in owing it to my seminar.</p>
<p>Je parlerai donc en parabole, c'est-à-dire pour dérouter.</p>	<p>I will speak then in parables, that is to say to put you off the track.</p>	<p>I will therefore speak in parables, which is to say, to perplex.</p>
<p>A regarder de plus près le pas de fumée, si j'ose dire, peut-être franchira-t-on celui de s'apercevoir que c'est au feu que ce pas fait signe.</p>	<p>Looking more closely at the no smoke, dare I say, perhaps we will take the step of noticing that it is to fire that this no makes a sign.</p>	<p>Regarding the step (<i>pas</i>) of smoke, if I dare say so, perhaps one will make it in grasping that it is to the fire that this step makes a sign^{rgk1}. TN: Apparently a play on the double meaning of "<i>pas</i>," which can be translated either as step or as "no," as in <i>Pas de fumée sans feu</i> (no smoke without fire). rgk1 : Lacan here referring to Charles Saunders Peirce's theory of signs. Here, from the triad of signs : icon, index, symbol. An Index shows evidence of what's being represented. A good example is using an image of smoke to indicate fire. The index is a relation built on contiguity (metonymy) of what it represents</p>

		and is irreversible. Robinson Crusoe's discovery of a footprint in the sand is another example of the sign as index.
De quoi il fait signe, est conforme à notre structure, puisque depuis Prométhée, une fumée est plutôt le signe de ce sujet que représente une allumette pour sa boîte, et qu'à un Ulysse abordant un rivage inconnu, une fumée au premier chef laisse présumer que ce n'est pas une île déserte.	Of what it makes a sign is in line with our structure, because since Prometheus a smoke is rather the sign of that subject that a match represents for its box, and that for Ulysses approaching an unknown shore, a smoke at first blush allows one to presume that it is not a desert island.	What it makes a sign of is conformed to our structure, in that since Prometheus, a smoke is rather the sign of this subject that a match represents for its box, and for a Ulysses approaching an unknown shore, a smoke above all lets him presume that this is not a desert isle.
Notre fumée est donc le signe, pourquoi pas du fumeur? Mais allons-y du producteur de feu : ce sera plus matérialiste et dialectique à souhait.	Our smoke is therefore the sign, why not of the smoker? But let's go with the producer of fire : it will be more materialist and as dialectical as one could wish.	Our smoke is thus the sign, why not of the smoker? But let's go there from the producer of the fire: this will be more materialist and perfectly dialectical.
Qu'Ulysse pourtant donne le quelqu'un, est mis en doute à se rappeler qu'aussi bien il n'est personne. Il est en tout cas personne à ce que s'y trompe une fate polyphémique.	That Ulysses however gives the someone is put into question by reminding oneself that he is nobody. He is in any case nobody in that a polyphemic fate makes a mistake about him.	But that Ulysses gives us the someone is put in doubt in recalling that he is also no one. In any case, he is no one in that a smug Polyphemia is fooled by it.

<p>Mais l'évidence que ce ne soit pas pour faire signe à Ulysse que les fumeurs campent, nous suggère plus de rigueur au principe du signe. [66]</p>	<p>But the evidence that it is not to make a sign to Ulysses that the smokers are camping out suggests to us more rigour in the principle of the sign. [66]</p>	<p>But the evidence that it is not to make a sign to Ulysses that the smokers are holding camp, suggests for us a more rigorous approach to the principle of the sign. [66]</p>
<p>Car elle nous fait sentir, comme au passage, que ce qui pêche à voir le monde comme phénomène, c'est que le noumène, de ne pouvoir dès lors faire signe qu'au voũç, soit : au suprême quelqu'un, signe d'intelligence toujours, démontre de quelle pauvreté procède la vôtre à supposer que tout fait signe : c'est le quelqu'un de nulle part qui doit toujours manigancer.</p>	<p>For it (the evidence) makes us feel, as if in passing, that what is at fault in seeing the world as phenomenon, is that the noumenon, because from then on it can make a sign only to the voũç, to the supreme someone, still a sign of intelligence, demonstrates with what poverty your intelligence proceeds by supposing that everything makes a sign; it's the someone from no-where who must always set it up.</p>	<p>For it makes us feel, as in passing, that what sins in seeing the world as a phenomenon is that the noumenon, from only being henceforth able to make a sign to the voũç --that is: to the supreme someone, a sign of intelligence always-- demonstrates from what poverty ours proceeds in supposing that everything makes a sign: it is the someone from nowhere who must scheme it all out.</p>
<p>Que ça nous aide à mettre le : pas de fumée sans feu, au même pas que le : pas de prière sans dieu, pour qu'on entende ce qui change.</p>	<p>Let that help us to put the « no smoke without fire » on the same footing as the « no prayer without god », so that one can understand what changes.</p>	<p>Let this help us in putting the: no (<i>pas de</i>) smoke without fire, at the same step (<i>au même pas</i>) as the: no prayer without God, for one to hear what changes.</p>

<p>Il est curieux que les incendies de forêt ne montrent pas le quelqu'un auquel le sommeil imprudent du fumeur s'adresse.</p>	<p>It is odd that forest fires do not show the someone to whom the careless sleep of the smoker addresses itself.</p>	<p>It is curious that forest fires do not show the someone to whom the imprudent sleep of the smoker is addressed.</p>
<p>Et qu'il faille la joie phallique, l'urination primitive don't l'homme, dit la psychanalyse, répond au feu, pour mettre sur la voie de ce qu'il y ait Horatio, au ciel et sur la terre, d'autres matières à faire sujet que les objets qu' imagine votre connaissance.</p>	<p>And that it requires phallic joy, the primitive urination with which man, says psychoanalysis, responds to fire, to put us on the track that there are Horatio, in heaven and earth, other matters to make a subject than the objects that your knowledge imagines.</p>	<p>And that there has to be the phallic joy, the primitive urination with which man, says psychoanalysis^{rgk1}, responds to fire, to put us on the path of what there are, Horatio, in heaven and on earth, of other materials to make a subject than the objects your knowledge (<i>connaissance</i>) imagines. rgk1: See Freud's 1932 essay, "The Acquisition and Control of Fire". S.E. XXII, pages 183-193.</p>
<p>Les produits par exemple à la qualité desquels, dans la perspective marxiste de la plus-value, les producteurs, plutôt qu'au maître, pourraient demander compte de l'exploitation qu'ils subissent.</p>	<p>The products for example from the quality of which, in the Marxist perspective of surplus-value, the producers could demand an accounting rather than from the masters for the exploitation they undergo.</p>	<p>The products for example from the quality of which, in the Marxist perspective of surplus value (<i>plus-value</i>), rather than from the master, the producers could ask an explanation (<i>demander compte</i>) for the exploitation they undergo.</p>

Quand on reconnaîtra la sorte de plus-de-jouir qui fait dire « ça c'est quelqu'un », on sera sur la voie d'une matière dialectique peut-être plus active que la chair à Parti, employée comme baby-sitter de l'histoire. Cette voie, le psychanalyste pourrait l'éclairer de sa passe.

When one recognizes the sort of surplus-jouissance which makes one say « that is somebody », we will be on the track of a dialectical matter that is perhaps more active than the Party flesh, employed as baby-sitter for history. That track, the psychoanalyst might illuminate with his pass.

When one recognizes the sort of surplus enjoyment (*plus-de-jouir*) that makes one say "this (*ça*) is someone," one will be on the path of a dialectical material perhaps more active than the Party flesh, employed as history's *baby-sitter* [in English]. This path, the psychoanalyst could light it with his pass.