

[The Seventh Chapter of Seminar VI : 26th April 2014 : Francisco-Hugo Freda](http://www.lacanianworks.net/?p=4504) or [here](#)  
<http://www.lacanianworks.net/?p=4504>

by Julia Evans on April 26, 2014

<http://www.nlscongress.org>

Francisco-Hugo Freda : 26<sup>th</sup> April 2014 : The Seventh Chapter of Seminar VI :  
Information [here](#)

The Seventh Chapter of Seminar VI : 26<sup>th</sup> April 2014 : Francisco-Hugo Freda

The ninth contribution for the **Blog of the next NLS Congress in Ghent on 17 and 18 May 2014**, brings you the English translation of a very interesting text by **Francisco-Hugo Freda**. F.-H. Freda poses the hypothesis of a relation between the knotting of the three registers, as elaborated later by Lacan through the Borromean knot, and the crossing of the fantasy.

Circulated as [nls-messenger] 1025.en/ THE BLOG TOWARDS THE NLS  
CONGRESS n° 9 / BLOG POUR LE CONGRES 2014 DE LA NLS n°9 : 26<sup>th</sup> April  
2014 20:05

Published by New Lacanian School of Psychoanalysis : NLS Messenger 1025.en  
[The Seventh Chapter of Seminar VI](http://www.nlscongress.org/?p=290) <http://www.nlscongress.org/?p=290> (JE:  
7<sup>th</sup> January 1959 : p78 of Cormac Gallagher's translation : Availability [here](#))

Posted on [April 26, 2014](#) by [NLS](#)

By Francisco-Hugo Freda

Available [here](#)

### **Chapter VII**

Reading Chapter VII of the *Seminar VI, Desire and its Interpretation*[1], aroused a particular questioning in me. Before telling you about it, I would like to say to you that I have read this Seminar and I think it is only in Chapter VII, and not elsewhere, that Lacan evokes the knot between the Real, the Imaginary and its symbolic sense.[2] Jacques-Alain Miller regards this paragraph as one of the fundamental points of the chapter. My quick reading does not allow me to categorically state that it is the only time that Lacan talks about this, but that does not prevent me from forming the hypothesis that it is in fact the only time.

Lacan uses the knot to define, with precision, the desire which is revealed in an analysis. This desire, which appears in analysis, finds its *raison d'être* from a much more complex dialectic which finds its support in the knot, that is to say, in the interaction of the three registers. Lacan does not let go of this undercurrent already present in the *Seminar I*, which will, many years later, give rise to the constitution of the Borromean knot. We could therefore read the whole of *Seminar VI* in light of the Borromean knot. This allows me to advance the idea that one of the facets of the Borromean knot, for Lacan, represents a model of interpretation.

We must, however, consider a further point. In effect, from the moment Lacan proposes the statement: "There is no Other of the Other"[3], that is to say that the Other exists, here is the Other of the signifier, he indicates to us that the true interpretation of desire concerns the knotting of the three registers. Thus, it is in the

elaboration of “The Other does not exist”, that he proposes, in the same movement, a new Other, a product of the articulation of the Real, the Symbolic and the Imaginary. It is at the very heart of this dialectic that I would like to highlight that which I mean by “traversing the fantasy” –the central thread of the Seminar, as Jacques-Alain Miller has demonstrated.

So, what relation is there between the knotting of the three registers and the traversal of the fantasy?

Traversing the fantasy is not a journey; it includes, and above all on the side of the analyst, a creation. This is the fantasy which is constructed under the model of “A Child Is Being Beaten”, which is marked by what is lacking. Freud, in that particular moment, extracted the formula according to which there is: “something that does not exist” but must be accounted for, that one must include and even invent, in order for the fantasy, in its entirety, to take on its true signification.

What Freud made explicit is that the fantasy is a construction which is elaborated in the analysis and that it is made through the passage from two to three: from two times to a third time. That is why the traversal of the fantasy must be understood, definitively, as an invention, that is to say, as an interpretation.

The traversal of the fantasy is not the recognition of its existence, but its construction which – in Freud’s terms – is very particular, since Freud makes exist that which does not exist. To make exist that which does not exist is what allows for the construction of the analytic fantasy.

This construction, proper to an analysis, implies a redefinition of the Other, and it is that which allows me to form the hypothesis that this Other Lacan is thinking of, is the knotting of the three registers. An Other which erupts into discourse as Lacan disassembles the Other which he himself had elaborated.

Thus, and to conclude, the traversal of the fantasy involves an act of creation which is accompanied, for each subject, by the three registers that order his subjectivity. There is no traversal of the fantasy without a radical redefinition of the Other for the subject. The Pass should account for this. The analyst would demonstrate a certain wisdom if he made of interpretation the artifice that leaves the doors open to what Lacan, in *Seminar XI*, denotes as *the x* of an end of an analysis, were “freedom” makes itself present.

Translated by *Raphael Montague*

Additional Reference : S. Freud, *A Child is Being Beaten*, 1919, trans. J. Strachey, SE: XVII, PFL Vol 10.

[1] Lacan J., *Le Séminaire*, livre VI, *Le désir et son interprétation*, Paris, éditions de La Martinière, 2013, p. 139 & sq : Seminar VI : 7<sup>th</sup> January 1959 : p78 of Cormac Gallagher’s translation : Availability [here](#)

[2] Ibid, p. 140. : Seminar VI [here](#) : 7<sup>th</sup> January 1959 : (Probably p78 of Cormac Gallagher’s translation : The fundamental fact of the demand with its imprinting, restraining, oppressing effects on the subject who is there and of whom it is precisely a question of seeing whether with regard to this function which we reveal as being formative, according to the formation of the genesis of the subject, whether we are adopting the correct attitude, I mean the one which in the final analysis is going to be justified. Namely the elucidation on the one hand and the removal at the same time of the symptom. It is in fact clear that if the symptom is not simply something which we should consider as being the legacy of a sort of subtraction, of suspension which is called frustration, if it is not simply a sort of deformation of the subject, however he is envisaged, under the influence of something which is measured out in function of a

certain relationship to the real - as I have said it is always to something real that an imaginary frustration is referred - if it is not that, if between what we discover effectively in analysis as its results, its consequences, its effects, indeed its lasting effects, its impressions of frustrations and the symptom there is something else, involving an infinitely more complex dialectic, and which is called desire; if desire is something which can only be grasped and understood at the most tightly knotted point, not from some impressions left by the real, but at the most subtle point where there is knotted together, for the real man, the imaginary and its symbolic meaning. Which is precisely what I tried to show. And this is why the relationship of desire to phantasy is expressed here in the intermediary field between the two structural lines of every signifying enunciation.

[3] Ibid, p. 345. Probably Seminar VI [here](#) : 8<sup>th</sup> April 1959 : p206 of Cormac Gallagher's translation :

This is the great secret: there is no Other of the Other. In other words for the subject of traditional philosophy, this subject subjectivises himself indefinitely. If I am in everything I think, I am in so far as I think that I am, and so on, this has no reason to stop. The truth is that analysis teaches us something quite different. The fact is that it has already been glimpsed that it is not so sure that I am in so far as I think, and that one can only be sure of one thing, which is that I am in so far as I think that I am. Certainly that. Only what analysis teaches us is that I am not the one who precisely is in the process of thinking that I am, for the simple reason that because of the fact that I think that I am, I think in the locus of the Other; I am different to the one who thinks that I am.

But the question is that I have no guarantee of any kind that this Other, through what there is in his system, can give me if I may express myself in this way, what I gave him: his being and his essence as truth. There is no, I have told you, Other of the Other. There is not in the Other, any signifier which is able on this occasion to answer for what I am. And to say things in a transformed way, this hopeless truth that I spoke to you about a while ago, this truth which is the one that we encounter at the level of the unconscious, is a faceless truth, is a closed truth, is a truth which can be bent in every direction. We only know it too well. It is a truthless truth.

[The Seventh Chapter of Seminar VI](#) : [April 26, 2014](#) : By *Francisco-Hugo Freda* :  
Published [NLS](#)