
**Extract from Ordinary Psychosis : 1999 : Éric Laurent & Radiophonie : 9th
April & 5th June 1970 : Jacques Lacan**

Published formerly at <http://www.amp-nls.org/page/gb/49/nls-messenger/0/2015-2016/2528>

Information and notes at www.LacanianWorks.org /4 Jacques Lacan (19700409) or
/5 Other Authors A-Z (Laurent)

Published at www.LacanianWorksExchange.net /Lacan or Laurent

Circulated on New Lacanian School Messenger :

Extract by Anne Béraud : Translated by Raphael Montague :

Extracts from *La psychose ordinaire. La convention d'Antibes* (1999) Éric Laurent &
Radiophonie : 9th April 1970 : Jacques Lacan

From: NLS-Messenger <messenger@amp-nls.org>

Subject: [nls-messenger] 2055.en/ NLS Congress - ORIENTATION 9

Date: 9 May 2016 at 17:40:59 BST

To: "nls-messenger@amp-nls.org" <nls-messenger@amp-nls.org>

Reply-To: nls-messenger@amp-nls.org

NLS Congress - ORIENTATION 9

Towards the XIVth Congress of Psychoanalysis of the NLS [New Lacanian School of
Psychoanalysis], Discreet Signs in Ordinary Psychoses. Clinic and Treatment, 2nd &
3rd July 2016, Dublin, Ireland

ORIENTATION - 9



“If the signifier represents a subject, according to Lacan (not a signified), and for another signifier (which is to say: not for another subject), then how can it, this signifier, fall to the sign which [...] represents something for someone?

[...] No smoke without fire.

A psychoanalyst, it is by the sign that I am warned.”

Jacques Lacan, "Radiophonie", dans *Autres Écrits*, p. 413

P7, 8-9 of Jack W. Stone's translation of Radiophonie. See below for text & links.

Also www.LacanianWorks.org /4 Jacques Lacan (19700409)

“Ordinary psychosis [...] It's the psychosis of the era of democracy, a taking into account of mass psychosis.

[...] As a patient said, in this volume: “What is it that in a given moment makes my head vanish... *Poof [*pfui*]... Nevertheless I have some possibilities...” [...]

There is the *flight of sense [*pfuit du sens*], and then there are all the attempts at quilting [*de capitonnage*] in order to recover this. [...] The question about quilting is the most widespread question in the world.

[...]

The general approach of ordinary psychosis is compatible with this state of civilisation. The era is in effect very consonant with this finding that nobody has the knack to manage. It's the *flight of sense, and the search for quilting points.”

Éric Laurent, *La psychose ordinaire*, La Convention d'Antibes, p. 258, 259, 260

La psychose ordinaire. La convention d'Antibes (1999), Agalma- Le Seuil

Extract by Anne Béraud

Translated by Raphael Montague

New Lacanian School

Enquiries: nls-messenger-help@amp-nls.org

New registration: <http://www.amp-nls.org/page/gb/42/sinscrire-nls-messenger>

| The website of the NLS www.amp-nls.org |

Note to Éric Laurent's text

The word PFOUIT is a French onomatopoeia which connotes something running away very fast, so fast that it makes a windy noise. So sense runs away, and we try to pin it down.

Bruno de Florence www.deflorence.com, 9th May 2016

References:

See Radiophonie : recorded on 9th April 1970, transmitted 5th, 10th, 19th, and 26th June 1970 : Jacques Lacan at www.LacanianWorks.org /4 Jacques Lacan (19700409 or index of Jacques Lacan's texts)

P7 of Jack W. Stone's translation, www.Freud2Lacan.com

What I have denounced of an implicit semiotics of which only the disarray would have permitted linguistics, does not prevent that it must be redone, and by this same name, since in fact it is to do this that as of old we carry this name forward.

If the signifier represents a subject, according to Lacan (not a signified), and for another signifier (which means: not for another subject), then how can it, this signifier, fall to the sign which as the logician remembers, represents something for someone?

It is of the Buddhist I think, in wishing to animate my crucial question from his: No smoke without fire.

A psychoanalyst, it is by the sign that I am warned. If it signals to me the something I have to treat, I know from having found out how to break the lure of the sign to the logic of the signifier that this something is the division of the subject: which division owes to the other being what makes the signifier, by which it would only know how to represent subject as not being one except from the other.

P8 of Jack W. Stone's translation : Information at this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19700409) See www.Freud2Lacan.com

This says nothing of the *petit a*, because it is only deductible in the measure of the psychoanalysis of each, which explains why few psychoanalysts manage it well, even in owing it to my seminar.

I will therefore speak in parables, which is to say, to perplex.

Regarding the step (*pas 4*) of smoke, if I dare say so, perhaps one will make it in grasping that it is to the fire that this step makes a sign.

What it makes a sign of is conformed to our structure, in that since Prometheus, a smoke is rather the sign of this subject that a match represents for its box, and for a Ulysses approaching an unknown shore, a smoke above all lets him presume that this is not a desert isle.

Our smoke is thus the sign, why not of the smoker? But let's go there from the producer of the fire: this will be more materialist and perfectly dialectical.

But that Ulysses gives us the someone is put in doubt in recalling that he is also no one. In any case, he is no one in that a smug Polyphemia **5** is fooled by it.

But the evidence that it is not to make a sign to Ulysses that the smokers are holding camp, suggests for us a more rigorous approach to the principle of the sign.

(67) For it makes us feel, as in passing, that what sins in seeing the world as a phenomenon is that the noumenon, from only being henceforth able to make a sign to the --that is: to the supreme someone, a sign of intelligence always--demonstrates from what poverty ours proceeds in supposing that everything makes a sign: it is the someone from nowhere who must scheme it all out.

4 Apparently, a play on the double meaning of "pas," which can be translated either as step or as "no", as in *Pas de fumée sans feu* (no smoke without fire).

5 Feminine in the original [tr.].

p9 of Jack W Stone's translation : www.Freud2Lacan.com

Let this help us in putting the: no (*pas de*) smoke without fire, at the same step (*au même pas*) as the: no prayer without God, for one to hear what changes.

It is curious that forest fires do not show the someone to whom the imprudent sleep of the smoker is addressed.

And that there has to be the phallic joy, the primitive urination with which man, says psychoanalysis, responds to fire, to put us on the path of what there are, Horatio, in heaven and on earth, [See note below *] of other materials to make a subject than the objects your knowledge (*connaissance*) imagines.

The products for example from the quality of which, in the Marxist perspective of surplus value (*plus-value*), rather than from the master, the producers could ask an explanation (*demander compte*) for the exploitation they undergo.

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

***Julia Evans' note:**

From <http://www.shakespeare-online.com/quickquotes/quickquotehamletdreamt.html>

Shakespeare Quick Quotes

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,

Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

- *Hamlet* (1.5.167-8), Hamlet to Horatio

your philosophy | i.e., philosophy (or learning) in general.

The emphasis here should be on "dreamt of", as Hamlet is pointing out how little even the most educated people can explain.

One can imagine happier times when Hamlet and Horatio, studying together at Wittenberg, engaged in heated philosophical debates.

Shakespeare does not expand on the specific nature of Horatio's philosophy, and in the [First Folio \(1623\)](#), the text actually reads "*our* philosophy." Some editors, such as Dyce, White and Rowe, choose to use "our" instead of "your" (as found in Q2), believing Hamlet is speaking in general terms about the limitations of human thought.