

<p>L'HOMME AUX LOUPS 1951-1952 See http://gaogoa.free.fr/SeminaireS.htm</p>		<p>THE WOLFMAN 1951-1952</p>
<p>On a connaissance de ce séminaire par Nicole Sels: Bibliographie des travaux de J.Lacan, ronéoté, n.d., EFP.</p>		<p>We know of this seminar through Nicole Sels "Bibliography of works by Jacques Lacan", mimeographed, no date EFP</p>
<p>Le séminaire se serait tenu dans l'appartement de l'auteur et n'aurait pas été sténotypé.</p>		<p>The seminar appears to have been held in the apartment of the author and was not typed.</p>
		<p>It appears to us that the notes at our disposal come from a pirate (unofficial) collection edited in Strasbourg "Jacques Lacan short writings and conferences 1969-1981" the collection, written hastily <five unreadable words> <three undreadable words> of preserving the original format (layout) of the text</p>
		<p>This one has 22 pages. It compresses a lot the typing of the version of the "secretariat", but does not have the same style "cadre de frappe"</p>
<p>Le texte n'est probablement pas de Lacan lui-même</p>		<p>The text is probably not by Lacan himself</p>
		<p>It appears to have been put together from student notes. Moreover it consists of three sections and an introduction. This strongly suggests a series of four talks distilled in this seminar. This is a hypothesis to be confirmed.</p>
<p>note de G.Taillandier, 26 novembre 1986.</p>		<p>E, (G.?) Taillandier November 26, 1986</p>
<p>(->p2) NOTES SUR L' " HOMME AUX LOUPS "</p>	<p>NOTES ON THE WOLFMAN, Draft 1</p>	<p>NOTES ABOUT THE WOLFMAN</p>
<p>FRENCH TEXT ESTABLISHED BY GERÔME TAILLANDIER</p>	<p>CORMAC GALLAGHER TRANSLATION</p>	<p>APRÈS-COUP PSYCHOANALYTIC ASSOCIATION GROUP</p>

		TRANSLATION FROM 2001-2002, A WORK-IN-PROCESS.
<u>L'Inconscient psychanalytique</u>	The psychoanalytic unconscious	The psychoanalytic unconscious
C'est le fruit du refoulement lié à certaines phases du développement infantile centrées sur le complexe d'Oedipe.	It is the fruit of repression linked to certain phases of childhood development centred on the Oedipus Complex	It is the result of repression linked to certain phases of infant (childhood) development centered on the Oedipus Complex.
Dans ce cas, on peut dire que le complexe d'Oedipe a été inachevé parce que le père est carrent. Le complexe d'Oedipe n'a pas pu se réaliser dans sa plénitude au bon moment: le malade reste avec seulement des amorces du complexe d'Oedipe.	In this case one should say that the Oedipus complex was incomplete because the father is deficient. The Oedipus complex could not therefore be realized in its plenitude at the right moment: the patient is left with only the beginnings of the Oedipus complex.	In this sense, one could say that the Oedipal complex was unresolved because the father is missing (lacking). Consequently, the Oedipal complex was unable to be realized (to come true) in its full plenitude at the right time: the patient is left with only the beginning of the Oedipal complex.
L'érotisme urétral est lié au trait de caractère ambitieux. Le langage en rend compte qui dit: "Il vise plus haut qu'il ne peut pisser" . . .	Urethral eroticism is linked to the character-trait of ambition. Language takes account of this with the expression: He's aiming higher than he can piss....."	Urethral eroticism is linked to an ambitious character trait. Language takes this into account when it says: "He aims higher that he can piss" ...
La passion ambitieuse a un caractère relatif: l'ambitieux veut toujours aller plus haut que l'autre, sa passion ambitieuse est donc toujours insatisfaite.	Ambition is a passion that has a relative character: the ambitious individual always wants to go higher than the other, so that his ambitious passion is always unsatisfied.	The ambitious passion has a relative character: the ambitious one wishes always to go higher than the other, his ambition is then always unsatisfied.
Rapport à deux de la phase de latence pré-oedipienne = rapport de dominance ou de soumission.	Dual relationships in the phase of pre-oedipal latency=relationship of dominance or submission	The relationship of two in the pre-Oedipal latency phase= a relationship of dominance or of submission.
La honte ne s'inscrit pas dans un rapport à l'autre.	Shame can be inscribed only in a relationship with an other.	The sense of shame is not introduced except in the relationship to the other.
L'"Homme au loups" permet électivement de mettre en relief les relations entre le développement du Moi et l'évolution de la libido.	The Wolfman allows the connections between the development of the ego and the development of the libido to be particularly well highlighted.	The Wolfman appears to underline on purpose the relationships between the development of the ego and the evolution of the libido.
Le conflit à base de super-ego est tout-à-fait au second plan dans cette observation. Le conflit est du registre des aspirations sexuelles	The conflict based on the super-ego is completely in the background in this observation. The conflict belongs to the	The benchmark conflict with the super-ego is complete on a second plane of this observation. The conflict is at

males et femelles.	register of male and female sexual aspirations.	the level of male and female sexual aspirations (desires, expectations).
On ne peut pas comprendre et englober tous les cas du refoulement si on ne met pas en lumière les rapports du narcissisme et de la libido.	One cannot understand or encompass all cases of repression if one does not clarify the connection between narcissism and libido.	One cannot understand and take in all of the instances (cases) of repression if one does not shed light on relationships of narcissism and the libido.
Chez l'animal, l'activation des fonctions sexuelles n'est pas du tout déliée de toute espèce d'activités et de références à l'autre et au semblable (pigeonne et miroir, parade et son rapport avec la parade.)	In the animal, the activation of sexual functions is not at all free from any kind of activity and reference to the other and to the fellow-creature (the female pigeon and the mirror, parade (?) and its connection with parade.)	Among animals, the activation of sexual functions is not entirely unrelated from all manner of activities and references to the other and members of its own species (pigeon and mirror, pairing, among birds, and its relationship with display.
(->p3) Chez l'homme, il existe des rapports de connaissance - comme homme et femme - entre individus. Chez les animaux, le rapport du sujet est un rapport à deux. Dans un rapport à deux va se constituer la référence femelle à mâle: connaissance du partenaire. Mais chez l'homme, il se connaît avant ces références au spectacle déterminant, l'individu a déjà au moins cette connaissance de lui-même (stade du miroir).	In man there exist relationships of knowledge between individuals, men and women. In animals, the relationship of the subject is a dual relationship. The male-female reference is constituted in a dual relationship: knowledge of the partner. But man knows himself before these references to the spectacle that determines him, the individual already has at least this knowledge of himself: the mirror stage.	With man, there exist relationships of familiarity—as man and woman—among individuals. Among animals, the relationship of the subject is a relationship of two. The male and female reference will be constituted within the relationship of two: familiarity of the partner. But with man, these references are known in advance of the determining spectacle; the individual at least already has that familiarity with himself (mirror stage).
En raison de cet accent mis dans l'expérience de ses exigences proprement narcissiques, il se révèle chez l'individu une sorte de prévalence d'un besoin de maîtrise qui va dans le sens contraire du choix instinctuel de l'objet et cela donne, dans le cas de l'homme aux loups, une situation très particulière. Le sujet fait un choix partiel et contrarié et cela l'amène à la méconnaissance de son partenaire féminin.	Because of the accent put experientially on his properly narcissistic requirements, there appears in the individual a sort of prevalence of a need for mastery which opposes the direction of his instinctual object-choice, and that produces a very special situation in the case of the Wolfman. The subject makes a partial and thwarted choice and this leads him to a misrecognition of his feminine partner.	As a function of this accent (emphasis) put on the experience of his properly (specifically) narcissistic exigencies (needs), a sort of prevalence of a want (desire) for mastery is revealed which runs contrary to the instinctual choice of the object and this results, in the case of the Wolfman, a very particular situation. The subject makes a partial and contradictory choice and this leads him to a mis-

		recognition of his feminine partner.
L'accent est mis sur la dimension agressive du rapport narcissique et cela provoque l'éclatement de sa libido et sa vie instinctuelle en est réduite à des explosions compulsives quand il rencontre une certaine image: celle de la servante accroupie, et il peut alors réaliser. Il est donc dans la position du maître (au sens Hégélien), c'est-à-dire qu'il est séparé de ses objets, dépossédé de son objet sexuel. Celui-ci étant constitutif du caractère et du monde humains normaux.	The accent is placed and maintained on the aggressive dimension of the narcissistic relationship and this provides the splintering of his libido, and his instinctual life is reduced to compulsive explosions when he encounters a certain image: that of the servant crouching down, and it can then be realized. He is therefore in the position of the master (in the Hegelian sense), namely that he is separated from his objects, dispossessed of his sexual object. This being constitutive of the normal human and human world.	The accent (emphasis) is put and supported (maintained), nourished on (by) the aggressive dimension of the narcissistic relationship and the provokes the onset of his libido and his instinctual life is reduced to compulsive explosions when he encounters a certain image: that of the squatting servant, and now he realizes. He is then in a role of master (in the Hegelian sense), that is to say he is separated from his subjects, and dispossessed from his sexual object. This constituting of a character and of the world of normal humans.
S'il n'arrive pas au rapport à trois c'est parce que le complexe d'Oedipe n'a pas été réalisé chez lui.	If he does not get as far as threefold relationships it is because the Oedipus complex was not realized in him.	If he does not attain a relationship of three it is because the oedipal complex has not been achieved within him.
<u>L'Expérience scopophilique est passivante.</u>	The scopophilic experience produces passivity	The scopophilic experience and passivity
Dans le refoulement Freud distingue le conflit, à l'intérieur du sujet, de la bi-sexualité (lutte narcissique pour maintenir sa virilité et réprimer, refouler la tendance homosexuelle	In repression Freud distinguishes, within the subject, the conflict about bisexuality (the narcissistic struggle to maintain his virility and to curb, to repress the homosexual tendency.	In repression Freud distinguishes the conflict, within the subject, of bisexuality (narcissistic struggle to maintain his virility and put down, repress the homosexual tendency).
La Moi prend parti: investissement narcissique de la force virile.	The ego takes sides: Narcissistic investment of the masculine force.	The ego joins in: narcissistic investment of the virile force.
Il peut y avoir conflit entre le Moi et quelque chose (->p4) venant des instincts sexuels: c'est un cas plus large que le premier (qui est un sous-cas).	There can also be a conflict between the ego and something coming from the sexual instincts: this is a more general case than the first (which is a subsidiary case).	There could also be conflict between the ego and something coming from the sexual instincts: it is a more general case than the first (which is a sub-case).
Chez l'homme aux loups le complexe d'Oedipe est inversé, et	In the Wolfman the Oedipus complex is inverted and this	In the Wolfman the Oedipal complex is inverted, and this,

ce, malgré la moins value de l'image paternelle.	despite the lesser value of the paternal image.	despite the lower value of the father's image.
Il y a un schisme entre la vie intellectuelle et la vie instinctuelle du sujet. Il y a des rapport hétéro-sexuels qu'il vit d'une manière compulsive, irruptive dans sa vie et qui est liée à un stéréotypage (image de la servante), et dépourvue des sentiments que comporte normalement cette situation sexuelle ; c'est un processus à deux, de maître à esclave.	There is a schism between the intellectual life and the instinctual life of the subject. There are hetero-sexual relationships that he lives out in a compulsive, intrusive way and which are linked to a stereotype (image of the servant) and lacking in the feelings that this sexual situation usually involves: it is a twofold process of master to slave.	There is a split between the intellectual life and instinctual life of the subject. He has heterosexual relationships that he lives (experiences) in a compulsive way, irruptive in his life and that are linked to a stereotype (the image of the servant), and deprived (lacking) of feelings that normally accompany these sexual situations: it is a process of two, of master and of slave.
La scène ravageante est survenue à la fin du stade du miroir: elle est passivante et cette passivité constitue une fixation homosexuelle inconsciente.	The destructive scene came at the end of the mirror stage: it induced passivity and this passivity constitutes the unconscious homosexual fixation.	The devastating scene occurring at the end of the mirror stage: it is pacifying and this passivity constitutes the unconscious homosexual fixation.
<u>La Phobie</u> : La peur de la castration est inséparable de l'image du père alors que la menace n'est pas exprimée par le père, mais au contraire par les femmes. Mais il est intervenu quelque chose qui a suppléé à l'absence du père et qui l'a fait sous la forme de l'initiation religieuse.	Phobia: The fear of castration is inseparable from the image of the father although the threat is not expressed by the father but on the contrary by women. But something intervened which made up for the father's absence and did this in the form of an initiation into religion.	The phobia: The fear of castration is inseparable from the image of the father now that the threat is not expressed by the father, but on the contrary by women. But something is introduced that replaces the absence of the father and does so in the form of a religious initiation.
Il y a superposition d'un petit noyau hystérique, d'une formation infantile de névrose obsessionnelle et d'une structure paranoïaque de la personnalité.	There are superimposed: a little kernel of hysteria, an infantile formation of obsessional neurosis and a paranoid personality.	There is an overlapping of a small hysterical nucleus (kernel), of a childhood formation of obsessional neurosis and of a paranoid structure of the personality.
Le père introduit un nouveau mode de référence à la réalité : c'est parce que la jouissance du sujet lui est d'une certaine façon ravie, qu'il peut se situer lui-même: c'est le rôle du complexe d'Oedipe	The father introduces a new mode of reference to reality: it is because the subject's enjoyment is in a way taken away from him that he can situate himself: this is the role of the Oedipus complex.	The father introduces a new mode of reference to reality: it is because the enjoyment of the subject is a sort of rapture that he can find himself: it is the role of the Oedipal complex.
Dans la rivalité, il y a deux faces : (une face de lutte, une face d'idéal et de modèle)	In rivalry there are two aspects: an aspect of struggle, an aspect of ideal and of model.	In rivalry, there are faces (sides of the coin): one face of battle;

		one face of the ideal and of the model.
Toute la difficulté pour l'être humain, avant la sexualité proprement génitale, est d'être un Moi qui se reconnaît et s'aliène (->p5) dans l'autre. La sexualité demande l'intervention d'un plan culturel. Par rapport au père le sujet va avoir à se situer.	The whole difficulty for the human being, before properly genital sexuality, is to be an ego which recognizes itself and alienates itself to the other. Sexuality requires the intervention of a cultural plane. The subject will have to situate himself with reference to the father.	The whole difficulty (problem) for the human being, prior to specifically genital sexuality, is to be an ego that recognizes and is in the other (that recognizes the other as alienated in it). Sexuality demands the intervention of a cultural plane. With respect to the father the subject will have to situate himself.
Dans la phobie il y a intervention de l'animal. A ce sujet, Freud fait intervenir les faits de totémisme: drame de l'Oedipe - drame du meurtre du père.	In phobia animals intervene. In this context Freud introduces the events of totemism: the Oedipal drama—the drama of the murder of the father.	Within the phobia there is an animal intervention. On that subject, Freud introduced the facts of totemism: the drama of Oedipus—the drama of the murder of the father.
Ce que l'on appelle la sublimation c'est la socialisation des instincts.	What is called sublimation is the socialization of instincts.	That which one calls sublimation is the socialization of the instinct.
<u>Dans le Refoulement</u> , il y a une exclusion de la conscience d'un certain relationnel qui n'en continue pas moins à dominer le sujet.	In repression there is exclusion from consciousness of a certain relational (trauma?) which continues nonetheless to dominate the subject.	In the repression, there is the exclusion (expulsion) of the consciousness of a certain rational that no longer continues to dominate the subject.
Le refoulement entraîne l'attraction propre d'une situation exclue de la conscience et la méconnaissance, l'aveuglement dans le système conscient subjectif et tout ce qui est coordonné à cette situation tend à rejoindre la masse du refoulé: c'est le système de l'inconscient qui a une inertie propre et qui continue à attirer dans cette sphère d'amnésie tout ce qui y est connexe et gêne la réalisation du sujet (comme par exemple ayant vécu telle situation Oedipienne). Tout ceci est assez électivement localisé autour du rapport au père et à la mère chez un sujet névrosé.	Repression brings with it a particular attraction for a situation that is excluded from consciousness and misrecognition, blindness in the subjective system of consciousness, and everything linked to this situation tends to rejoin the mass of the repressed: it is the system of unconsciousness which has its own inertia and continues to draw into this sphere of amnesia everything that is connected with it and impedes the fulfillment of the subject (like, for example, having experienced a particular Oedipal situation). All this is	The repression drives the attraction specifically of a situation that is excluded from consciousness and misrecognition, a blindness in the subjective consciousness system and all that is coordinated in that situation aims to catch up with the repressed mass (the mass of repressed stuff): it is the system of the unconscious that has an internal inertia and that continues to lure (draw, attract) within that sphere of amnesia (forgetfulness) all that is connected and hinders (hampers) the realization of the subject (for example having

	fairly specifically localized around the relationships with the mother and the father in the case of a neurotic subject.	lived such an Oedipal situation). All that is rather electively localized around the relationship with the father and the mother in a neurotic subject.
Le complexe d'Oedipe a aussi cette fonction normativante à côté de ses incidences sur la genèse des névroses.	The Oedipus complex also has a normalizing function as well as the incidence it may have on the genesis of neuroses.	The Oedipal complex also has a normative (normalizing) function along side (together with) these events in the genesis of neurosis.
(->p6)"L'HOMME AUX LOUPS" (N°1)	THE WOLFMAN-I	"WOLFMAN" (No. 1)
En étudiant le cas "Dora", nous avons vu que le transfert était lié à des anticipations subjectives chez l'analyste, et que le contre-transfert pouvait être considéré comme la somme des préjugés de l'analyste.	In studying the Dora case we have seen that transference is linked to the subjective anticipations of the analyst and that counter-transference could be considered as the sum of the analysts prejudices.	In studying the case of "Dora", we have seen that the transference is linked with subjective interests on the part of the analyst, and the counter-transference can be considered as the sum of preconceptions of the analyst.
Il faut essayer de voir ce qu'apporte et ce que signifie ce texte de l'Homme aux loups'.	We must try to see what this text of the Wolfman contributes and what it means.	One must try to see what is provided by and what is meant by this text of the Wolfman.
L' "Homme aux loups" est un personnage dont une partie de son drame est son insertion pourrait-on dire "désinsérée" dans la société. Il représente un certain trouble névrotique qui a été qualifié, avant que Freud ne la voit, d'état maniaco-dépressif. Pour Freud, il ne s'agit pas d'une telle classification nosographique, ce que présente l' "Homme aux loups" doit être considéré comme un état qui est celui suivant la guérison spontanée d'une névrose obsessionnelle.	The Wolfman is a person whose problems stem in part from what could be called an "uninserted" insertion into society. He presents a particular neurotic disturbance which had been described, before Freud saw him, as a manic-depressive state. For Freud there is no question of such a nosographical classification; what the Wolfman presents should be considered as a state following on from the spontaneous cure of an obsessional neurosis.	The Wolfman is a character (personage) where a part of his script (drama) is his insertion could one say un-contained "<désinsérée> in the society. He evinces a certain neurotic problem (trouble) that has been noted (discerned), before Freud ever saw him, of being manic-depressive. For Freud, it is not a matter of such a nosographic classification, what the Wolfman presents (shows, manifests) should be considered a state that following the spontaneous cure (healing, recovery) of an obsessive neurosis.
Après l'analyse faite par Freud, ce personnage a présenté un comportement psychotique.	After the analysis by Freud this person presented with psychotic behavior.	After the analysis conducted by Freud, this character manifests psychotic behavior.
Il faut noter que très précocement cet homme fut séparé de tout ce	It should be noted that very early on this man was	One should remark very precisely this man was

<p>qui se pouvait, sur la plan social, constituer pour lui un modèle... Toute la suite de son histoire doit se voir et se situer sur ce contexte.</p>	<p>separated from everything that, on the social level, could have constituted a model for him. Everything that follows in his history should be seen and situated in this context.</p>	<p>separated from all that he could , on the social plane, constitute for him a model...The rest of his whole story <histoire> must be seen and be situated within that context.</p>
<p>Freud a donc publié l'"Homme aux Loups", comme l'histoire d'une névrose infantile. Cette névrose de l'enfance a eu des manifestations variées et diverses dans leur structure. Si on y regarde de près, on voit que ce sur quoi l'observation de Freud est concentrée c'est sur la recherche passionnée, détaillée, contre les faits pourrait-on dire, de l'existence ou de la non existence d'évènement traumatisants dans la prime enfance.</p>	<p>Freud then published the Wolfman as the history of an infantile neurosis. This childhood neurosis had a variety of manifestations that had different structures. If you examine it carefully you see that what Freud's observations concentrates on is a detailed and passionate research, going one might say against the facts, into the existence or non-existence of traumatizing events in earliest childhood.</p>	<p>Freud therefore published the "Wolfman", as the history of a infantile neurosis. This childhood neurosis had had various and diverse manifestations in its structure. If one looks closely, one sees that on which Freud's observation was concentrated was on the passionate, detailed investigation despite (or against) the facts could one call it, of the existence or of the non-existence of traumatizing events in early childhood.</p>
<p>Dans ses écrits Freud a souvent insisté sur la difficulté qu'il eut à maintenir ses idées sur ce sujet, idées tirées de son champ d'expérience. Même dans son propre groupe il y eu des tentatives (->p7) pour diminuer et rendre plus acceptable au commun ces idées. Et de là naquirent les scissions inaugurées par Jung et Adler.</p>	<p>In his writings Freud often stressed the difficulty that he had in holding onto his ideas on this subject, ideas that were drawn from his own field of experience. Even in his own group there were attempts to lessen these ideas and to make them more acceptable to commonsense. From this were born the dissensions of Jung and Adler.</p>	<p>In his writings Freud often insisted on the difficulty that he had to maintain his ideas on this subject, ideas taken from the field of his experience. Even in his own group there were attempts (tendencies) to diminish make (render) his ideas more acceptable to the common reader <au commun>. And this gave birth to the breaks started (begun, initiated) by Jung and Adler.</p>
<p>Bien avant la déviation jungienne, dès le début des recherches sur l'hystérie, ont fut frappé par la régularité d'apparition d'histoires de séduction ou de viol s'avérant comme purement fantasmatiques. Ceci n'est pas une objection absolument valable contre la réalité d'évènements traumatiques de la prime enfance.</p>	<p>Well before the deviations of Jung, from the beginning of the researches on hysteria, what was striking was the appearance of stories of seduction or rape which turned out to be pure phantasms. This is not an absolutely valid objection against the reality of traumatic events in earliest childhood.</p>	<p>Well before the Jungian departure (deviation), from the beginning of the investigations on hysteria, one is struck by the recurrence (regularity) of the appearance of stories of seduction or rape that prove <s'avérant> to be purely phantasmatic. This is not a completely valid (fair) objection against the reality of traumatic events in early childhood (infancy).</p>

<p>Une objection plus grave est le caractère stéréotypé de la scène primitive: il s'agit toujours d'un coït à tergo. Et il y a là quelque chose de très problématique: est-ce là un schéma, une image phylogénique ressurgissant dans la reviviscence imaginaire (voir chapitre V de l'observation).</p>	<p>A more serious objection concerns the stereotyped character of the primal scene: it is always a question of <u>coitus a tergo</u>. And we have something very problematic: is it a phylogenetic schema of image merging to be relived in the imaginary? (cf Chapter V of the case history)</p>	<p>A more serious objection is the stereotypical character of the primal scene <scène primitive>; it always concerns "coitus a tergo". And there is something very problematic in that; that there is a scheme (construct), a reappearing (re-emerging) phylogenetic image in the imaginary reliving <reviviscence> (see chapter V of the observation)</p>
<p>Dans une analyse il est essentiel de ne pas détourner le sujet de la réalisation de ce qui est recherché. Il est important que le sujet fasse la réalisation pleine et entière de ce qui a été son "histoire".</p>	<p>In an analysis it is essential not to turn the subject away from the realization of what is sought. It is important that the subject should realize fully and entirely what has been his own "history".</p>	<p>In an analysis it is essential to not to divert (derail, deviate) the subject from the realization of what is being researched. It is important for the subject to make a complete and clear realization of what was his "story"</p>
<p>Qu'est-ce qu'une analyse? C'est quelque chose qui doit permettre au sujet d'assurer pleinement ce qui a été sa propre histoire.</p>	<p>What is an analysis? It is something that should allow the subject to fully assume what has been his own history.</p>	<p>What is an analysis? It is something that must allow the subject to fully accept what was his own story (history histoire>).</p>
<p>Dans l'analyse de l'"Homme aux Loups" Freud n'a jamais pu obtenir la réminiscence à proprement parler de la réalité dans le passé de la scène autour de laquelle tourne pourtant toute l'analyse du sujet.</p>	<p>In the analysis of the Wolfman Freud was never able to obtain, properly speaking, the recall of the reality in the past of the scene around which the whole of the analysis of the subject nevertheless turns.</p>	<p>In the Wolfman's analysis Freud was never able to obtain the reminiscence of, properly speaking, about the reality in the past of the scene around which nevertheless the whole analysis of the subject evolves (turns).</p>
<p>La réalité de l'évènement est une chose, mais il y a quelque chose d'autre: c'est l'historicité de l'évènement, c'est-à-dire quelque chose de souple et de décisif qui fut une impression chez le sujet et qui domina et qui fut nécessaire à expliquer la suite de son comportement. C'est cela qui reste l'importance essentielle de la discussion de Freud autour de l'évènement traumatique initial. Celui-ci fut reconstitué très indirectement grâce au rêve des loups. C'est Freud qui apprend au</p>	<p>The reality of the event is one thing, but there is something else: it is the historicity of the event, namely, something supple and decisive that consisted of the subjects impression, which dominated him and is necessary to explain his subsequent behavior. This is what remains the essential importance of Freud's discussion about the initial traumatic event. This was reconstituted very indirectly thanks to the wolf dream. It is</p>	<p>The reality of the event is one thing, but there is something else: it is the historicity of the event, that is to say something subtle and decisive that was an impression for the subject and that dominated and is necessary to explain the his ensuing behavior. That is what remains the essential importance of Freud's discussion about the initial traumatic event. That was reconstituted (reconstructed) very indirectly thanks to the</p>

<p>sujet à lire son rêve. Ce rêve se traduit comme un délire. Il n'y a qu'à l'inverser pour (->p8) le traduire: Les loups me regardent immobiles, très calmes: Je regarde une scène particulièrement agitée. On peut y ajouter: "Ces loups ont de belles queues, gare à la mienne"!</p>	<p>Freud who teaches the subject how to read his dream. The dream is translation like a delusion. To translate it, all that is required is to invert it. The wolves look at me without moving, very calmly: I am looking at a scene full of activity. One can add: "The wolves have lovely tails: my own is in danger"!</p>	<p>dream of the wolves. It is Freud who teaches the subject to read his dream. This dream is expressed like a delusion. One only has to invert (flip it around) it to translate it: the wolves are looking at me without moving, very calm: I am seeing a particularly agitated scene. One can add: "those wolves have pretty tails, beware of mine".</p>
<p>C'est ce rêve qui mène à la scène reconstruite et qui est ensuite assumée par le sujet.</p>	<p>It is this dream that leads to the reconstituted scene and which is afterwards assumed by the subject.</p>	<p>It is this dream that leads to the reconstructed scene and that is then assumed by the subject.</p>
<p>A noter, à propos de l'interprétation de ce rêve, l'attention portée par Freud au travail du rêve: Pour lui la signification d'un rêve se lit dans son travail d'élaboration, de transformation.</p>	<p>As regards the interpretation of this dream the attention Freud pays to the dream-work should be noted: for him the signification of the dream is to be seen above all in the work of elaboration, of transformation.</p>	<p>It should be noted, concerning the interpretation of this dream, the tension that Freud provides toward the dreamwork: for him the meaning of a dream is read in its (work of) elaboration, of transformation.</p>
<p>Cet évènement traumatique permet de comprendre tout ce qui s'est passé ensuite et tout ce qui est assumé par le sujet: son histoire.</p>	<p>This traumatic event allows us to understand everything that happened subsequently and everything that is assumed by the subject: his history.</p>	<p>This traumatic event allows the understanding of everything that happens afterwards and everything that is accepted by the subject: his story.</p>
<p>A ce propos, il n'est pas inutile de se demander qu'est-ce que c'est que c'est que l'histoire. Les animaux ont-ils une histoire?</p>	<p>In this connection it is not irrelevant to ask what history is? Have animals a history?</p>	<p>Concerning this it is not of no use to ask oneself what is the story? Do animals have a story?</p>
<p>L'histoire est-elle une dimension proprement humaine?</p>	<p>Is history a properly human dimension?</p>	<p>Is the story a specifically human dimension?</p>
<p>L'histoire est une vérité qui a cette propriété que le sujet qui l'assume en dépend dans sa constitution de sujet même et cette histoire dépend aussi du sujet lui-même car il la pense et la repense à sa façon.</p>	<p>History is a truth which has the property that the subject who assumes it depends on it for his very constitution as subject and history also depends on the subject himself since he conceptualizes it and then re-conceptualizes it in his own way.</p>	<p>The story is a truth that has this property that the subject who accepts (assumes) it depends on his constitution as subject himself and the story also depends on the subject himself because he thinks it and re-thinks it in his own way.</p>
<p>Une psychanalyse est-elle achevée quand l'analysé est capable d'avoir pleine conscience de lui-même?</p>	<p>Is a psychoanalysis completed only when the analysand is capable of becoming fully</p>	<p>Is a psychoanalysis successful (concluded) only when the analysand is capable of having</p>

<p>L'expérience de Freud exige que le sujet qui parle réalise sur un certain champ - celui des rapports symboliques - une intégration difficile: celle de sa sexualité qui est une réalité qui lui échappe en partie dans la mesure où il a échoué à symboliser d'une façon humaine certains rapports symboliques.</p>	<p>conscious of himself? Freud's experience requires that the speaking subject achieves in a certain field—that of symbolic relationships—a difficult integration: that of his sexuality which is a reality that escapes him in the measure that he has failed to symbolize in a human way certain symbolic relationships.</p>	<p>(able to have) complete awareness <conscience> of himself? Freud's experience demands that the subject who speaks realizes on a certain level (field <champ> - that of symbolic relations—a difficult assimilation <intégration>: that of his sexuality that is a reality that escapes him in part in so far as he failed to symbolize in a human way certain symbolic relationships.</p>
<p>L'expérience psychanalytique se situe pour le sujet sur la plan de "sa vérité". La psychanalyse est une expérience "en première personne".</p>	<p>Psychoanalytic experience is situated for the subject on the plane of "his truth". Psychoanalysis is an experience "in the first person".</p>	<p>The psychoanalytic experience is situated itself for the subject on the plane of "his truth". Psychoanalysis is an experience "in the first person".</p>
<p>Dans le cas de l'"Homme aux loups", pendant des mois et des années des séances n'apportent rien. C'est un sujet isolé par sa position de riche :</p>	<p>In the case of the Wolfman for months and years the sessions produce nothing. He is a subject isolated by his position as a rich man:</p>	<p>In the case of the Wolfman, the sessions produced nothing for months and years. He is an isolated subject because of his wealth:</p>
<p>son Moi est un moi fort - (comme tout moi de (->p9) névrotique) - . L' "Homme aux loups" n'arrive seulement pas à assumer sa propre vie. Sa vie instinctuelle est "incluse", "enkystée": tout ce qui est d'ordre instinctuel survient comme un raz de marée si il rencontre une femme jouant du chiffon à laver par terre, ou du balai, et qui montre son dos et ses fesses.</p>	<p>His ego is a strong ego—(like the ego of every neurotic). Not only does the Wolfman not succeed in assuming his own life. His instinctual life is "enclosed", "encysted": everything of the instinctual order comes on like a flood if he encounters a woman using a cloth to wash the floor, or a brush, and showing her back and her bottom.</p>	<p>His Ego is a strong ego ("me")—(like every neurotic ego). The Wolfman doesn't even come to assume his own life. His instinctual life is "enclosed", "stuck" <enkystée>: all that is of the instinctual order wells up like a tidal wave when he meets a woman playing <jouant du> with a cleaning rag on the floor, or with a broom, who shows her back and her ass.</p>
<p>Pendant des années donc cet homme parle et n'apporte rien, il se mire seulement dans la glace: la glace c'est l'auditeur, c'est-à-dire Freud en l'occurrence.</p>	<p>For years then, this man speaks without contributing a thing, he is admiring himself in the mirror; the mirror is the listener, namely Freud on this occasion.</p>	<p>Therefore, for years, this man talks and does not produce anything, he only looks at himself in the mirror; the mirror is the listener, which is to say, in this case, Freud.</p>
<p>Le langage n'est pas seulement un moyen de communication, quand un sujet parle, une part de ce qu'il dit a part de révélation pour un</p>	<p>Language is not just a means of communication; when a subject speaks a part of what he says consists in revealing himself to another.</p>	<p>Language <langage> is not only a means of communication, when a subject speaks; a part of what he says is in part</p>

autre.		(partakes) a revelation for an other.
Le progrès d'une analyse se juge quand on sait à quel moment le "vous" équilibre le "je" dont il s'agit.	The progress of an analysis can be judged when you know the moment at which the "you" balances the "I" that is in question.	The progress of an analysis is measured when one knows at which moment the "you" balances the "I" which is in question.
Dans l'analyse de l'"Homme aux loups", l'accent reste très longtemps sur le Moi et sur un Moi irréfutable. C'est alors que Freud fait intervenir un élément de pression temporelle. Et à partir de ce moment là, l'analyse se déclenche: l'homme aux loups prend son analyse en première personne: c'est "Je" qui parle et non plus "Moi".	In the Wolfman analysis the accent remains for a long time on the ego and on an ego that is unquestionable. It is then that Freud introduces an element of pressure of time. And from that moment the analysis takes off: the Wolfman takes on his analysis in the first person: It is "I: who speaks and no longer "Me". (moi)	In the analysis of the Wolfman the emphasis remains for a very long time on the ego and on an irrefutable ego. It is then that Freud introduces a temporal pressure. And from that moment on, the analysis begins (starts), is triggered, is unleashed, <se déclenche> the Wolfman thinks of the analysis in the first person: it is "I" who speaks and no longer the ego.
A se rappeler:	Remember:	To recall:
1. - L'évidence saisissable dans l'instant d'un regard.	1. -The evidence graspable in the moment of a look.	The graspable evidence in the instance of a glance (look) <regard>
2. -Étape: Celle du problème: travail de cogitation du "working through".	2.-Stage: That of the problem; the work of cogitating, of working through.	2-stage: that of the problem: cognitive work of the "working through".
3. - Étape: le moment de conclure: élément de hâte et d'urgence propre à toute espèce de choix et d'engagement	3.-Stage: The moment to conclude: the element of haste and urgency proper to every choice and commitment.	3-stage: The moment of conclusion: element of haste and urgency characteristic (belonging to) of every type of choice and commitment.
"L'HOMME AUX LOUPS" N°II	WOLFMAN No. II	"WOLFMAN" (No. 2)
(->p10) La question qu'il faut poser est celle des rapports du Moi et de l'instinct sexuel qui, chez l'homme, aboutit à l'instinct génital. L'observation de l'"Homme aux loups" est significative et instructive à cet endroit. L'"Homme aux loups" a une vie sexuelle réalisée, apparente, à caractère "inclus" (-"compulsionnelle" pour Freud) - Il s'agit d'un cycle de comportement qui, une fois déclenché, va jusqu'au bout et qui est "entre parenthèse" par rapport	The question that must be posed is that of the relationships between the ego and the sexual instinct which, in the case of man, culminates in the genital instinct. In this respect the Wolfman observation is significant and instructive. The Wolfman has a sexual life that is apparently fulfilled and has an "enclosed" character (=compulsive for Freud). It is a question of a cycle of behavior which once it is released goes all the way and	The question to ask (that must be posed) is that of the relationship between the ego and the sexual instinct that in the case of man leads <aboutit> to the genital instinct. Observing the Wolfman is significant and instructive here. The Wolfman has a realized <réalisée> sexual life, manifest <apparente>, of "inclusive" character (-"compulsive" for Freud) – it concerns a cycle of behavior that once triggered goes all the way and that is "in

<p>à l'ensemble de la personnalité du sujet. Cette sorte de parenthèse est frappante à côté de la confiance d'une vie à caractère également clos et fermé. L' "Homme aux loups" a honte de sa vie sexuelle, néanmoins elle existe et ponctue sa vie adulte ravagé par une dépression narcissique.</p>	<p>which is "in parenthesis: with regard to the personality of the subject. This kind of parenthesis is striking alongside the secrecy of a life which is also shut up and closed off. The Wolfman is ashamed of his sexual life, nevertheless it exists and punctuates an adult life devastated by a narcissistic depression.</p>	<p>parenthesis" in relation to the whole personality of the subject. This kind of parenthesis is striking together with the confiding <confidence> of a life with an equally (both) closed and inaccessible <clos et fermé> character. The Wolfman is ashamed of (is embarrassed by) his sexual life, still it exists and punctuates his adult life, ravaged by narcissistic depression.</p>
<p>L' "Homme aux loups" a eu avec sa soeur des rapports proprement génitaux. Il n'y a pas d'arriération instinctive à proprement parler chez lui. Il a des réactions instinctives très vives et prêtes à pénétrer à travers l'opacité qui fixe et fait stagner sa personnalité dans un état proprement narcissique. On trouve une virilité de structure narcissique (termes adlériens presque affleurants)</p>	<p>The Wolfman had with his sister properly genital relationships. There is, properly speaking, no instinctual retardation in his case. There are very lively instinctive reactions which are ready to break through the opacity that fixes and stagnates his personality in a properly narcissistic state. We find a virility with a narcissistic structure (touching almost on Adlerian terms).</p>	<p>The Wolfman had had specifically genital relations with his sister. There is not any specifically instinctual <arriération> handicap (limitations, hindrances) to speak of in him. He has very lively <vives> instinctive reactions ready to penetrate through the opacity that stops <fixe> and makes stagnant his personality in a specifically narcissistic stage (condition). One finds a virility of a narcissistic structure almost surfacing at the level of Adlerian terms.</p>
<p>On peut partir du schéma classique du refoulement: le refoulement est lié à la rivalité avec le père et qui est inassumable (rival tout puissant) et sanctionné par une contrainte, une menace, celle de la castration. Il y a donc dissociation entre la sexualité et le Moi; processus à double face et ayant un résultat normatif et heureux (période de latence). Mais le retour du refoulé provoque les névroses infantiles survenant dans la période de latence.</p>	<p>We can begin from the classical schema for repression: repression is linked to rivalry with the father which cannot be integrated (all powerful rival) and is sanctioned by a constraint, a threat, that of castration. Therefore there is a dissociation between sexuality and the ego; a two-sided process having a normative and happy outcome (latency period). But the return of the repressed provokes the childhood neuroses arising in the latency period.</p>	<p>One can begin with the classical schema of repression: the repression is linked (related, associated with, tied) to the rivalry with the father and that is not acceptable <inassumable> (all powerful rival) and punished by (limitation of freedom, constraint, encumbrance) <contrainte>, a threat, that of castration. There is then a dissociation between sexuality and the ego; a two-sided (bivalent) development having a normative and happy result (latency period). But the return of the repressed provokes</p>

<p>Ici la rivalité avec le père est loin d'être réalisée et est remplacée par une relation qui, dès l'origine, se présente comme une affinité élective avec le père; l'Homme aux loups" aimait son père qui était très gentil avec lui; il y a une (->p11) préférence affective. Le père n'est pas le castrateur ni dans ses actes, ni dans son être (il est vite bien malade, plus chartré (<i>chatré</i>) que castrateur). Et pourtant Freud nous dit que la peur de la castration domine toute l'histoire de ce malade. Freud se demande si c'est en fonction d'un schéma phylogénique.</p>	<p>Here the rivalry with the father is far from being realized and is replaced by a relationship that from the beginning presents itself as a preferential affinity for the father: the Wolfman loved his father who was very kind to him; there is an affective preference. The father is not a castrator either in his actions or in his being (very quickly he falls ill, more castrated than castrator). And nevertheless Freud tells us that the fear of castration dominates the whole history of the patient. Freud asks himself whether it is in function of a phylogenetic schema.</p>	<p>childhood neurosis occurring during the period of latency.</p> <p>Here the rivalry with the father is far from being realized and it is replaced (substituted) by a relationship that from the beginning presents itself as a relationship among equals <affinité élective> with the father: the Wolfman loved his father who was very affectionate with him: there is a preference for affection <préférence affective>. The father is not castrating neither in his acts nor in his being (he soon becomes very ill, more imprisoned than castrator). Nevertheless Freud tells us that the fear of castration dominates the whole story of the patient <malade>. Freud asks himself if this is not a function of a phylogenetic scheme.</p>
<p>La relation d'ordre symbolique que le sujet cherche à conquérir car elle lui apporte sa satisfaction propre, est la suivante: Tout se passe comme si, sur le fondement d'une relation réelle, l'enfant, pour des raisons liées à son entrée dans la vie sexuelle, recherchait un père castrateur: qui soit le géniteur, le personnage qui punit: il cherche le père symbolique (pas son père réel) ayant avec lui des rapports punitifs (et cela juste après la séduction de sa soeur). L'enfant a une attitude provocatrice et il cherche une satisfaction: être puni par son père. La différence entre ce père symbolique et le père réel n'est pas chose rare.</p>	<p>The relationship in the symbolic order that the subject tries to conquer, because it brings him his own special satisfaction, is the following: everything happens as if, on the basis of a real relationship, the child, for reasons bound up with his entry into sexual life, is seeking out a castrating father: who can be the begetter, the person who punishes: he is looking for the symbolic father (not the real father) who would have a punitive relationship with him (this happens just after his seduction by his sister). The child has a provocative attitude and he is looking for one satisfaction: to be punished by his father. The difference between the symbolic father</p>	<p>The relationship of the symbolic order that the subject seeks to win because it (<elle>) = the relation) provides him with its own satisfaction, is the following: everything transpires as if on the basis of a real relationship, the child, for reasons linked to his introduction into sexual life, searched for a castrating father: who would be the progenitor, the person who punishes: he looks for the symbolic father (not his real father) as he has with him a punitive relationship (and this just before the seduction by his sister). The child has a provocative attitude and searches for satisfaction: to be punished by his father. The difference between this</p>

	and the real father is not something unusual.	symbolic father and the real father is not a rare thing.
Une autre chose est également importante pour éclairer notre recherche: c'est l'instruction religieuse qui est donnée par une femme (Freud considère cette instruction religieuse comme un facteur d'apaisement).	Something else is important to throw light on our research: this is the religious instruction which is given by a woman. (Freud considers this religious instruction to be a calming element).	Another thing is important to clarify our research: the religious education given by a woman (Freud considers the religious education as an appeasing factor).
Dans le langage de Freud la sublimation a un sens différent de l'image vulgaire qu'on s'en fait: c'est-à-dire le passage d'un instinct à un registre plus sublime. Pour Freud, c'est l'initiation d'un sujet à un symbole plus ou moins socialisé et objet de croyance universelle.	In Freud's language sublimation has a different meaning to the popular image given to it: namely, an instinct passing onto a more sublime register. For Freud it is the initiation of a subject into the symbol that is more or less socialized and the object of universal belief.	In Freud's language <language> sublimation has a different meaning than the vulgar image that one has of it: which is to say the passage of one instinct to a more sublime level. For Freud it is the initiation of a subject to more or less socialized symbol and object of universal belief.
Pendant un certain temps, l'enfant est calmé grâce à cela.	Thanks to the child is calmed down for some time.	For a time, the child is pacified (calmed) thanks to that.
Pour Freud, la religion est une illusion car sa structure dogmatique lui paraît mythique.	For Freud religion is an illusion because its dogmatic structure seemed to him to be mythical.	For Freud religion is an illusion because its dogmatic structure seems to him mythic.
Pour Freud, la satisfaction du désir de l'homme exige d'être reconnue. Cette reconnaissance devient l'objet même du désir de l'homme. Quand le petit d'homme ne trouve pas la forme d'une religion, il s'en fait une: c'est la névrose obsessionnelle, (->p12) et c'est ce que la religion évite. Ce que l'instruction religieuse apprend à l'enfant c'est le nom du Père et de Fils. Mais il manque l'esprit: c'est-à-dire le sentiment du respect. La religion traçait les voies par lesquelles on pouvait témoigner l'amour pour le père, "sans le sentiment de culpabilité inséparable des aspirations amoureuses individuelles" (Freud). Mais, pour l' "Homme aux loups", il manquait une voix pleinement autorisée. Un père qui incarne le bien, le père symbolique. Et la	For Freud the satisfaction of man's desire needs to be recognized. This recognition becomes the very object of man's desire. When the young man does not find the form of a religion he makes one for himself: this is the obsessional neurosis and it is what religion spares him. What religious instruction teaches the child is the name of the Father and of the Son. But the Spirit is missing, namely the sentiment of respect. Religion traced out the paths along which love could be shown for the father "without the feeling of guilt inseparable from the loving aspirations of the individual" (Freud). But for the Wolfman a fully authorized voice was missing. A father who	For Freud, the satisfaction of man's desire demands to be recognized. This recognition becomes the very object of man's desire. When the little-in-man <le petit d'homme> does not find a form of a religion, he makes up his own: it is the obsessive neurosis and that is what religion precludes (helps to avoid, avoids <évite>. What religious education teaches the child is the name of the Father and of the Son. But it lacks the spirit: that is to say the feeling of respect, Religion points the ways by which one can witness love for the father, "without the feelings of guilt that are inseparable from the longings (ambitions) of love" (Freud). But for the Wolfman a clearly authorized voice was

<p>révolte liée au masochisme se manifeste (critique religieuse que fait l'enfant). Quand apparaît le répétiteur qui peut incarner la fonction du père et qui dit: "la religion c'est des blagues", tout cela ne tient pas longtemps. Car, dans ce cas, il n'y a pas de super-ego: l'enfant n'a pas pu s'identifier à une image proprement paternelle remplissant la fonction symbolique du Père. Pour cela et du même coup il n'a pas pu réaliser non plus le complexe d'Oedipe normativant. Ses relations, dans le triangle oedipien le montre identifié à la mère. L'objet de ses désir est le père. On le sait grâce au rêve d'angoisse. Dans ses antécédents immédiats se trouve l'attente du double don pour le jour de Noël. Le "double don" manifeste sa duplicité par rapport au père" (le cadeau de Noël manifeste la transcendance de l'enfant par rapport à l'adulte). L'enfant est l'étranger échappant à l'ordre où on se reconnaît; l'enfant sent qu'il y a tout un monde organisé du côté de l'adulte et auquel il n'est pas initié à proprement parler. Le rapport enfant-adulte est d'amour mais cet amour est aussi repoussé: l'enfant pige tout et d'un autre côté ne sait pas tout. Et ceci explique que l'enfant s'introduise d'un seul coup dans un système complet de langage en tant que système d'une langue et non épellation de la réalité.</p>	<p>incarnated the good, the symbolic father. And the rebellion linked to masochism manifests itself (the criticism of religion made by the child). When there arrives on the scene the tutor who can embody the function of the father and who tells him: "religion is nonsense", none of this holds together for very long. Because in this case there is no super-ego; the child was not able to identify himself with a properly paternal imago fulfilling the symbolic function of the father. Because of this he is at the same time unable to realize either a normalizing Oedipus complex. His relationships in the oedipal triangle show him to be identified with his mother. The object of his desires is the father. We know this from the anxiety dream. Immediately preceding it we find the expectant wait for this double gift on Christmas day. The "double gift" shows his duplicity in relation to the father (the Christmas present manifests the transcendence of the child compared to the adult). The child is a stranger stumbling on an order where one can be recognized; the child sense that there is a whole organized world for adults into which he has not, properly speaking, been initiated. The child-adult relationship is a love-relationship but this love is also rejected: the child understands everything and on the other hand he does not know everything. And this is what explains that a child introduces</p>	<p>missing. A father who incarnates the good, the symbolic father. And the revolt linked to masochism is manifested (criticism of religion made by the child). When the tutor who can incarnate the father function appears, and says: "religion is a joke", all of this does not hold together for very long. Because in this case there is no superego: the child could not identify himself with a specifically paternal image fulfilling (of) the symbolic function of the Father. Because of this and at the same time, he also could not overcome (realize) the normative Oedipal complex. His relationships in the Oedipal triangle show him identified with the mother. The object of his desires is the father. One knows it thanks to his anxiety dream. In his immediately preceding experiences <antécédents> we find the longing for a double Christmas day gift. The double gift manifests its duplicity with respect to the father (the Christmas day gift manifests the transcendence of the child with respect to the adult). The child is the stranger escaping the order in which one recognizes oneself: the child feels that there is a whole organized world on the side of adults to which he has not ben initiated literally speaking. The child-adult relationship is of love but this love is also rejected: the child understands everything (gets it <pige> and on the other hand does not know everything. And this explains why the child</p>
---	---	---

	himself into a complete system of language qua language-system (langue) and not as a spelling out of reality.	introduces himself all at once into a complete system of language <langage> in so far as a system of language <une langue> and not a spelling out of reality.
L'"Homme aux loups" voulait donc son cadeau de Noël et celui de son anniversaire. Pour lui, qui se considère comme le fils de son seul Père, il veut aussi un don d'amour réel. Et (->p13) autour de cela se cristallise le rêve-cauchemar essentiel. C'est un rêve d'angoisse. Celle-ci n'est pas toujours liée au retour du refoulé dans la conscience (le refoulé étant quelque chose qui n'a pas été mémorisé symboliquement).	The Wolfman therefore wanted his Christmas and his birthday present. He also wants for himself, since he considers himself to be the son of his only father, he also wants a real gift of love. And around this the essential nightmare-dream crystallizes. It is an anxiety dream. This is not always linked to the return of (the repressed being something that was not able to be remembered symbolically).	The Wolfman wanted therefore his Christmas present and birthday present. For him who considers himself as the son of his own and only Father he also wants a gift of real love. And around this is crystallized the essential dream-nightmare. It is an anxiety dream. It is not always linked to the return of what is repressed in the conscious (the repressed is a thing that was not memorized symbolically).
Il y a deux mémoires à distinguer. L'enfant se souvient de quelque chose qui a existé et qui ne peut pas être remémoré sur le plan symbolique. Et cela détermine pourtant tout son comportement ultérieur qui donne cette "sexualité fendue en éclats": c'est le drame du développement de cet enfant.	There are two memories to be distinguished. The child remembers something that did exist and cannot be called to mind on the symbolic plane. And nevertheless this determines all his future behavior and gives the "splintered sexuality": it is the drama of this child's development.	Two memories must be distinguished. The child remembers something that existed and cannot be recalled (re-memorized <rememoror>) on the symbolic plane. And this notwithstanding determines all his later (subsequent) behavior that gives this "sexuality split into shared (smithereens)": It is the drama of the development of the child.
Dans l'analyse de ce rêve il y a deux plans :	In the analysis of the dream there are two planes:	In the analysis of the dream there are two levels <plans>:
1°) les mythes qui sont dans le registre de sa tentative d'assumer les mythes socialisant (le conte à une valeur de satisfaction suturante qui introduit l'enfant dans un moyen de communication qui le satisfait).	1) The myths which are in the register of his attempt to assume the socializing myths (the fairy-tale has a value of all-pervading satisfaction that introduces the child into a method of communication that satisfies him).	1) The myths that are in the register of his attempts to adopt the socializing myths (the story has a saturating satisfaction value that introduces the child to a means of communication that satisfies him).
2°) Après ça, il n'y a plus rien et c'est Freud seul qui interprète ce rêve qui a la valeur de l'irruption de la scène primitive elle-même dans	2) There is nothing further after that and it is Freud alone who interprets this dream which has the value of being the irruption	2)After that there is no more and it is Freud alone who interprets this dream that has the value of the bursting (irruption) of the primal scene

<p>la conscience nocturne.</p>	<p>of the primal scene itself into nocturnal consciousness.</p>	<p>itself in the nocturnal consciousness.</p>
<p>Pour le comprendre il faut l'inverser, ce rêve. La réalité visée a été abolie par ce renversement: fenêtre ouverte: c'est l'inverse du voile qui enveloppe le sujet: c'est un miroir où il va se voir lui-même regardant (sous la forme de ces animaux qui le regardent) - une scène agitée: le père et la mère ayant un coïtus à tergo. Ceci entraîna un relâchement sphinctérien dû à la terreur. (Ceci représentant un cadeau organique du bébé). Le malade a oublié cette scène qui est inintégréable à sa mémoire consciente. Elle ressurgit quand il tente de médiatiser son désir en créant un rapport symbolique avec le père. Dans son inconscient il s'agit d'un rapport homo-sexuel passif. Mais celui-ci est refoulé par une exigence narcissique. Qu'est-ce que le narcissisme? Une relation libidinale avec le corps propre? Le rapport narcissique est centré par une réflexion: une image spéculaire, narcissique et une identification à l'autre. Il y a une ambiguïté totale (->p14) le sujet est à la fois lui et l'autre. Autre chose: il y a un rôle de l'image imprégnate dans l'érotisation de l'image de l'autre. Là se posent toutes les questions de la bi-sexualité. Féminisé dans l'inconscient, sujet sur le plan du Moi, choisit avec la dernière énergie la position justement opposée. Comment expliquer cela? En se référant aux rapports qui, dans la nature, existent entre la parade et la pariade: il y a une relation à une certaine image dont l'affrontement est réalisé de façon assez contingente. Il s'établit une réaction de parade: c'est une sorte</p>	<p>This dream, to be understood, must be inverted. The reality alluded to had been abolished by this reversal. The open window is the inverse of the veil that envelops the subject; it is the mirror in which he will see himself looking (in the form of those animals looking at him) – a scene of violent movement: the mother and father having <u>coitus a tergo</u>. This caused a relaxation of the sphincter due to his terror. (This representing an organic present from the baby). The patient had forgotten this scene which could not be integrated into his conscious memory. It reemerges when he tries to mediate his desire by creating a symbolic relationship with the father. In his unconscious it is a question of a passive homosexual relationship. But this is repressed by narcissistic requirements. What is narcissism? A libidinal relationship with one's own body? The narcissistic relationship is focused by a reflection: a narcissistic mirror image and an identification with the other. There is total ambiguity; the subject is at the same time himself and the other. Another thing: there is a role for the impregnating image in the eroticizing of the image of the other. Here all the questions of bi-sexuality arise. Feminized in the unconscious the subject, on the plane of the ego, chooses with fierce energy the precisely opposite position. How can this be explained? By</p>	<p>To understand it, this dream has to be turned around (inverted), The <visée> reality referred to had been abolished by this inversion: open window: it is the reverse side of the curtain that envelops the subject: it is a mirror where he will see himself watching (in the form of those animals watching him) an agitated scene: the father and the mother having a "coitus a tergo". This gave rise to release of the sphincter owing to the terror. (This represents an organic present from the baby). The patient had forgotten this scene that cannot be subsumed in his conscious memory. The scene re-emerges when he tried to mediate his desire by creating a symbolic relationship with the father. In his unconscious it is a matter of a passive homosexual relationship. But this is repressed by a narcissistic need. What is narcissism? A libidinal relationship with one's own body. The narcissistic relationship is countered by a reflection: a specular narcissistic image and identification to the other. There is total ambiguity (:) the subject is at the same time himself and the other. Another thing: there is a role of the impregnating image in the eroticization of the image of the other. There all the questions of the bisexuality are posed. Feminized in the unconscious, (the) subject, at the level of the ego, chooses as a final recourse <avec la</p>

<p>d'épreuve qui donne un changement dans l'attitude des partenaires et l'un et l'autre, et l'un par rapport à l'autre, se reconnaissent. Par là se complète une sorte de schéma inné et les rôles sont fixés, répartis une fois pour toute. Peut-on dire qu'il y a quelque chose d'analogue dans la référence imaginaire aux personnages dans la scène primitive? D'où conflit entre une impression féminisante et une expérience du corps complet; spéculaire (voir la leçon de Freud sur la féminité) . Le rapport à une image univoque et phallique nous met en présence du phénomène qui, dans l'expérience clinique garde un caractère original. Tout se passe comme si un phénomène de relation imaginaire à lui-même recouvrait, éteignait tout ce qui est de l'autre registre. D'où l'identification à la mère dans la scène primitive est rejetée: l'image de l'identification féminine est du côté de l'image du corps morcelé, en arrière pour le malade. Et c'est pourquoi la libido narcissique, confirmation narcissique, doit amener une dénégation absolue de sa teneur (ou teinte - le mot manque dans le texte) homosexuelle: il y a prévalence de l'image complétée (phallique) du corps. La réévocation de l'image morcelée du corps provoque la résurgence d'un état antérieur du Moi et cela donne de l'angoisse. Ainsi s'explique le caractère narcissique de l'affirmation virile du sujet et, de là, vient aussi la difficulté (->p15) pour atteindre un objet hétéro-sexuel.</p>	<p>referring to the relationships that exist in nature between parade and <u>pariade</u> (?): there is a relationship to a particular image which is confronted in a fairly contingent manner. A parade-reaction is set up: it is a kind of challenge which brings about a change in the attitude of the partners to one another, and they recognize one another. In this way a sort of innate schema is brought to completion and the roles are fixed, allotted once and for all. Can one say that this is something analogous in the imaginary reference to the characters in the primal scene? Whence a conflict between a feminizing impression and an experience of the whole specular body (cf Freud's lecture on femininity). The relationship with a univocal phallic image confronts us with the phenomenon that retains an original stamp in clinical experience. It is just as if a phenomenon having an imaginary relationship to himself covered over, extinguished, everything that is of the other register. Hence the identification with the mother in the primitive scene is rejected; the image of feminine identification is associated with the image of the fragmented body, in the background for the subject. And this is why the narcissistic libido, narcissistic confirmation, must lead to an absolute denegation of its homosexual tenor (or colouring: the word is missing in the text): the completed (phallic) image of the fragmented body</p>	<p>dernière énergie > the diametrically <justement> opposed position. How do we explain this? By referring to the relationships that in nature exists between display and pairing: there is an association <relation> with a certain image where the confrontation is realized in a very contingent way. A reaction of display is established: it is a sort of test that provokes <donne> a change in the attitudes of the partners and one and the other, and one in relation to the other, recognizes himself. Thereby a kind of innate scheme is completed and the roles are fixed, apportioned once and for all. Can one say that there is something analogous in the imaginary reference to the people in the primitive scene? Therefore (there is) conflict between a reminiscent impression and an experience of the complete body: specular (see Freud's lecture on femininity). The relation to a univocal (unambiguous) and phallic image puts us in the presence of the phenomenon that in the clinical experience holds (maintains, keeps) an original character. Everything happens as if a phenomenon of imaginary relation to himself covered up, extinguishes all that is of the other register. Therefore the identification with the mother in the primitive scene is rejected: the image of the feminine identification is on the side of the image of the cut up (fragmented, <morcelée> body</p>
--	---	--

	<p>provokes a resurgence of an earlier state of the ego and this produces anxiety. This explains the narcissistic character of the subject affirmation of virility, and from this there also comes the difficulty of attaining a hetero-sexual object.</p>	<p>in the past <en arrière> for the patient. And that is why narcissitic libido, narcissistic confirmation, must lead to a absolute denial of his (the patient <sa> homosexual tenor (or shade (aspect <teinte>) - the word is missing in the text): there is a prevalence of the completed image (phallic) of the body. The re-evoking of the fragmented image of the body brings about the re-emergence of a previous state of the ego and that causes anxiety. In this way the narcissistic character of the virile proposition <affirmative> of the subject is explained and from there also comes the difficulty of attaining a heterosexual object.</p>
<p>L'identification à la soeur est certaine (il y a un an et demi de différence entre eux = bonne différence: "note sensible" au sens que cela a en musique). A ce point que, quand la soeur est morte, elle est comme résorbée en lui-même. Il ne peut pas pour cela accepter les problèmes avancés de sa soeur qui lui aurait donné accès à un stade proprement génital.</p>	<p>The identification with the sister is certain (there is a year and a half between them = the right difference: the "leading note" in the musical sense of the term). To the point that when the sister dies, she is as if were reabsorbed into him. Because of this he cannot accept the first advances by his sister which would have given him access to a properly genital stage.</p>	<p>For the identification with the sister is certain (there is a year and half difference) (in age) between them –a good difference: "sensitive note: with the meaning it has in music). It (the identification) is storn to the point that when the sister died, she is as if absorbed <résorbée> in him <lui-même>. Because of that he cannot accept the first advances of his sister that would have given him access to a specifically genital stage.</p>
<p>Pour que l'identification se produise chez l'homme, ce doit être par l'intermédiaire d'un modèle réalisé: adulte, féminin ou masculin (il y a une différence avec les animaux: chez eux l'épreuve est passivante pour l'un, motivante pour l'autre).</p>	<p>For identification to occur in man it must be mediated by a fully realized model: a masculine or feminine adult (it is different to animals: in their case the experience makes one passive, the other active).</p>	<p>For the identification to occur in man it must be through an intermediary of a finished <réalisé> model: adult, feminine or masculine (there is a difference with animals: for them the test (contest, event) is passive <passivante> for one, active (motivating <motivante> for the other).</p>
<p>L'homme s'anticipe dans son image complétée avant qu'il l'ait</p>	<p>Man anticipates himself in his completed image before he has</p>	<p>Man anticipates himself as a finished image before he has</p>

atteinte. D'où fantasme de castration: le pénis peut être pris ou enlevé.	attained it. Whence fantasms or castration: the penis can be taken or removed.	attained it. Therefore the castration fantasy: the penis can be taken or taken away (removed, made to disappear, taken by force).
L'identification narcissique est fragile et toujours menacée.	Narcissistic identification is fragile and always threatened.	The narcissistic identification is fragile and always threatened.
L'école française a touché à quelque chose de juste en liant l'oblativité à la maturation de la fonction génitale. Mais ce lien est très complexe. Le sens véritable de l'oblativité se trouve dans une relation de don constitutive d'un accès plein à la sexualité humaine. (L'altruisme est différent qui est lié à une identification narcissique de l'autre).	The French school touched on something authentic by linking oblativity to the maturation of the genital function. But this bond is a very complex one. The true meaning of oblativity is found in a gift-relationship that constitutes a complete access to human sexuality. (Altruism, which is linked to a narcissistic identification with the other, is something different).	The French school touched upon something true in linking gift giving <oblativité> to the maturing of the genital function. But that is very complex. The veritable meaning of gift giving is found in the relation of the gift constitutive a full access to human sexuality. (Altruism is different in that it <qui> is linked to the narcissistic identification of the other).
L'oblativité véritable est une relation symbolique qui fait que le désir de l'homme se reconnaît et se médiatise par le désir de l'autre: sorte de coupure du désir de l'autre.	True oblativity is a symbolic relationship which ensures that man's desire is recognized and mediated by the desire of the other: a sort of capture of the desire of the other.	The veritable gift giving is a symbolic relation that causes the desire of man to be recognized (itself) and is mediated by the desire of the other: a kind of capture by the desire of the other.
L'HOMME AUX LOUPS- (SUITE N°III)	WOLFMAN No. 3	WOLFMAN (No 3)
(->p16) Nos explications ont montré que l'observation de l'"Homme aux loups" permettait de poser des questions et d'apporter des lumières sur la question du transfert. Dans ce cas, comme nous l'avons vu dans l'étude de l'historicité, nous pouvons ouvrir le problème d'une façon qui dépasse de beaucoup l'observation..	Our explanations have shown that the case-history of the Wolfman allows us to pose questions about and throw light on the question of transference. In this case, as we have seen in the study of historicity, we can open up the problem in a way that goes well beyond the case-history.	Our explanations showed that the observation of the Wolfman allowed us to pose questions and shed some light on the issue of transference. In this case as we have seen in the study of the historicity, we can attack (approach), handle <ouvrir> the problem in a way that goes well beyond observation.
Dans l'observation de Ruth Mac Brunswick une chose est claire : ce qui reste est plus qu'un résidu morbide, ce qui est au centre de la cure avec R.M. Brunswick c'est le transfert.	In Ruth Mack Brunswick's case-history one thing is clear: what remains is more than a morbid residue, what is at the centre of the analysis with Ruth Mack Brunswick is the transference.	In Ruth Mack Brunswick's observation one thing is clear: what remains is more than a morbid residue, what was at the center of the cure with R. M. Brunswick is the transference.

<p>Pendant toute la période de cure avec R. M. Brunswick il ne s'agit plus du malade, on ne parle que de Freud. Par le don de la parole quelque chose est changé dans la position réciproque de ceux qui se sont parlé. Ce que Freud a été pour le patient est donc tout le temps là au premier plan.</p>	<p>Throughout the whole period of treatment with Ruth Mack Brunswick it is no longer the patient that is in question; Freud is the only one that is spoken about. By the gift of the word something has changed in the reciprocal position of those who have spoken to one another. What Freud had been for the patient is therefore always in the foreground.</p>	<p>During the whole period of the cure with R.M. Brunswick it is not about the patient, he only talks about Freud. Through the gift of speech something is changed in the reciprocal position of those who spoke to each other. What Freud had been for the patient is therefore always there on the surface.</p>
<p>Il n'est donc pas douteux qu'on voit se poser dans la seconde partie de l'histoire de l' "homme aux loups" le transfert comme intermédiaire entre l'analysé et l'analyste. R. Mac Brunswick se pose la question de savoir ce qui a été la cause de la seconde poussée morbide, c'est-à-dire la détermination de la seconde maladie. Et c'est le transfert. Elle pense que c'est une sorte de tendance qui est tout à fait fondamentale dans les relations affectives du sujet: elle l'exprime en termes d'affectivité.</p>	<p>There is therefore no doubt that in the second part of the history of the Wolfman one sees the transference being posed as intermediary between the analyst and the one analyzed. Ruth Mack Brunswick poses a question as to the cause of the second outbreak of morbidity, namely the determination of the second illness. And it is the transference. She thinks it is a kind of quite fundamental tendency in the affective relationships of the subject: she expresses herself in terms of affectivity.</p>	<p>There is therefore no doubt that one sees posed in the second part of the story of the Wolfman the transference as an intermediary between the analysand and the analyst. R. Mack Brunswick asks herself the question what was the cause of the second morbid outbreak, that is to say, the determination of the second illness. And it is the transference. She thinks that it is a kind of tendency that is completely fundamental in the affective relationships of the subject: she expresses it in terms of affectivity.</p>
<p>Quand le patient est revenu voir Freud pour la seconde fois, Freud dit avoir analysé le transfert. R.M. Brunswick dit qu'il s'agit de la passivité primordiale du sujet et porte la lumière sur le fait que Freud l'a coincé sur une date, une échéance. Les patients retiennent jusqu'à la dernière limite quelque chose. Dans ce cas, on peut penser que si le sujet a été ainsi-forcé- , il a dû garder une position. Là est le ressort du transfert non liquidé. Mme Mac Brunswick dit aussi qu'il y a quelque chose de curieux. Il n'y a pas d'exemples que, au cours d'une analyse (->p17) profonde, toutes les attitudes possibles d'un</p>	<p>When the patient came back to see Freud for the second time, Freud says that he analyzed the transference then. Ruth Mack Brunswick says that it is a question of the primordial passivity of the subject and puts the spotlight on the fact that Freud got him stuck on a date, on a time-scale. Patients hold on to something as long as possible. In this case one may assume that if the subject was "forced" he had to hold on to a position. This is the source of the unliquidated transfer. Mrs. Mack Brunswick says also that there is something curious.</p>	<p>When the patient came back to see Freud for the second time, Freud says to have then analyzed the transference. R.M. Brunswick says that it is a matter of the primordial passivity of the subject and sheds light on the fact that Freud cornered him on a date, a deadline < échéance >. Patients hold back something until the last limit. In this case, one can think that if the subject had been "forced" in this way, he should have kept a position. There is the originating factor (incentive, motive) of the unsettled transference. Mme.</p>

<p>sujet ne se révèlent. La psychanalyse de l' "Homme aux loups" fut totale et épuise le matériel et pourtant jamais une attitude paranoïaque ne se manifeste (Ainsi donc l'explication par "un moyen resté pas atteint" n'est pas une explication valable).</p>	<p>There are no cases in which in the course of a thoroughgoing analysis all the possible attitudes of a subject are not revealed. The Wolfman's analysis was complete and exhausted the material and nevertheless a paranoid attitude was never disclosed. (Therefore the explanation in terms of a "kernel that remained untouched: is not a valid explanation).</p>	<p>Mack Brunswick also says that there is something curious there. There are no examples that, in the course of a profound analysis, all possible attitudes of a subject are revealed. The analysis of the Wolfman was complete and used up (consumed) the material and nevertheless no paranoid attitude is manifested (In this way then the explanation of "a way that remains unattained" is not a valid explanation).</p>
<p>Il faut s'attacher à voir les différentes relations paternelles de ce sujet, toutes celles dont il est capable. Dans la dernière phase de la maladie on voit s'incarner les différents types de relations paternelles. Les dentistes et les dermatologues forment deux séries de personnages très différents.</p>	<p>One must look carefully at the different paternal relations of this subject, all those that he is capable of. In the last phase of the illness one can see different types of paternal relationships being incarnated. Dentists and dermatologists are two very different series of personages.</p>	<p>One has to concentrate to see the different paternal relationships of this subject, all those of which he is capable. In the last phase of the illness one sees the the different types of paternal relationships incarnated. The dentists and the dermatologists make up two very different series of characters.</p>
<p>La recherche de la punition, de la castration paternelle par le sujet est différentes de l'identification elle-même. Donc il y a deux séries:</p>	<p>The search by the subject for punishment, for paternal castration, is different to the identification itself. Therefore there are two series.</p>	<p>The seeking of punishment, of the paternal castration by the subject is different from the identification itself. Therefore there are two series:</p>
<p>D'une part: les pères castrateurs, représentés par les dentistes: ils arrachent les dents bonnes où mauvaises et le malade ne leur en veut pas. Ceci montre ce que recherche le sujet: plus il lui en feront, mieux cela vaudra pour lui.</p>	<p>On the one hand: the castrating fathers represented by the dentists: they extract good and bad teeth but the patient does not hold it against them. This shows what the subject is looking for: the more they do to him, the better it is for him.</p>	<p>On the one hand: the castrating fathers represented by the dentists: they pull out the teeth good or bad and the patient bears them no grudge. This shows what the subject seeks: the more they do him, the better it is for him.</p>
<p>Avec eux, son mode de relation est spécial: c'est de la méfiance, méfiance qui ne l'empêchera pas de leur faire confiance: plus il se méfie et plus il se confie ...</p>	<p>His style of relating to them is very special: it is one of distrust, distrust which does not prevent him from trusting them: the more he distrusts the more he entrusts himself to them....</p>	<p>With them, his type of relationship is special: it is of distrust that will not prevent him from trusting them: the more he distrusts the more he confides...</p>

<p>D'autre part, un autre type paternel: les Pères mortifères: sur le plan de la relation imaginaire la plus primitive, contre laquelle le moi du sujet fuit et se dérobe avec une sorte de panique. Ce type est lié à l'image de la scène primitive: il identifie le sujet (à ?) cette attitude passive cause de suprême angoisse, car elle équivaut au morcelage primitif. D'où la rénovation de ce malaise et désordre primordial. Le danger vient alors de l'intérieur et il faut choisir: refouler ou tout remettre en question: c'est une menace mortelle: le contre-coup ambivalent d'une agressivité radicale.</p>	<p>On the other hand, a different paternal type: fathers who are death-bearing on the plane of the most primitive imaginary relationship, in face of whom the ego of the subject flees and hides itself in a sort of panic. This type is linked to the image of the primal scene: it identifies the subject with that passive attitude which is the cause of his most extreme anxiety, because it is equivalent to primal fragmentation. Hence the renewal of this primordial <u>malaise</u> and disorder. Thus the danger comes from within and a choice must be made: to repress or to put everything in question again is a mortal threat: the ambivalent repercussion of a radical aggressivity.</p>	<p>On the other hand, a different paternal type: the mortifying heros: at the level of the imaginary relationship the most primal, from which the ego <moi> of the subject flees and hides with a kind of panic. This type is linked to the image of the primal scene: it identifies the subject to this passive attitude reason of great anxiety, because it is equivalent to the primal fragmentation. Therefore there is a renewal of this uneasiness and primordial confusion (disturbances) <désordre>. The danger therefore comes from within, and he must choose: repress or question everything: it is a lethal threat: the ambivalent response (recoil, parry) <contre-coup> of a radical aggressivity.</p>
<p>Pour l'"Homme aux loups", le nez représente un symbole senti, imaginaire: le trou que tous les autres pourraient voir.</p>	<p>For the Wolfman the nose is felt as an imaginary symbol: the hole that everyone else can see.</p>	<p>For the Wolfman, the nose represents a sensitized, imaginary symbol: the hole that all others could see.</p>
<p>(->p18) A mesure que se développe l'analyse de R. Mac Brunswick, on voit entre le personnage castrateur et l'autre (le professeur I, son plus mortel ennemi) se passer des phases successives.</p>	<p>According as the analysis with Ruth Mack Brunswick develops one sees successive phases occurring between the castrating person and the other (Professor X, his most deadly enemy).</p>	<p>As the analysis of R. Mack Brunswick develops one sees successive phases occurring between the castrating character and the other (the professor X, his most lethal enemy).</p>
<p>Pour l'"Homme aux loups", il était le fils favori de Freud. La réaction type, celle qui correspond à la méfiance, c'est l'hypocondrie: signe émergent. Il cacha à Freud (qui lui a versé une rente) qu'il avait pu récupérer quelques bijoux et quelques ressources alors que, jusque là, il était considéré à juste titre comme un honnête homme. Est-ce qu'il voit dans la rente un gage d'amour qui lui est dû? Où est-ce plus lié à la réalité? Freud</p>	<p>As far as the Wolfman was concerned he was "Freud's favorite son". The typical reaction corresponding to distrust is hypochondria: signs emerged. He hid from Freud (who paid him an allowance) the fact that he had been able to recuperate some jewels and some resources, even though until then he had been rightly considered to be an honest man. Does he see in the</p>	<p>For the Wolfman, he was "Freud's favorite son." The typical reaction, that corresponds to distrust, is hypochondria: emerging sign. He hid from Freud (who was gibving him a pension <rent> that he had been able to recover some jewelry and money whereas, until then, he had been considered rightfully <à juste titre> an honest man. Does he see in the pension a</p>

<p>l'ayant empêché de retourner en Russie récupérer ses biens quand cela était encore possible, ceci est-il un sourd grief compensé par le fait qu'il croit que Freud lui a donné ce mauvais conseil par amour, pour le garder ? Quoi qu'il en soit, il considère que cela lui est dû, ce don d'argent.</p>	<p>allowance a gage of the love that is his due? Or is it more closely linked to reality? Since Freud prevented him from returning to Russia to recuperate his goods when it was still possible, is this a silent reproach compensated for by the fact that he thinks that Freud gave him this bad advice out of love, in order to hold onto him? In any case he thinks that this monetary gift is his due.</p>	<p>pledge of love that is due to him? Or is it more linked to reality? Freud having kept him from returning to Russia to recover his possessions when that was still possible, is this a silent complaint compensated by the fact that he believes Freud gave him this bad advice out of love, to keep him? Whatever it may be, he considers it is due to him, this gift of money.</p>
<p>Le destin sert Madame Mac Brunswick et lui permet de pénétrer dans les positions du malade. Au moment de la mort du professeur X, elle marque en effet un premier pas en avant dans les défenses du patient qui sur l'heure, derrière le symptôme hypocondriaque, révèle: "Il est mort, je ne pourrai donc plus le tuer". C'est là le fantasme qui sort d'abord et qui est suivi du contenu persécutif longtemps mijoté: délire de persécution. La disparition même de l'objet supprime la saturation dans une relation qui peut rester sous forme de tension. C'est alors que Madame Mac Brunswick interprète: "Le professeur X, c'est Freud" ... Le sujet nie car, la relation à laquelle il se tient, en ce qui concerne Freud, est celle de fils favori. Autre face du délire qui apparaît alors, celle du délire de grandeur. C'est la même chose sous une forme différente (ex: Le professeur X apparaît dans un rêve comme l'analyste). Que va être le pas suivant? R. Mac Brunswick le pousse assez dans ses retranchements pour démanteler sa position de fils favori. Et alors, les choses sont abordées (->p19) sur le plan de la réalité actuelle de</p>	<p>Fate then played into Ruth Mack Brunswick's hands and helped her to fathom the patient's position. At the time of Professor X's death she takes a first step forward in the defenses of the patient who at the moment, behind his hypochondriacal symptom, reveals: "He is dead, therefore I can't kill him any more" (1972, 283). This is the fantasy that emerges first and it is followed by the long-simmering persecutory content: a persecutory delusion. The very dearth of the object puts an end to the saturation in a relationship which can remain in the form of tension. It is then that Ruth Mack Brunswick interprets: "Professor X is Freud" The subject denies it because the relationship that he held onto as regards Freud is that of a favorite son. Another aspect of the delusion then appears, that of the delusion of grandeur (the so-called R.M.B. (?)). It is the same thing in a different form (for example: Professor X appears in a dream as the analyst). What is the next step? Ruth Mack Brunswick</p>	<p>Destiny serves Mme Mack Brunswick and allows her to penetrate into the position of the patient. At the moment of the death of professor X, she underlines in effect a step forward in the defenses of the patient who at the time <sur l'heure>, behind the hypochondria symptoms, reveals: "He is dead, I therefore can no longer kill him." There is the fantasy that appears first and is followed by the longtime-simmering persecuting content: delusion of persecution. The disappearance itself of the object suppresses the saturation in a relationship that can remain tense <sous forme de tension>. That is where R. Mack Brunswick interprets: professor X is Freud. . . "The subject denies, because the relationship that he wants, in so much as Freud is concerned, is that of the favorite son. Another side of the delusion, that appears then, that of the delusion of grandeur (says R.M.B.). It is the same thing in a different form (ex.: professor X appears in a dream as the</p>

<p>l'analyste: Dans quelle mesure Freud y est-il réellement présent? R. Mac Brunswick lui montre que Freud ne s'intéresse pas à son cas. Alors, le sujet se comporte comme un fou. Freud apparaît tout de suite après dans un rêve spectaculaire. Rêve du père malade ressemblant à un musicien ambulancier etc ... C'est un rêve en miroir: Le père est lui-même et Freud contre qui il apporte la revendication: " il a refusé sa vieille musique, c'est un Juif, un sale Juif". Qu'est-ce que ce don qu'il y a entre eux? C'est la remise en question de toutes les relations qu'il a eues avec Freud et ces relations sont à peine des relations à un objet et sont essentiellement agressives. Le sujet est alors à l'acmé de son désordre mais la suite des rêves montre des progrès dans le sens d'un retour à la réalité. Le fond de la question, c'est son sens à lui, à savoir les loups. Dans un rêve l'origine instinctuelle de ses troubles est de l'autre côté d'une muraille à la limite de laquelle se trouve R. Mac Brunswick. Lui est d'un côté, les loups de l'autre: c'est la symbolisation du rôle, dans la détermination de sa psychose, de son désir, que ses désirs soient reconnus par l'autre et trouvent ainsi leur sens.</p>	<p>weakens his defenses to the extent that his position as Freud's "favorite son" can be dismantled. And then matters are approached on the plane of the present reality of the analyst: In what measure is Freud really present in it? Ruth Mack Brunswick shows him that Freud is not interested in his case (265). The subject then behaves like a lunatic. Freud appears immediately afterwards in a spectacular dream. The dream of the sick father looking like a begging musician. It is a mirror dream. The father is himself and Freud against whom he is making his complaint: "he refused his old music, he is a Jew, a <u>sale juif</u>". What is the meaning of this gift that exists between them? It is a reassessment of all the relationships he had with Freud and these relationships are scarcely object-relations and are essentially aggressive. The subject is now at the height of his disorder but the following dreams show progress in the sense of a return to reality. The core of the problem is "his own meaning", namely the wolves. In a dream the instinctual origin of his troubles is on the other side of a wall at the end of which is found Ruth Mack Brunswick. He is on one side, the wolves on the other: it is the symbolization of the role that his desire has in determining his psychosis, that his desires should be recognized by the other and therefore find a meaning.</p>	<p>analyst). What will the next step be? R. Mack Brunswick pushes him enough in his entrenchment to dismantle his position of "the favorite son." And now, things are treated (assumed) on the level of the present reality of the analyst: to what extent is Freud actually present? R. Mack Brunswick shows him that Freud is not interested in his case. Now the subject behaves like a madman. Freud appears right away afterwards in a spectacular dream. Dream of the sick father resembling a minstrel, etc. It is a mirror dream: the father is himself and Freud (the person?) against whom he brings the vindication (claim): "he refused his old music, he is a Jew, a dirty Jew." What is this gift that there is between them? It is the re-questioning of all the relationships that he has had with Freud and those relationships are hardly relationships that he has had with Freud and those relationships are hardly to an object and are essentially aggressive. The subject is then at the acme of his confusion but the following dreams show progress in the direction of a return to reality. The basis of the question, is "his meaning to himself", that is the wolves. In a dream the instinctual origin of his troubles is on the other side of a wall at the limit of which R. Mack Brunswick is found. He is on one side, and the wolves on the other: it is the symbolization of the role, in the determination of his psychosis, of his desire, that his desires be</p>
--	--	---

		recognized by the other and in this way find their meaning.
<p>Un autre tournant est marqué par le rêve de la destruction des icônes: celle-ci représentant le ressort, la signification fondamentale par rapport au dogme chrétien: le Dieu incarné dans un homme: repousser les images saintes c'est nier l'incarnation. Au moment de sa névrose infantile, la religion a failli socialiser ces difficultés (ébauche de guérison). Mais cela a échoué dans le dogme de l'incarnation. Les rapports entre Dieu Père et Fils sont sentis comme masochiques et le renvoyaient à son angoisse fondamentale devant la passivation absolue de la scène primitive. Tout son moi n'est rien d'autre que la négation de sa passivité fondamentale. Son type d'identification est fondé sur (->p20) le rapport symbolique humain et culturel qui définit le Père, non seulement comme le géniteur, mais aussi comme maître à pouvoir souverain: rapport de maître à esclave. Toute l'histoire du sujet est scandée par la recherche d'un Père symbolique et punisseur, mais sans succès. Ce que Freud a vu de plus clair dans le transfert paternel, c'est la crainte d'être mangé.</p>	<p>Another turning-point is marked by the dream of the destruction of the icons: these represent the source, the fundamental signification compared to Christian dogma: the God incarnated in a man: to reject the holy images is to reject the incarnation. At the time of his infantile neurosis, religion had almost socialized his difficulties (the beginning of a cure). But it came to grief on the dogma of the incarnation. The relationship between God the Father and his Son are felt to be masochistic and send him back to his fundamental anxiety before the absolute passivity of the primal scene. His whole ego is nothing other than the negation of his fundamental passivity. His type of identification is founded on the symbolic human and cultural relationship that defines the father not just as the Begetter but as the master who has sovereign power: master-slave relationship. The whole history of the subject is punctuated by the search for a symbolic, punishing father, but without success. The real father is very kind and besides his strength has failed. What Freud saw as being clearest in the paternal transference is the fear of being eaten.</p>	<p>Another turn is marked by the dream of the destruction of icons: these represent the originating factor (incentive, motive), the fundamental meaning in relation to Christian dogma: the God incarnated in a man: to repel the saintly images is to deny the incarnation. At the moment of his infantile neurosis, religion failed to socialize his difficulties (outline of healing). But that has stumbled against the dogma of incarnation. The relations between God the Father and the Son are felt as masochistic? <masochiques> and send him back to his fundamental anxiety in front of the absolute passivity <passivation> of the primal scene. All his ego <moi> is nothing more than the negation of his fundamental passivity. His type of identification is based on the symbolid relation human and cultural that defines the Father, not only as the Progenitor, but also as master of sovereign power: relation of master and slave. The whole history of the subject is punctuated by the search of a symbolic and punishing Father, but without success. The real father is very nice and what is more, diminished. What Freud saw more clearly in the paternal transference, is the fear of being eaten.</p>
<p>On doit rappeler la conception dialectique de l'expérience analytique. Dans le rapport de la parole elle-même, tous les modes de rapports possibles entre les</p>	<p>The dialectical conception of analytic experience should be recalled. In the relationship of the world itself, every possible type of relationship between</p>	<p>We must remember the dialectical conception of the analytic experience. Within the relations of the spoken word itself, all the types of possible</p>

<p>êtres humains se manifestent. Il y a une différence entre un sujet qui dit " je suis comme ça " et un sujet qui dit "je vous demande de me dire qui je suis". Il y a une fonction de la parole que ce soit une fonction de méconnaissance ou de mensonge délibéré, il existe néanmoins un certain rapport avec ce qu'elle est chargée de faire reconnaître en le niant. Autour de ce don de la parole s'établit une certaine relation de transfert. Donc, ce qui se passe entre le sujet et son analyste est un don: celui de la parole. Le sujet ne se fait reconnaître qu'à la fin. Le don va du sujet à l'analyste. Et plus, le sujet donne de l'argent. Pourquoi? Il y a là un paradoxe apparent. Le don d'argent n'est pas une pure et simple rétribution (le mot d'honoraires en témoigne du reste). Pour comprendre ce don d'argent, on doit le comparer aux prestations des primitifs qui sacralisaient les choses. Le don d'argent à l'analyste à la même signification que le don que fait le disciple au maître mais cela constitue le maître comme garant de cette parole et assure qu'il ne l'échange pas, qu'il continuera à en prendre soin.</p>	<p>human beings in manifested. There is a difference between a subject who says "That's the way I am" and a subject who says "I want you to tell me who I am". There is a function of the word that it should be a function of miscognition or of deliberate mis-truth, there nevertheless exists a certain relationship with what it is charged with revealing by denying it (?). Around this gift of the word a certain transference-relationship is established. Therefore what happens between the subject and his analyst is a gift: that of the word. Thus, the subject only comes to be recognized at the end. The gift goes from the subject to the analyst. As well as that the subject gives money. Why? There is here an apparent paradox. The gift of money is not a pure and simple remuneration (this moreover is witnessed by the word honorarium). To understand the gift of money it should be compared to the offerings of the primitives by which things are made sacred. The gift of money to the analyst has the same signification as the gift the disciple makes to his master but that establishes the master as the guarantor of that word and ensures that he will not exchange it, that will continue to take care of it.</p>	<p>relations between human beings manifests themselves. There is a difference between a subject that says "I am this way" and a subject that says "I ask you to tell me who I am." There is a function of speech that is either a function of failure to recongnize or a deliberate lie, there exists nevertheless (however) a certain relation with what it is charged (responsible for) to make recognizable by denying it. Around this gift of speech a certain relationship of transference is established. Therefore, what happens between the subject and his analyst is a gift: that of speech. The subject, therefore does not make himself known until the end. The gift goes (travels) from the subject to the analyst. And more, the subject pays. Why? There is there an apparent paradox. The gift of money is not a pure and simple remuneration (payment) (the word 'fee' shows it moreover). To understand this gift of money one has to compare it to the dues of the primitive that sanctify things. The gift of money to the analyst has the same meaning as the gift that the disciple gives to the master but makes the master a gurantor of that speech and assures that he will not exchange it, that he will continue to take care of it.</p>
<p>Quelle a donc été la fonction de l'argent dans l'ensemble de l'histoire du sujet? C'est un sujet qui a une structure mentale de "riche". Le mode de relation dialectique entre le Fils et le Père</p>	<p>What then had been the function of money in the whole history of the subject? He is a subject who has the mental structure of a rich man. The mode of dialectical relationship</p>	<p>What was then the function of money in the whole of the history of the subject? It is a subject who has a mental structure of "wealth." The types of dialectic relationships</p>

<p>dans l'Oedipe entraîne une identification à un père qui soit un vrai père: un maître ayant des risques et des responsabilités. Il y a quelque chose de tout différent entre cela et la structure bourgeoise qui gagne actuellement. Ce qui se transmet c'est alors le patrimoine. Il en résulte que chez ce sujet le caractère aliénant de ce pouvoir incarné par la richesse est évident. Cela a recouvert cette relation qui ne put jamais être autre que narcissique avec son Père. Et la mort de la soeur a ce sens: " je suis le seul à hériter ".</p>	<p>between the son and the father in the Oedipus complex involves an identification with the father who is a real father: a master having risks and responsibilities. There is something completely different between this and the bourgeois structures that are now gaining ground. What is transmitted in this case is the patrimony. The result is that for this subject the alienating character of this power incarnated by wealth is evident. This covered over the relationship with his father which could never be anything but narcissistic. And the death of his sister has the meaning: "I am the sole heir."</p>	<p>between the Son and the Father in Oedipus involves an identification to a father who would be a real father: a master having risks and responsibilities. There is something completely different between that and the bourgeois structure that endures today. What is transmitted is therefore the patrimony. What results is that in this subject the alienating character of this power incarnated by wealth is evident. This recovered the relationship that could never be other than narcissistic with his Father, and the death of the sister has this meaning: "I am the only one to inherit."</p>
<p>Si un malade comme celui là vient trouver Freud cela montre que dans sa misère, son abjection de riche, il veut demander quelque chose. Il tente d'établir quelque chose de nouveau. Freud est un maître auquel il demande secours. Le ressort de la relation qu'il tente d'établir est qu'elle est la voie par où il veut établir une relation paternelle. Il n'y arrive pas car Freud était un peu trop un maître. Son prestige personnel tendait à abolir entre lui et le malade un certain type de transfert: Freud fût trop identifié à un père trop suprême pour pouvoir être efficace. Cela laisse le sujet dans son circuit infernal. Il n'a jamais eu de père qui symbolise et incarne le Père, on lui a donné le "nom du Père" à la place. Au départ, il y avait une relation d'amour réelle avec le père mais cela entraînait la réactivation de l'angoisse de la scène primitive. La recherche du père symbolique entraîne la peur</p>	<p>If a patient like that comes to look for Freud that shows that in his misery, in his abjection as a rich man, he wants to ask for something. He is trying again to establish something. Freud is a master whom he asks for help. The source of the relationship that he is trying to establish is that it is the way in which he wants to establish a paternal relationship. He does not succeed because Freud is a bit too much of a master. His personal prestige tended to do away with a certain type of transference between himself and the patient: Freud was too identified with a too eminent father to be effective. This leaves the subject in his vicious circle. He never had a father who either symbolized or incarnated the Father; in its place he had been given the "name of the Father". At first there had been a real love-</p>	<p>If a patient like him comes to see Freud that shows that in his misery, his abjection (hopelessness <abjection> of his wealth, he wants to demand something. He tries to establish something new. Freud is a master from whom he demands help. The motivation for the relationship he tries to establish is that it is the way by which he wants to establish a paternal relationship. He is unsuccessful because Freud was a bit too much a master. His personal prestige tended to abolish between him and the patient a certain type of transference: Freud was too much identified with a father too supreme to be effective. That leaves the subject in his infernal circuit. He has never had a father who symbolizes and incarnates the Father, one gave him the "name of the Father" instead. At the</p>

<p>de la castration et cela le rejette au père imaginaire de la scène primitive. Ainsi s'établit un cercle vicieux. Avec Freud, il n'a jamais pu assumer ses relations avec lui. C'était "un père trop fort" et Freud a dû faire agir la contrainte temporelle et lui "donner le mot de son histoire". Mais lui, le malade ne l'a pas conquis ni assumé. Le sens reste aliéné du côté de Freud qui en reste le possesseur.</p>	<p>relationship with the father but that involved the re-activation of the anxiety of the primal scene. The search for the symbolic father involves the fear of castration and that throws him back on the imaginary father of the primal scene. So a vicious circle is set up. With Freud, he had never been able to assume his relations with him. He was "too strong a father" and Freud had to bring the time constraint into play and to give him the word of his history". But the patient himself neither conquered nor assumed it. Meaning remains alienated with Freud who remains in possession of it.</p>	<p>beginning, there was a relationship of real love with the father but that lead to the reactivation of the anxiety of the primal scene. The search for the symbolic father leads to the fear of castration and that throws him back (recasts him <rejette> to the imaginary father of the primal scene. In this way a vicious circle is established. With Freud, he could never assume his relationships with him. It was "a too strong father" and Freud should have provoked the secular constraint and to him "given the word of his history." But he, the patient never could conquer or assume it. The meaning remains alienated on Freud's side who remains the owner (holder <possesseur>).</p>
<p>Toute la question d'argent est sur le même plan. Freud fait payer "l'homme aux loups" comme un malade très riche et pour un tel malade très riche cela n'avait pas de signification (à la fin seulement, cela représentait une sorte de castration). Là se retrouve la dialectique du double don et il en est ainsi tout (->p22) au long de l'observation. Quand la sujet revoit Freud pour un symptôme hystérique (constipation) Freud lève ce symptôme assez facilement, mais sur l'autre plan il se passe une jolie catastrophe: Freud se laisse impliquer dans une sorte de culpabilité à l'envers: il lui fait une rente : le sujet est passé maintenant au rang de momie psychanalytique alors que déjà il n'arrivait pas à l'assomption de sa personne. Le paranoïaque se croit l'objet de l'intérêt universel et le sujet construit son délire</p>	<p>The whole money question is on the same plane. Freud made the Wolfman pay like a very wealthy patient and for a very wealthy patient that had no signification (at the end only did it represent a sort of castration). Here the dialectic of the double gift is found again and this is the way throughout the whole account. When the subject sees Freud again for a hysterical symptom (constipation) Freud removes this symptom easily enough but on another a nice little catastrophe occurs; Freud allows himself to be caught up in a sort of reversed guilt; he pays him an allowance; the subject has now passed over to the state of being a psychoanalytic mummy whereas up to this he had not succeeded in assuming his own</p>	<p>The whole question of money is on the same plane. Freud made the Wolfman pay like a very rich patient and for such a very rich patient that did not have meaning (in the end, that only represented a kind of castration). There one finds again the dialectic of the double gift and it is that way throughout the observation. When the subject sees Freud again for a hysterical symptom (constipation) Freud uncovers <lève> this symptom quite easily, but on the other level an amusing <jolie> catastrophe happens: Freud lets himself become involved in a sort of reversed guilt: he gives him a pension: the subject has now passed into the ranks of psychoanalytic mummy since already he had not managed to assume his own person. The</p>

<p>narcissique. La réalisation narcissique est aidée et soutenue par l'action de Freud qui a renversé le don d'argent.</p>	<p>person. The paranoid believes that he is the object of universal interest and the subject constructs his narcissistic delusion. The narcissistic fulfillment is helped and sustained by Freud who had reversed the gift of money.</p>	<p>paranoid believes himself to be the object of universal interest and the subject builds his narcissistic delusion. The narcissistic realization is helped and maintained (fed, supported) by Freud's action of giving the gift of money.</p>
<p>Si le génie de R. Mac Brunswick fût grand, elle ne le formule pas toujours bien. Si elle a pu faire quelque chose c'est dans la mesure où, par position, elle coïncidait avec le personnage de la soeur. Elle était objectivement entre Freud et le malade, subjectivement Freud vint toujours entre le malade et elle. Elle réussit là où la soeur avait échoué. Le père était trop près du malade, la soeur aussi (elle avait fait son identification au père et elle est active dans leur relation et d'une façon traumatique, trop proche, qui entraînait la même panique de la passivation devant le père. Elle est identifiée au père par le malade). Au lieu de ça, R. Mac Brunswick sut à la fois participer d'une certaine dureté propre au personnage paternel, d'un autre côté, elle se soumet à la réalité du sujet: il y a une sorte de retour à l'école du sujet par ce que les chinois appellent "la douceur malléable de la femme". Elle sait lui montrer qu'elle n'est pas adhérente à Freud, donc pas identifiée au père et "pas trop forte". Le sujet est ré-enfanté par elle et, cette fois, de la bonne façon.</p>	<p>Even though Ruth Mack Brunswick had great talent she did not always formulate it very well. If she was able to accomplish something it was in the measure that by her position she coincided with the character of the sister. Objectively she was between Freud and the patient, subjectively Freud always came between the patient and her. She succeeded where the sister had failed. The father was too close to the patient and so was the sister (she identified with the father and she is active in their relationship in a way that is traumatic, too close, and which brought the same panic of passivity as with the father. She is identified with the father by the patient). Instead of that, Ruth Mack Brunswick could at the same time participate in a certain hardness proper to the paternal figure, and at the same time she submits to the reality of the subject; there is a sort of re-education of the subject by which the Chinese call "the malleability of women". She is able to tell him that she is not a supporter of Freud, therefore not identified with the father and not too strong. The subject is reborn by her, this time in the proper manner.</p>	<p>If the penchant <génie> of R. Mack Brunswick was strong, she did not always formalize it very well. If she could have done something it is to the extent where, because of her position, she coincided with the character of the sister. She was objectively between Freud and the patient, subjectively Freud always came between the patient and her. She succeeded there where the sister had failed. The father was too close to the patient and the sister too (she had made her identification with the father and she is active in their relationship and in a traumatic way, too close, that led to the same panic of passivity before <devant> the father. She is identified with the father by the patient). In place of that, R. Mack Brunswick knew how to participate at the same time in a certain toughness <dureté> characteristic of the paternal character, on the other hand, she submits to the reality of the subject: there is a sort of return to the school of the subject by what the Chinese call "the malleable sweetness (tenderness <douceur> of the woman." She knows how to show him that she is not associated with <adhérente> Freud, therefore not identified with the father and "not too</p>

		strong." The subject is again infantilized by her and, this time, in the good way.
La gratuité du traitement n'a pas joué le même rôle que dans les rapports avec Freud (et par là elle se distingue de la soeur) et ce qui se passe entre eux n'est pas du même ordre que ce qui se passe dans une analyse: c'est plus une psycho-pédagogie où l'on discute de la réalité qu'une analyse proprement dite.		The gratuitousness of the treatment did not play the same role as in the relations with Freud (and by that she distinguishes herself from the sister) and what happens between them is not of the same order as what happens in an analysis: it is more a psycho-pedagogy where one discusses reality rather than an analysis, properly called.
Dans la mesure où le sujet s'est décollé de l'image du Père tout puissant et qu'il voit que ce père ne l'aime pas tant que ça, l'issue fût favorable. Le sujet accepte de ne pas être un maître et il n'est plus entre deux chaises.		To the extent that the subject detached himself from the all-powerful father and that he sees that this father does not love him all that much, the outcome was positive <favorable>. The subject accepts not being a master and he is no longer playing two roles <entre deux chaises>.
Disons enfin que son analyse fut influencée par la recherche de Freud à propos de la réalité ou de la non-réalité des scènes primitives et on voit, là aussi, les rapports étroits du transfert et du contre-transfert.		Let us say finally that his analysis was influenced by Freud's research concerning the reality or non-reality of the primal scenes and one sees, there also, the close relations of transference and counter-transference.