The complete text is available to download at www.LacanianWorksExchange.net

Also published in sections at www.LacanianWorks.org /Authors A-Z (Evans Julia-2nd September 2026)

'this site' refers to www.LacanianWorks.org throughout this document

---

'Me the truth, I speak' 19th June 1968 - provenance & ambiguities : 2nd September 2026 : Julia Evans

---

INDEX OF THIS TEXT

SECTION 1
Background
Lessons from compiling this text – Julia Evans
Commentary
Related posts
SECTION 2
1. **Jacques Lacan cites 'The Freudian Thing' 7th November 1955**

1a. Session of 19th June 1968 Seminar XV
Me the truth I speak
****1b. The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955**
– first appearance of 'Me the truth, I speak'
****1c. The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955**
The trade route of truth no longer passes through thought: strange to say, it now seems to pass through things: *riddle*, it is through you that I communicate,
…as Freud said 'From me [*de moi*], the truth that speaks',
1d. Interpretation of Dreams (1900) in 1c.
The dream-thoughts and the dream-content are presented to us like two versions of the same subject-matter in two different languages. **SE IV p277**
****1e. The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955,**
"I speak", in order to shackle "There is word/speech [*parole*] only from language."
"Everything is language: language, such as my heart beating faster when a sudden pang seizes me;"
1f. reference to 1e, Psalm 19
2 Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge.
3 There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.
1g. [Note to 1e.] the progression from speech [*parole*] to logos -The Gospel of St John
Jean 1, 1 Au commencement était la Parole,
John I, 1 In the beginning was the Word [*logos*],
1h. [Note to 1e.] Jacques Lacan quotes the Gospel of St John-15th June 1955 Seminar II
LACAN – Does this short story illustrate language or speech [*parole*]?
Collette AUDRY – Both, on the one side there is language, and on the other, word/speech [*parole*].
…and *verbum* is language in the strict sense; it's the same word.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

…also emphasised in the Greek text: "Εν αρχη ην ο Λογος" (iii), Λογος: language, not word/speech. And after that, God makes use of the speech/word [*parole*]. He says, "Let there be light."
… humans take an interest—in the most "inter-es(t)" [*inter-esse*] sense—in the speech/logos [*parole*].
In any case, what interests [*intéresse*] us is understanding the difference.
– 1i. Note on Ambiguity 15th June 1955 Seminar II plus 'Wo Es war; soll Ich warden (GW XV p86)
…what gives it its meaning are the temporal breaks we introduce into it – as you yourself said – which, incidentally, if they are incorrect, can introduce ambiguities(i) that are sometimes difficult to resolve, but to which we will always eventually assign a meaning.
1j. Jacques Lacan's quotes the Gospel of St John – continued from 1h Seminar II.
LACAN – In principio erat verbum: this is unquestionably language, not speech/word [*parole*].
Serge LECLAIRE – So, there is no beginning.
1k. A similarity between Sigmund Freud's text & St John's Gospel
-Where Id (It) was; I (Ego) should become (SE XXII p71),
Wo Es war; soll Ich warden (GW XV p86)
-…, so that where I (Other) am, there you (subject) may be also. (St John, Ch 14, v1)
****1l. The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955, continued from 1b. 1c. & 1e.**
-One began only to repeat after Freud the word of his discovery: Id speaks, and, no doubt, where it is least expected, namely, where id (it) hurts.
– The truth has said: 'I speak'
-'There is speech/word (*parole*) only from language'
1m. (reference to 1l.) Civilisation and its Discontents : 1929 : Sigmund Freud,
Neurosis appeared to be the outcome of a struggle between the drive for self-preservation and the demands of the libido, a struggle in which the ego/I had triumphed, but at the cost of severe suffering and sacrifice.
1m. Footnote [4] to 1l. Mass Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego 1921
Lacan …when the Apostle Paul, in his famous Epistle to the Corinthians, extols love above all else, he certainly understood it in the specific 'broader' sense SE XVIII p91
Civilisation, Thus, the contrast between the 'ego' drives and those directed at the object, the 'libidinal' drives of love in the broadest sense. [4] SE XXI p117
1n. Footnote to 1l. "Medusa's Head" (Das Medusenhaupt) : 1922 : Sigmund Freud
This symbol of horror is worn upon her dress by the virgin goddess Athena.
Lacan, in the hope that the Athenian might come face to face with the Athena who emerged, clad in her armour, from Freud's mind.
SECTION 3

2. **Seminar IV**

2a. 5th December 1956
'…before 'I' emerges from 'self' [*soi*] or 'id' [*ça*], there was something that the 'id' was, of course. It is simply a question of knowing what this 'id' [*ce ça*] is.'
2b. (Footnote to 2a) Lecture XXXI 16th June 1931 Sigmund Freud
Wo es war, soll Ich werden SE XXII p71
Where Id was, there I should become
2c. 5th December 1956
'The Es. .. that is, that which in the subject is liable to become 'I''
2d. 27th February 1957
It (phallus) is never really there where it (self or me) [*le moi*] is, it (phallus) is never quite absent there where it (self or me)[*le moi*] isn't.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

2e. 13th March 1957
…at the level of the big Other there is someone who is able to respond in any event, and who only responds in all cases the phallus, the truth, the real penis
2f. 13th March 1957
But he can only enter within this order of the law if for at least a moment he has had a real partner in front of him, … someone who responds to him. …
… insofar as he is the symbolic father, it is the one who could say as the God of monotheism said: I am the one who am …
… in other words that everything goes to be resolved through the: 'You are the one who is'. Don't believe it, because in order to say this to whomever, this should be (in place) from other, who am I?
SECTION 4
3. **Truth & Science 1st December 1965 Seminar XIII**
3a. Jacques Lacan's citation – 19th June 1968 Seminar XV
And actually, before I articulated it precisely as I did here one day…
… and as if wearing a perfectly logicised label, the article titled "Truth and Science" in my *Écrits*
3b. 1st December 1965 Science & Truth
… but because the logical form given to this knowledge [*ce savoir*] includes the mode of communication as suturing the subject that it implies.
3c. Footnote to 3b. Fetishism : 1927 : Sigmund Freud
the fetish is a substitute for the penis
To put it more plainly, the fetish is a substitute for the phallus of the woman (the mother), in which the little boy believed and which – for reasons we know – he is unwilling to do without.
3d. Footnote [i] to 3c. Leonardo da Vinci (1910)
It is by no means irrelevant what a person believes they remember from their childhood; as a rule, hidden within the fragments of memory which they themselves do not understand …
The erotic attraction emanating from the mother soon culminated in a longing for her genitals, which were perceived as a penis. With the realization, acquired only later, that the female does not possess a penis, this longing often turns into its opposite, giving way to a sense of revulsion…
SECTION 5
4. The Return to 'Me the truth I speak – 19th June 1968 Seminar XV
4a. 19th June 1968
"Me [Ego/self] the truth, I speak."
Who is this "I" who speaks?
4b. Reference [iv] to 4a. The Situation of Psychoanalysis and the Training of Psychoanalysts in 1956, 30thSeptember 1956
…Freud's discovery is this truth that the truth never forfeits its claims, and that sheltering its credentials in the field/domain devoted to the immediacy of the instincts, only its register permits conceiving this inextinguishable duration of the desire
4c. Reference [v] to 4a. The Scream 1893 Edvard Munch
See https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/c/c5/Edvard_Munch%2C_1893%2C_The_Scream%2C_oil%2C_tempera_and_pastel_on_cardboard%2C_91_x_73_cm%2C_National_Gallery_of_Norway.jpg?utm_source=en.wikipedia.org&utm_campaign=imageinfo&utm_content=original
4d. 19th June 1968 Seminar XV
But if you take the prosopopoeia seriously 'Me the truth, I speak', Id can above all have, unfortunately for those who put themselves within this path, some large inconveniencies.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

If I say that the unconscious is structured as a language,
it is because this unconscious which interests us is what can say itself, and then saying itself, it generates the subject.

BACKGROUND
In September 2026, I became engaged with the phrase

‘Me the truth I speak’ 19th June 1968 Seminar XV (i),
« Moi la vérité, je parle » [p.409 Staferla/Séminaire XV].

I pondered on it and its translation, which is not straight forward.

I started to trace Jacques Lacan’s use of this phrase and how its development takes place.
Lacan himself references ‘The Freudian Thing’ 7th November 1955 (ii).

There seemed to be an echo here of Freud’s phrase “Wo es war, soll Ich werden” (iii), which is again difficult to translate.
James Strachey translates as “Where Id was, there Ego shall be.” SE XXII p71
Another translation would be, Where It was, there I shall be.
Further, Where Id was, there I shall be.
& lastly, Where It was, there Ego shall be.
It seems that Jacques Lacan translates it, to French of course, as
‘Where Id was, there I shall be.’

Jacques Lacan appears to forge the link on 5th December 1956 (iv),

The Es. .. that is, that which in the subject is liable to become ‘I’, (p4 of EC’s translation)

so using ‘Where Id was, there I shall be’ to proceed to ‘Me the Truth, I speak’.

There follows details of this progression through Jacques Lacan’s texts , from The Freudian Thing 7thNovember 1955 to 19th June 1968 Seminar XV.

Any Sigmund Freud texts follow Jacques Lacan’s citation of them.

Julia Evans 24th October 2026

(i) 19th June 1968, see Session of Seminar XV : 19th June 1968 : Jacques Lacan, this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19680619)
P7 Cormac Gallagher’s translation, I had given to this word another function in an article called “La chose freudienne” where one can read these terms:
“Me the truth I speak”.
p.409 Staferla/Séminaire XV ….j’avais donné à ce mot une autre fonction, dans un article qui s’appelle La chose freudienne[120], où on peut lire ces termes :
« Moi la vérité, je parle. »

(ii) The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955, see The Freudian Thing or the Meaning of the Return to Freud in Psychoanalysis : 7th November 1955 (Vienna) : Jacques Lacan (19551107 or https://web.archive.org/web/20210225162125/http://www.lacanianworks.net/?p=12074)

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

(iii) The phrase appears in the last but one sentence of ‘Lecture XXXI Dissection of the personality : 6th June 1932 : Sigmund Freud ’, see this site /Sigmund Freud (19320606 or Index of Sigmund Freud’s texts)

(iv) 5th December 1956, See Session of Seminar IV (The signifier and the Holy Spirit) : 5th December 1956 : Jacques Lacan, at this site /Sigmund Freud (19561205)

Lessons from compiling this text – Julia Evans

This started as an idea for a post in mid-August 2026. I am typing these notes on 8th November 2026 so nearly three months later. It has been a roller coaster & probably I should introduce more structure into this text. Maybe tomorrow!

The following is what has emerged from this journey:

– Jacques Lacan’s French is very formal and was in formation over a hundred years ago. Internet translators, Linguée & Google & …, simplify and modernise it. I stray to a more literal translation, where meaning may not emerge immediately. I also find my Uncle’s Naval, French-English dictionary very useful – it dates to the First World War!

– it seems to me that Jacques Lacan’s method of transmission is to make something emerge through speaking, many times in dialogue with others. I discovered that in the published Seminar II, much of the dialogue has been omitted – see texts in 1h., 1i., & 1j. The lesson is to always use original texts from Staferla, École lacanienne de la psychanalyse, etc and even then be careful with any text published after about 1975 and always publish the French and English text side by side.

– Method of translating. I attempt to translate within Jacques Lacan’s logic or process of transmission. This is clearly an impossibility. It remains however the job of each of us to link to what Lacan might be saying or arguing and bring it into the meaning available to each.

-Ambiguity – see Section 1i. There are at least four possible translations of ‘“Wo es war, soll Ich werden” and at least three of “Moi la vérité, je parle”. [Me the truth, I speak, Ego the truth, I speak or Self the truth, I speak or am speaking ….]. I have used the one that makes most sense to me, and that does not mean it will work for you. I like to think of my translations as informed guestimates, based in a thorough grounding in French grammar sixty or more years ago.

Julia Evans – 9th November 2026

Commentary

– Section 6, The narcissistic structure of the ego, in
‘From a seminar on the first four chapters of ‘Civilisation and its Discontents’ : Winter 1994 : Richard Klein
See this site /5 Authors A-Z (Klein)
A commentary on Lacan’s ‘where one can read these terms: ‘*Me, the truth, I speak*.’’

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Related text

General information – Seminar XV – The Psychoanalytic Act (1967-1968) : from 15th November 1967 : Jacques Lacan, SE XXI p58-145, see this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19671115)
Session of Seminar XV : 19th June 1968 : Jacques Lacan, see this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19680619)

SECTION 2

1. Jacques Lacan cites 'The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955'

See The Freudian Thing or the Meaning of the Return to Freud in Psychoanalysis : 7th November 1955 (Vienna) : Jacques Lacan
at this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19551107 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts)
In French, from Écrits 1966, & Alan Sheridan's translation are available
from www.Freud2Lacan.com.

1a. Session of 19th June 1968 Seminar XV

Me the truth I speak

P163 of Staferla, http://staferla.free.fr /Séminaire 15	19.6.68 p7 of Cormac Gallagher's translation (www.LacaninIreland.com)	P9 of Anthony Chadwick's translation, www.Freud2Lacan.com,
Il y a un mot que j'ai fait rentrer ici il y a quelques années dans cette dialectique, c'est le mot « vérité ».	There is a word that I brought in here a few years ago, into this dialectic. It is the word truth.	There is a word that I brought back here a few years ago, it's the word "truth".
Et puis à vrai dire avant de l'articuler précisément comme je l'ai fait ici un certain jour...	And then, in truth, before articulating it precisely as I did here on a particular day,	And then, to tell the truth, before articulating precisely as I did here one day
et comme en porte la marque parfaitement logicisée l'article qui s'appelle dans mes Écrits : La vérité et la science [120]	the perfectly logical mark of the article Truth and Science[i], in my Écrits bears witness to,	and as carries the perfectly digitised mark the article which is called in my Écrits "Truth and Science",
...j'avais donné à ce mot une autre fonction, dans un article qui s'appelle La chose freudienne [121], où on peut lire ces termes :	I had given to the word another function, in an article called The Freudian Things[ii], where one can read these terms:	I had given to this word another function in an article called "La chose freudienne" where one can read these terms:
« Moi la vérité, je parle. » [Écrits, Seuil, 1966, p.409].	**'Me the truth, I speak.'**	"I the truth speak".
Qui est ce « je » qui parle ?		Who? this I who speaks?

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

[JE: Who is this 'I' that speaks?]	Who? The I that is speaking?	

Footnotes to Staferla,

[120] Cf. – séance du 15 janvier 1964, du séminaire « Fondements de la psychanalyse », éd. du Seuil : « Les quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychanalyse ». – « La science et la vérité », Écrits p. 855.

[121] « La Chose freudienne », Écrits p. 401 ou t.1 p. 406.
Julia Evans' footnotes to Cormac Gallagher's translation,

[i] Session of Seminar XIII- Science & Truth : 1st December 1965 : Jacques Lacan.
See below or this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19651201 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts)
Note, see below for other translations and reference for this passage.

[ii] The Freudian Thing or the Meaning of the Return to Freud in Psychoanalysis : 7th November 1955 (Vienna) : Jacques Lacan
at this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19551107 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts)

Note
Staferla, *Moi la vérité, je parle.*
Cormac Gallagher, Me, the truth, I speak
Anthony Chadwick, I the truth speak

Cormac Gallagher is translating from unedited tapes.
Anthony Chadwick is translating from Pas-tout Lacan. The "Talk from Wednesday the 19th of June 1968" was published in the Bulletin de l'Association freudienne no. 35, p3-9 in November 1985
This explains the difference between the two, as it is not a translation error but one of the editing.
Of these translations, 'Me the truth, I speak' is preferred and will be used, though 'Self the truth, I speak' is possible. The indefinite article has been kept though it is possible to omit it.

1b. The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955 – first appearance of 'Me the truth, I speak', [Footnote 120 p406 Écrits]

But so that you will find me where I am, I will teach you by what sign you will recognize me. Men, listen, I am giving you the secret. [JE] Me the truth, I speak. [Alan Sheridan] I, truth, will speak.

Écrits (1966) p 408-409, p8—9 of www.Freud2Lacan.com	P121 of Alan Sheridan's translation, p8—9 of www.Freud2Lacan.com	P340 of Bruce Fink's translation, Complete Écrits (2002)
La chose parle d'elle-même.	*The thing speaks of itself* [JE, could be	*The Thing Speaks of Itself* [could be

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

	The thing speaks from itself].	The Thing speaks from itself
Mais voici que la vérité dans la bouche de Freud prend la dite bête aux cornes : «Je suis donc pour vous l'énigme de celle qui se dérobe aussitôt qu'apparue, hommes qui tant vous entendez à me dissimuler sous les oripeaux de vos convenances. Je n'en admets pas moins que votre embarras soit sincère, car même quand vous vous faites mes hérauts, vous ne valez pas plus à porter mes couleurs que ces habits qui sont les vôtres et pareils à vous-mêmes, fantômes que vous êtes. Où vais-je donc passée en vous, où étais-je avant ce passage? Peut-être un jour vous le dirai-je? Mais pour que vous me trouviez où je suis, je vais vous apprendre à quel signe me reconnaître. Hommes, écoutez, je vous en donne le secret. **Moi la vérité, je parle.**	But the truth in Freud's mouth takes the said beast by the horns: "So for you I am the enigma of her who vanishes as soon as she appears, men who try so hard to hide me under the tawdry finery of your proprieties! But I am prepared to believe that your embarrassment is sincere, for even when you take it upon yourselves to serve as my heralds, you place no greater value on tearing my colours than your own, which are like you yourselves, phantoms that you are. Where, then, will I pass into you? Where was I before I entered you? Perhaps one day I will tell you? **But so that you will find me where I am, I will teach you by what sign you will recognize me. Men, listen, I am giving you the secret. [JE] Me the truth, I speak. [Alan Sheridan] I, truth, will speak.**	But now the truth in Freud's mouth takes the said bull *[bete]* by the horns: "To you I am thus the enigma of she who slips away as soon as she appears, you men who try so hard to hide me under the tawdry finery of your proprieties. Still, I admit your embarrassment is sincere, for even when you take it upon yourselves to become my heralds, you acquire no greater worth by wearing my colours than your own clothes, which are like you, phantoms that you are. Where am I going, having passed into you? And where was I prior to that? Will I perhaps tell you someday? But so that you will find me where I am, I will teach you by what sign you can recognize me. Men, listen, I am telling you the secret. [JE] **Me the truth, I speak.** [Bruce Fink] I, truth, speak.

TRANSLATION NOTE, Alan Sheridan's translation 'I, truth, will speak' & Bruce Fink's translation 'I, truth, speak' are not accurate translations of 'Moi la vérité, je parle.' Thus, 'Me the truth I speak' is advised.
Also the title's translation should be 'The Thing speaks from itself'. 'de' can be translated as 'of' or 'from'.

1c. The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955, 'From Me [Ego?/moi], the truth that speaks'

The trade route of truth no longer passes through thought: strange to say, it now seems to pass through things: *riddle*, it is through you that I communicate,

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

…as Freud said 'From me, the truth that speaks',

p410-411 of Écrits 1966, P10-11 of Freud2Lacan,	The Freudian Thing, P10-11 of Freud2Lacan, p122-123 of Alan Sheridan's translation	Bruce Fink's translation (2002) p342
« Vous pouvez donc réduire le trafic sur les voies que vous vous épuisâtes à faire rayonner de la conscience, et qui faisaient l'orgueil **du moi,** couronné par Fichte des insignes de sa transcendance**. Le commerce au long cours de la verité ne passe plus par la pensée : chose étrange**, **il semble que ce soit désormais par les choses : rébus, c'est par vous que je communique,** comme Freud le formule à la fin du premier paragraphe du sixième chapitre, consacré au travail du rêve, de son travail sur le rêve et sur ce que le rêve veut dire.	'So you can reduce the traffic on the roads that you strive so hard to radiate from the consciousness, and which constitute the pride **of the ego**(i), crowned by Fichte with the emblems of transcendence. **The trade route of truth no longer passes through thought: strange to say, it now seems to pass through things: *riddle*, it is through you that I communicate**, as Freud formulates it at the end of the first paragraph of the sixth chapter[ii], devoted to the work of the dream, of his work on dreams and what dreams mean.	"You can therefore reduce the traffic on the roads that you strove so hard to prove radiate from consciousness, and which were **the ego's** pride and joy, crowned by Fichte with the insignias of its transcendence. **The long-term trade in truth no longer involves thought; strangely enough, it now seems to involve things: *rebus,* it is through you that I communicate**, as Freud formulates it at the end of the first paragraph of the sixth chapter, devoted to the dreamwork, of his work on dreams and what dreams mean.
... Entendez bien ce qu'il (Freud) a dit, et, comme il l'a dit **de moi**, **la vérité qui parle**, le mieux pour le bien saisir est de le prendre au pied de la lettre. Sans doute ici les choses sont mes signes, mais je vous le redis, signes de **ma parole**.	... Listen carefully to what he (Freud) says, and, **as he said from me**, **the truth that speaks**, the better for to grasp it and to take it literally. Here, no doubt, things are my signs, but, I repeat, signs of my speech.	...Listen carefully to what he (Freud) says, and-as he said it Of me(ii), the truth that speaks-the best way to grasp it is to take it quite literally. Here no, doubt, things are my signs, but, I repeat, signs of my speech.

Internet translation of last two sentences,

Listen carefully to what he said, and, as he (Freud) said it **'From me [*moi*/Ego/self], the truth that speaks'**, The best, in order to understand it, is to take it literally [au pied de la lettre-at the base of the letter]. Here without doubt the things are my signs, but I repeat to you, signs of **my speech/word(logos) [*parole*]**.(iii)

TRANSLATION NOTE

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2020.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

(i) 'et qui faisaient l'orgueil **du moi'**, it is possible to translate this as 'and which constitutes the pride of the self,' le moi is either Ego or self.
(ii) 'de' can be translated as 'of' or 'from' or not translated or possibly 'about'. The 'de' is not a part of the phrase.
(iii) 'Parole' can be translated as word or speech.

1d. Lacan's reference to Interpretation of Dreams (1900) in The Freudian Thing, 7th November 1955 – Footnote [i]

The dream-thoughts and the dream-content are presented to us like two versions of the same subject-matter in two different languages. SE IV p277

-The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955, p123 Alan Sheridan,
…as Freud formulates it at the end of the first paragraph of the sixth chapter [i], devoted to the work of the dream, of his work on dreams and what dreams mean.

-Footnote [i] SE IV p277,

We have introduced a new class of psychical material between the manifest content of dreams and the conclusions of our enquiry: namely, their latent content, or (as we say) the 'dream-thoughts', arrived at by means of our procedure. It is from these dream-thoughts and not from a dream's manifest content that we disentangle its meaning. We are thus presented with a new task which had no previous existence: the task, that is, of investigating the relations between the manifest content of dreams and the latent dream-thoughts, and of tracing out the processes by which the latter have been changed into the former.

The dream-thoughts and the dream-content are presented to us like two versions of the same subject-matter in two different languages.

See Chapter VI The Dream-Work– Interpretation of Dreams : 6th November 1899 : Sigmund Freud, at this site /3 Sigmund Freud (18991106 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts)

***

1e. The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955,

"I speak", in order to shackle "There is word/speech only from language."

"Everything is language: language, such as my heart beating faster when a sudden pang seizes me;"

This quotation is continued directly from the above quote, 1c.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Écrits 1966 p412-413, The Freudian Thing	Alan Sheridan's translation 1977 p124-125	Bruce Fink's translation 2002 p343-344	Translation from Linguée, 10th October 2026
Pour mesurer ce déchirement, il faut entendre les clameurs irrépressibles qui s'élèvent des meilleurs comme des pires, à tenter de les ramener au départ de la chasse, avec les mots que la vérité nous y donna pour viatique : **« Je parle », pour enchaîner : « Il n'est parole que de langage »**. Leur tumulte couvre la suite.	In order to appreciate the scope of this split we must hear the irrepressible cries that arise from the best as well as the worst, attempting to bring them back to the beginning of the chase, with the words that truth has given us as viaticum: **'I speak'**, adding: 'There is no other speech but language?' The rest is drowned in their tumult.	To gauge the extent of this rending we must hear the irrepressible protests that arise from both the best and the worst, when one tries to bring them back to the beginning of the hunt, with the words that truth gave us as a viaticum—**'I speak'**—adding, 'There is no speech without language.' Their tumult drowns out what follows.	To gauge the depth of this rift, one must listen to the irrepressible clamour rising from both the best and the worst, as they attempt to lead us back to the start of the hunt, with the words that truth gave us as a provision for the journey: **'I speak', in order to shackle: 'There is speech [*parole*] only from language'.** (i) Their clamour drowns out what follows.
«Logomachiel telle est la strophe d'un côté. Que faites-vous du préverbal, du geste et de la mimique, du ton, de l'air de la chanson, de l'humeur et du con-tact af-fec-tif? » A quoi d'autres non moins animés donnent l'antistrophe : « **Tout est langage : langage que mon cœur qui bat plus fort quand la venette me saisit,** et si ma patiente défaille au vrombissement d'un avion à son zénith, c'est pour dire le souvenir qu'elle a	Logomachia!' goes the strophe on one side. 'What are you doing with the preverbal, gesture and mime, tone, the tune of a song, mood and af-fec-tive con-tact?' To which others no less animated give the antistrophe: 'Everything is language: language when my heart beats faster when I'm in a funk, and if my patient flinches at the throbbing of an aeroplane at its zenith it is a way of *saying* how she remembers the last bomb attack?' - Yes, eagle of thought, and when the plane's shape cuts out your	Logomachia!" goes the strophe on one side. "What do you make of the preverbal, gestures and facial expressions, tone, melody, mood, and af-fec-tive con-tact?" To which others, no less vehement, give the antistrophe: "Everything is language: Language when my hearts beats faster as fear strikes and, if my patient faints at the roar of an airplane at its	'Logomachiel – that is the strophe on one side. What of the pre-verbal elements, the gestures and facial expressions, the tone, the mood of the song, the sentiment and the em-o-tional con-tact?' To which others, no less animated, respond with the antistrophe: **'Everything is language: language, such as my heart beating faster when a sudden pang seizes me;** and if my patient faints

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

gardé du dernier bombardement ». - Oui, aigle de la pensée, et quand la forme de l'avion découpe ta semblance dans le pinceau perçant la nuit du projecteur, c'est la réponse du ciel.	likeness in the night-piercing brush of the searchlight, it is the sky's answer	zenith, it is a way of *telling* me the memory she still has of the last bombing." Yes, eagle of thought, and when the plane's shape cuts out your semblance in the night-piercing beam of the searchlight, it is heaven's response.	at the roar of an aeroplane at its zenith, it is to express the memory she has retained of the last bombing raid'. - Yes, eagle of thought, and when the shape of the aeroplane cuts your image from the beam of light piercing the night, that is the sky's answer.
On ne contestait pourtant, à s'essayer à ces prémisses, l'usage d'aucune forme de communication à quoi quiconque pût recourir en ses exploits, ni les signaux, ni les images, et fonds ni forme, aucun non plus qu'aucune, ce fonds fût-il un fonds de sympathie, et la vertu n'étant pas discutée d'aucune bonne forme.	Yet one did not challenge, in dealing with these premises, the use of any form of communication to which anyone might have recourse in his exploits, whether signals or images, content or form, if this content is a content of sympathy, and virtue is not discussed by good form.	Yet, in trying out these premises, people did not challenge the use of any of the forms of communication people might resort to in their exploits, neither signals nor images, content nor form, whether man or woman, even if this content were one of sympathy, the virtue of any proper form not being debated.	Yet, in considering these premises, no one disputed the use of any form of communication to which anyone might resort in their endeavours—neither signals nor images, nor substance nor form—none more than any other, even if that substance were one of sympathy, and virtue being beyond question in any proper form.

TRANSLATION NOTE,

These three paragraphs are difficult to translate so that what Lacan is driving at, emerges.
The recommended translation of
« Je parle », pour enchaîner : « Il n'est parole que de langage »
is
'I speak', in order to shackle: 'There is speech only from language'.
Both Alan Sheridan & Bruce Fink do not translate 'pour enchaîner' and therefore do not reflect Jacques Lacan's meaning.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Both Alan Sheridan's 'There is no other speech but language?' and Bruce Fink's 'There is no speech without language.' are possible and do not seem to reflect the point Jacques Lacan is making. A speech in French is 'un discours'.
Further, on translation of 'parole'
It seems I have been intrigued about this area since 2013. So see related texts quoted in
– 1g. the progression from word/speech (*parole*) to logos
– 1h. Jacques Lacan's quoting the Gospel of St John
– 1i. the reflection of 'Wo Es war; soll Ich warden (GW XV p86)' in all of this.
The following reflects some of what guides my thoughts.

– 1f. reference to 1e, Psalm 19

NOTE (i) The origin may be Psalm 19 verses 1-4, King James Version

19 The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.
2 Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge.
3 There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.
4 Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun,

– 1g. the progression from word/speech [*parole*] to logos

Quote from the Gospel of St John

https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Jean%201%2CJohn%201&version=LSG;KJV;NIVDownloaded 14th October 2026

Jean 1, Louis Segond
1 Au commencement était la Parole, et la Parole était avec Dieu, et la Parole était Dieu.
2 Elle était au commencement avec Dieu.
John I, King James' Version
1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.
2 The same was in the beginning with God.

In Greek 'word' is λόγος (logos). This according to the internet means word, speech, statement, or divine reason/logic. Early in his work the translation 'word' is used though Lacan also uses logos throughout his work. Some examples are given at

Tracking Jacques Lacan's use of 'logos' : 30th October 2013 : Julia Evans. See this site /5 Other Authors A-Z (Evans)
or https://web.archive.org/web/20200813120833/https://www.lacanianworks.net/?p=1261

– 1h. Jacques Lacan's quotes the Gospel of St John – la *parole*

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Jacques Lacan makes the link to St John's Gospel

Session of Seminar II Where is speech/word [*parole*]? Where is language? : **15th June 1955** : Jacques Lacan, see this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19550615 or 19541117 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts.)

LACAN – Does this short story illustrate language or speech [*parole*]?

...and *verbum* is language in the strict sense; it's the same word.

...also emphasised in the Greek text: "Εν αρχη ην ο Λογος" (iii),
Λογος: language, not word/speech. And after that, God makes use of the speech/word [*parole*]. He says, "Let there be light."

... humans take an interest—in the most "inter-es(t)" [*inter-esse*] sense—in the speech/logos [*parole*].

In any case, what interests [*intéresse*] us is understanding the difference.

NOTICE

To my dismay, when I could not make sense of a paragraph in the Sylvana Tomacelli translation, I consulted the original transcript as given by Staferla and I discovered

– many interventions by Jacques Lacan's interlocutors have been excised. This is concerning for two reasons, (1) this transforms Lacan's choice of transmission method, debate, into a dislocated lecture. (2) Without the interventions, the copy does not make sense. (3) There are probable mistranslations of important words.

I have chosen some extracts to illustrate my point, and really this session, and probably the whole seminar, needs translating from the original transcription, see Staferla.

TRANSLATION NOTE,

These three paragraphs are difficult to translate so that what Lacan is driving at, emerges.
The recommended translation of
« Je parle », pour enchaîner : « Il n'est parole que de langage »
is
'I speak', in order to shackle: 'There is speech only from language'**.**
Both Alan Sheridan & Bruce Fink do not translate 'pour enchaîner' and therefore do not reflect Jacques Lacan's meaning.
Both Alan Sheridan's 'There is no other speech but language?' and Bruce Fink's 'There is no speech without language.' are possible and do not seem to reflect the point Jacques Lacan is making. A speech in French is 'un discours'.
Further, on translation of 'parole'
It seems I have been intrigued about this area since 2013. So see related texts quoted

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

in
– 1g. the progression from word/speech (*parole*) to logos
– 1h. Jacques Lacan's quoting the Gospel of St John
– 1i. the reflection of 'Wo Es war; soll Ich warden (GW XV p86)' in all of this.
The following reflects some of what guides my thoughts.

– 1f. reference to 1e, Psalm 19

NOTE (i) The origin may be Psalm 19 verses 1-4, King James Version

19 The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.
2 Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge.
3 There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.
4 Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun,

– 1g. the progression from word/speech [*parole*] to logos

Quote from the Gospel of St John

https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Jean%201%2CJohn%201&version=LSG;KJV;NIVDownloaded 14th October 2026

Jean 1, Louis Segond
1 Au commencement était la Parole, et la Parole était avec Dieu, et la Parole était Dieu.
2 Elle était au commencement avec Dieu.
John I, King James' Version
1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.
2 The same was in the beginning with God.

In Greek 'word' is λόγος (logos). This according to the internet means word, speech, statement, or divine reason/logic. Early in his work the translation 'word' is used though Lacan also uses logos throughout his work. Some examples are given at

Tracking Jacques Lacan's use of 'logos' : 30th October 2013 : Julia Evans. See this site /5 Other Authors A-Z (Evans)
or https://web.archive.org/web/20200813120833/https://www.lacanianworks.net/?p=1261

– 1h. Jacques Lacan's quotes the Gospel of St John – la *parole*

Jacques Lacan makes the link to St John's Gospel

Session of Seminar II Where is speech/word [*parole*]? Where is language?
: **15th June 1955** : Jacques Lacan, see this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19550615 or 19541117 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts.)

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

LACAN – Does this short story illustrate language or speech [*parole*]?

…and *verbum* is language in the strict sense; it's the same word.

**…also emphasised in the Greek text: "Εν αρχη ην ο Λογος" (iii),
Λογος: language, not word/speech. And after that, God makes use of the speech/word [*parole*]. He says, "Let there be light."**

… humans take an interest—in the most "inter-es(t)" [*inter-esse*] sense—in the speech/logos [*parole*].

In any case, what interests [*intéresse*] us is understanding the difference.

NOTICE

To my dismay, when I could not make sense of a paragraph in the Sylvana Tomacelli translation, I consulted the original transcript as given by Staferla and I discovered

– many interventions by Jacques Lacan's interlocutors have been excised. This is concerning for two reasons, (1) this transforms Lacan's choice of transmission method, debate, into a dislocated lecture. (2) Without the interventions, the copy does not make sense. (3) There are probable mistranslations of important words.

I have chosen some extracts to illustrate my point, and really this session, and probably the whole seminar, needs translating from the original transcription, see Staferla.

P263 Staferla, Unedited original transcript, 15th June 1955, Seminar II	Translated via Linguée 19th October 2026, 15th June 1955	P281 Sylvana Tomacelli's translation from edited text, 15th June 1955
...Lacan - Ils ont tous les trois compris quelque chose. Ce qu'ils ont compris est ce qui les intéresse chacun au plus haut point. Vous voyez le sens de cet apologue ? Est-ce que vous croyez que ce phénomène, dont vous voyez bien le caractère justement exemplaire, à savoir que c'est ce qui se passe tout le temps, en toute occasion, chaque fois que nous nous livrons à un discours intime ou public, est du côté du *langage* ou du côté de *la parole* ?	Lacan, All three of them understood something. What they understood is what interests each of them the most. Do you see the meaning of this parable? Do you believe that this phenomenon—the exemplary nature of which you can clearly see, namely that it happens all the time, on every occasion, whenever we engage in private or public discourse—lies on the side of language or on the side of word/speech [*la parole*]?	TEXT Omitted [Lacan] That is what happens every time we engage in private or public discourse.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Wladimir GRANOFF - Où est votre question ? **LACAN - Cette petite histoire illustre-t-elle *le langage* ou *la parole* ?** Collette AUDRY - Les deux, il y a *langage* d'un côté et *parole* de l'autre.	Wladimir GRANOFF (i) - Where is your question? **LACAN - Does this short story illustrate language or speech [*parole*]?** Collette AUDRY (ii) - Both, on the one side there is language, and on the other, speech [*parole*].	[Granoff omitted] [Lacan] Does this short story illustrate language or speech? MME AUDRY: Both.

(i) From http://isfp.sdf.org/russian_thinkers/wladimir_granoff.html 19th October 2026, Wladimir Alexandrovich GRANOFF (7. 09. 1924, Strasbourg — 2. 02. 2000, Paris) — French psychoanalyst of Russian origin, disciple and colleague of Jacques Lacan. He was born in the family of Russian émigrés; and although he wrote many of his books in French, Russian was his first language. 'My first language is Russian, my second languages are French and German, and lastly English. When I want to use offensive words or count I do it in English, when I am planning I speak Russian, if I am lecturing I use French, and when I am singing the songs of my childhood, they are in German' (In Memoriam of Jacques Lacan.) After World War II he went to Paris, where he received a degree in Psychiatry. In the 1950s he met Lacan and visited his seminars in the St Anne Clinic. Serge Leclaire and François Perrier and Granoff were the most active members of the Lacanian cycle in those years. But in 1964 after a quarrel with Lacan he initiated the expulsion of his teacher and colleague from the French Psychoanalytic Society.

(ii) From Wikipedia 18th October 2026, Colette Audry (1906–1990) was a prominent French leftist intellectual, novelist, screenwriter, and pioneer feminist. Audry was born in Orange, Vaucluse. She won the Prix Médicis for the autobiographical novel Derrière la baignoire (Behind the Bathtub). As a screenwriter she first gained acclaim for The Battle for the Railway and also wrote for her sister Jacqueline. In politics she was a member of the Anti-Stalinist left (she was a member of the Workers and Peasants' Socialist Party) and an associate of Simone de Beauvoir. She died at Issy-les-Moulineaux, aged 84.

THEN…

P265-266 Staferla, Original unedited transcript, 15th June 1955, Seminar II	Translated by Linguée, 19th October 2026, 15th June 1955	P282-283 of Sylvana Tomaselli's translation, edited published text, 15th June 1955
LACAN J'appelai à la rescousse le Père BEIRNAERT(i) car il y a quand même l'« *in principio erat verbum* » [Εν αρχη ην ο Λογος]. L'autre jour - vous n'étiez pas là et je l'ai regretté - j'ai trouvé la	LACAN I called on Father BEIRNAERT(i) for help, because there is, after all, the "in principio erat verbum" [Εν αρχη ην ο Λογος]. The other day—you weren't there, and I	Lacan I appealed to Father Beirnaert for help. because of the *in principio erat verbum*. One day you said that fides was in your opinion the best translation for speech.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

confirmation dans PLAUTE (ii) de l'emploi du mot *fides,* que vous avez dit un jour être ce qui pour vous traduisait le mieux *la parole*. C'est curieux que *la traduction religieuse* ne dise pas *in principio erat fides*, mais *in principio erat verbum* **et *verbum* c'est *le langage* à proprement parler, c'est le même mot**.	regretted it—I found confirmation in PLAUTUS (ii) of the use of the word fides, which you once said one day to be that which, for you translated speech/logos [*la parole*] the best. It's curious that the religious translation does not say *in principio erat fides*, but rather *in principio erat verbum*—**and *verbum* is language in the strict sense; it's the same word.**	It is odd that the religious translation doesn't say 'in principio erat fides'. 'Verbum', that's language. and even the word.
Elle ne dit pas *au commencement était la parole.* Quand elle dit qu'au *commencement était le mot,* elle dit quelque chose qui a un certain sens et qui probablement nous indique qu'il y a là quelque chose, puisqu'on dit que c'était *au principe* que nous ne pouvons pas atteindre qui nous est à la vérité fort difficilement pensable, car ça ne veut rien dire d'autre que ce qui est également souligné *dans le texte grec* : « Εν αρχη ην ο Λογος »(iii), Λογος : ***le langage* et non pas *la parole***. Et après ça, Dieu fait usage de *la parole*. Il dit « *Que la lumière soit.* » Reprenons ce que nous visions tout à l'heure dans cet apologue Wells-ien (iv). La question a son sens, et on conçoit que les uns et les autres la reçoivent de façon différente. Mais enfin, si nous donnons un sens précis au mot *parole*, qui est cette question qui reste ouverte - qui n'est pas celle que nous devons approcher aujourd'hui - essayons d'approcher de plus près la façon dont **l'homme**	It does not say, "In the beginning was the Word [*la parole* (logos)]." When it says that "in the beginning was the word [*le mot*]," it is saying something that has a certain sense and that probably indicates to us that there is something there, since it is said that it was at the beginning—a point we cannot reach—which is, in truth, very difficult for us to conceive, for it means nothing other than what is **also emphasised in the Greek text: "Εν αρχη ην ο Λογος" (iii), Λογος: language, not word/speech. And after that, God makes use of the speech/word [*parole*]. He says, "Let there be light."** Let's return to what we were discussing earlier in that Wells-ian apologue (iv). The question has its sense, and one understands that the Ones and the Others interpret it in different ways. But ultimately, if we give a precise sense to the word "speech/logos [*parole*]"—which is a question that remains open, and one we need not address today—let	In the Greek text, logos is also language. and not speech. After that. God made use of speech – 'Let there be light,' he said. Let's try to get a little closer to the manner in which man comes into [s'interesse], in

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

s'intéresse - au sens le plus « *inter-esse* »(v) - à *la parole*.	us try to take a closer look at the way in which **humans take an interest—in the most "inter-es(t)" [*inter-esse*] sense (v)—in the speech/logos [*parole*].**	the sense of *inter*-esse, speech.
Nous éprouvons tout de même bien la nécessité de distinguer ce qui est message - au sens de ce qui est *signe*, un *signe en promenade* - et la façon dont l'homme entre dans le coup. Je dis qu'il est lui-même intégré au *discours universel*. Vous vous apercevez même que ce n'est tout de même pas de la même façon que ces messages dans des bouteilles ou sur des crânes qui se promènent à travers le monde. Ce n'est pas du même ordre, en tout cas pour nous. D'un point de vue de Sirius peut-être (vi), on peut faire une confusion, mais pour nous il n'y en a pas de possible. **En tout cas, ce qui nous intéresse est de savoir la différence.**	We do, however, keenly feel the need to distinguish between what is a message—in the sense of a sign, a sign on the move—and the way in which man becomes part of the process. I'm saying that he himself is integrated into the universal discourse. You can even see that this is not, after all, the same as those messages in bottles or on skulls that wander across the world. It is not of the same order—at least not for us. From the point of view of Sirius (vi), perhaps, one might confuse the two, but for us, there is no possibility of confusion. **In any case, what interests [*intéresse*] us is understanding the difference.**	We certainly feel the necessity of distinguishing between a message. in the sense of sign, a wandering sign, and the manner in which man gets in on it. If he is himself integrated into the universal discourse, it isn't after all in the same way as the messages which wander the world in bottles or on scalps. From the point of view of Sirius. Maybe they are the same, but for us that's not possible. In any case, what concerns us is to know the difference.
C'est pour ça que VALABREGA(viii) tout à l'heure a dit formellement que dans l'apologue de WELLS il s'agit de *la parole*.	It is for that, that VALABREGA(viii) stated explicitly earlier that WELLS's apologue acts by itself [*il s'agit*] from the speech/logos [*la parole*].	

(i) From Wikipedia, 18th October 2026, **Louis Beirnaert**, born on 2 April 1906 in Ascq (France) and died on 30 April 1985 in Paris, was a French Jesuit priest and psychoanalyst. His research and writings focused in particular on the intersection between psychoanalysis and religion.

(ii) Plautus & 'fides' From Wikipedia 19 October 2026, **Titus Maccius Plautus** (c. 254 – 184 BC) was a Roman playwright of the Old Latin period.

From A.I. The use of the word *fides* (meaning trust, faith, or reliability) appears frequently across **Plautus'**comedies, which are widely studied for their insights into early Roman social ethics.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

From The Relativity of fides: Faith Language, Commerce and Interreligious Trust in the Crown of Aragon, c. 1240–1350, by Annabel Laura Hancock, June 2025, https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:066be048-cc08-4798-94d2-80497148d18d/files/rv118rg48m

This article argues that a relational and trust-based understanding of fides can explain its use and impact in a variety of secular and religious settings, but particularly between members of different religious communities and especially in commercial contracts. The Latin word fides can be translated in a variety of ways, from 'faith', 'trust' and 'trustworthiness', to 'proof' and 'belief'. Within these meanings there are complex religious and legal implications. Most understandings focus on the ways in which the term defines and creates relationships within a community.

(iii) From A. I. The English transliteration (writing Greek words using the English alphabet) of «Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος» (John 1:1) is: "En archē ēn ho Logos" (or without diacritics: "**En arche en ho Logos**").

Word-by-Word Breakdown

- Ἐν (En) = In
- ἀρχῇ (archē) = beginning (root of archaic)
- ἦν (ēn) = was (past tense of "is")
- ὁ (ho) = the (masculine article)
- Λόγος (Logos) = Word / Logic / Reason

(iv) From Wikipedia 19th October 2026 **Herbert George Wells** (21 September 1866 – 13 August 1946) was an English writer, prolific in many genres. He wrote more than forty novels and dozens of short stories. His non-fiction output included works of social commentary, politics, history, popular science, satire, biography, and autobiography. Wells is most known today for his groundbreaking science fiction novels; he has sometimes been called the "father of science fiction", a title that has also been given to Jules Verne and Hugo Gernsback.

In addition to his fame as a writer, he was prominent in his lifetime as a forward-looking, even prophetic social critic who devoted his literary talents to the development of a progressive vision on a global scale. As a futurist, he wrote a number of utopian works and foresaw the advent of aircraft, tanks, space travel, nuclear weapons, satellite television and something resembling the World Wide Web. His science fiction imagined time travel, alien invasion, invisibility, and biological engineering before these subjects were common in the genre.

Wells rendered his works convincing by instilling commonplace detail alongside a single extraordinary assumption per work – dubbed "Wells's law" – leading Joseph Conrad to hail him in 1898 with "O Realist of the Fantastic!"

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

From A.I., The relationship between H. G. Wells and Sigmund Freud centred on mutual intellectual respect, their shared exile experiences in London, and a failed 1939 effort to secure British citizenship for Freud.

The 1939 British Citizenship Effort

- The Wish: After fleeing Nazi persecution in Vienna and moving to 20 Maresfield Gardens in Hampstead in 1938, Freud confessed to H. G. Wells in a July 1939 letter that he had held a lifelong "intense wish phantasy" to become an Englishman.
- The Campaign: Wells championed Freud's cause, enlisting the support of Member of Parliament Oliver Locker-Lampson to propose a private parliamentary bill granting Freud citizenship.
- The Outcome: The bill failed because parliamentarians were unwilling to waive the standard five-year residency requirement. Freud died a stateless refugee shortly after on September 23, 1939. Wells later expressed deep regret that the government could not complete the simple half-hour bill

(v) which humans take an interest—in the most "inter-es(t)" [*inter-esse*] sense (v)—in the word.

Julia Evans, 19th October 2026, This looks like one of Lacan's neologisms. 'esse' sounds like the German 'Es' which means Id or It. Inter means: "Between," "among," "mutually," or "connected to two or more things" [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/inter] so maybe unpacked as, word is connected to the Es (Id).

(vi) 'From the point of view of Sirius'

Wikipedia 19th October 2026 Sirius is the brightest star in the night sky, located in the southern constellation of Canis Major. Its name is derived from the Ancient Greek word Σείριος (Latin script: Seirios; lit. 'glowing' or 'scorching').

&

The phrase's source is Le Micromégas by Voltaire, Genre-Science fiction, 1752

Le Micromégas is a 1752 novella by the French philosopher and satirist Voltaire. Along with his story "Plato's Dream", it is an early example in the literary genre of science fiction and has its place in the development of the history of literature. Some uncertainty surrounds the first publication of Micromégas, with possible editions dating to 1751 or as early as 1739, but with the widely accepted publication being 1752. The tale recounts the visit to Earth of a being from a planet circling the star Sirius, and of his companion from the planet Saturn. The technique of using an outsider to comment on aspects of Western culture was popular in this period.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

(vii) From Wikipedia 18th October 2026, **Jean-Paul Valabrega**, born on June 21, 1922, in Saint-Claude (Jura) and died on January 25, 2011, in Paris, he was a French philosopher and psychoanalyst.

THEN…

– 1i. Note on Ambiguity 15th June 1955 – a reflection of 'Wo Es war; soll Ich warden (GW XV p86)

…what gives it its meaning are the temporal breaks we introduce into it – as you yourself said – which, incidentally, if they are incorrect, can introduce ambiguities(i) that are sometimes difficult to resolve, but to which we will always eventually assign a meaning.

Session of Seminar II Where is speech/word [*parole*]? Where is language? : **15th June 1955** : Jacques Lacan, this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19550615 or 19541117 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts.)

p267 Staferla, from the original transcript of 15th June 1955, Seminar II	Translated by Linguée, 15th October 2026, 15th June 1955, Seminar II	P284 Translated by Sylvana Tomaselli (1988), 15th June 1955
LACAN Ce qui lui donne *sa signification* est le moment où nous arrêtons la machine. En d'autres termes, ce qui lui donne *sa signification,* ce sont les coupures temporelles que nous y faisons, vous l'avez dit vous-même, qui d'ailleurs, si elles sont fautives, peuvent y introduire des ambiguïtés parfois difficiles à résoudre, mais auxquelles on finira toujours par donner une signification.	LACAN What gives it its meaning [*signification*] is the moment when we stop the machine. In other words, **what gives it its meaning are the temporal breaks we introduce into it – as you yourself said – which, incidentally, if they are incorrect, can introduce ambiguities(i) that are sometimes difficult to resolve, but to which we will always eventually assign a meaning.**	Lacan What gives it its signification is the moment when we stop the machine. These are the temporal breaks which we make in it. If they are faulty, we will see ambiguities emerge, which are sometimes difficult to resolve, but which one will always end up giving a signification to.

(i)

EMERGENCE OF AMBIGUITY

On pondering,

'In other words, what gives it its meaning are the temporal breaks we introduce into it – as you yourself said – which, incidentally, if they are incorrect, can introduce ambiguities that are sometimes difficult to resolve, but to which we will always

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

eventually assign a meaning.' Session of Seminar II : 15th June 1955 : Jacques Lacan, p267 Staferla

I have produced the following ambiguities:
Ego – (Das Ich) German – translated as I or Ego
Id – (Das Es) German – translated as Id or it

This gives four translations of 'Wo Es war; soll Ich warden' (GW XV p86)

*

Le moi – French – translated as Ego (Das Ich) or self/me. See section 2e. translation of c'est sur cette *toute-puissance* de la mère que le *moi* de l'enfant repose,
The Id (Das Es): Translated as le Ça(French) which is also the It
The Super-Ego (Das Über-Ich): Translated as le Surmoi or le Sur-moi (French)

In French, 'le je' 'the I' is different to 'le moi' 'the me/self/Ego', though the German 'Das Ich' can be translated as 'i' or 'Ego' .
So 'Ego the truth, I am speaking' is a possible, though unlikely, translation of 'Moi la verité je parle'.
There are also difficulties with the translation of 'Qui est ce « *je* » qui parle ?'
Probably a better translation is 'Who is this 'I' that speaks?'

*

Signification – French – translated as Meaning or Signification See 15th June 1955 p267 1i. below

*

Ambiguities and the translation of 'parole' as word or speaking
St John's Gospel was originally written in Koine Greek (common Greek), around 90–100 AD (Wikipedia), so Ch1 v1, is «Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος» is "En archē ēn ho Logos". See 1g. for translation detail.
This was translated into
Latin as "In principio erat verbum"
English as "In the beginning was the Word"
French as "Au commencement était la parole"
1i. gives quotes from 15th June 1955 of the discussion on the translation of verbum/parole from Seminar II.
'Parole' can be translated as word, speech or speaking (www.Linguée.com – October 2026) 'logos' underlies my decision on how to translate parole, so it is 'In the beginning was the logos'.
Jacques Lacan argues, 15th June 1955,
P263 Staferla, 'on every occasion, whenever we engage in private or public discourse—lies on the side of language or on the side of word/speech [*la parole*]'
P263 Staferla, 'Collette AUDRY – Both, on the one side there is language, and on the other, word/speech.'

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

P265 Staferla, It's curious that the religious translation does not say *in principio erat fides*,
but rather *in principio erat verbum*—and *verbum* is language in the strict sense; it's the same word.
P266 Staferla, 'it was at the beginning …for it means nothing other than what is, … also emphasised in the Greek text …Λογος: language, not word/speech. And after that, God makes use of the word/speech.
So it seems that Jacques Lacan resolves this ambiguity by linking logos & God or the I making use.

THEN…

– 1j. Jacques Lacan's quotes the Gospel of St John – continued from 1h. Seminar II

LACAN – In principio erat verbum: this is unquestionably language, not speech/word [*parole*].

Serge LECLAIRE – So, there is no beginning.

Session of Seminar II Where is speech/word [*parole*]? Where is language?
: **15th June 1955** : Jacques Lacan, see this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19550615 or 19541117 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts.)

P273-274 Staferla, downloaded 15th October 2026, 15th June 1955	Translated by Linguée, 15th October 2026, 15th June 1955, Seminar II	P291 Translated by Sylvana Tomaselli (1988), 15th June 1955
Serge LECLAIRE Il y a une chose qui me trouble dans tout cela. Était-ce une erreur, mais vous avez traduit tout à l'heure « *Au commencement était le langage* ». Et c'est la première fois que j'entends cela. C'est ainsi que vous l'entendez. C'est « *Au commencement était la parole* », ou *le verbe*, et vous avez dit : « *Au commencement était le langage* » ? Mais à quoi vous rapportez-vous ? C'est la traduction que vous donnez ? LACAN - *In principio erat verbum,* c'est	LECLAIRE (i) There's one thing that troubles me about all this. Perhaps I'm mistaken, but a moment ago you translated it as 'In the beginning was language'. And that's the first time I've heard that. Is that how you understand it? It's 'In the beginning was the word/speech [*parole*]', or the Verb, and you said, 'In the beginning was language'? But what are you referring to? Is that the translation you're giving? **LACAN – In principio erat verbum: this is**	DR LECLAIRE: *There is something which troubles me in all this. Earlier on you translated* in the beginning was language, and that is the first time I've heard that. What are; you referring to? Is this your translation?

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

incontestablement *le langage*, ce n'est pas *la parole*. Serge LECLAIRE- Alors, il n'y a pas de commencement. LACAN - Mais ce n'est pas moi qui ai écrit l'*Évangile selon Saint Jean.* Serge LECLAIRE - C'est la première fois que je vois cela. On écrit toujours *la parole*, ou *le verbe*, et jamais *le langage*. LACAN Je vous ai déjà écrit deux fois au tableau *le distique* dont personne ne m'a demandé l'explication: *Indem er alles schaft, was schaftet der hôchste ? - Sich.* *Was schaft er aber vor er alles schaftet ? - Mich. [i]* *Que faisait le Tout-Puissant au moment où il a fait la création ? - Sich : soi-même.* *Qu'est-ce qui était avant qu'il fasse quoi que ce soit? - Mich : moi-même.* C'est évidemment une affirmation hasardée, mais qui vise probablement quelque chose. Serge LECLAIRE - Je ne comprends pas pourquoi vous traduisez *au commencement* et non pas *avant le commencement*. LACAN Je ne suis pas du tout en train de vous dire que Saint JEAN a écrit les choses correctement. Je vous dis que dans Saint JEAN il y a : in principio erat verbum, en latin. Vous l'avez vu quand nous avons traduit le De significatione, je n'aurais pas eu à	**unquestionably language, not speech/word [*parole*]. Serge LECLAIRE – So, there is no beginning.** LACAN – But I wasn't the one who wrote the Gospel according to Saint John. Serge LECLAIRE – That's the first time I've come across that. We always write 'the word/speech' or 'the verb', and never 'language'. LACAN I have already written the couplet on the blackboard twice, and no one has asked me to explain it: *Indem er alles schaft, was schaftet der hôchste? - Sich.* *Was schaft er aber vor er alles schaftet? - Mich.[ii]* Was He powerful at the moment He created the world? – Sich: oneself. What was there before He did anything? – Mich: myself. This is obviously an emboldened claim, but which probably targets something. Serge LECLAIRE – I don't understand why you translate 'in the beginning' rather than 'before the beginning'. LACAN I am by no means telling you that Saint John wrote things correctly. What I am saying is that in Saint John there is: 'in principio erat verbum', in Latin. You saw this when we translated the *De significatione*[iii]; I wouldn't have had to ask	LACAN 'In principio erat verbum', that is undeniably language, it isn't speech . DR LECLAIRE: So there is no beginning. LACAN I didn't write the Gospel according to St John. DR LECLAIRE: That's the first time I've ever seen this. One always writes speech, or the word [verbe], and never language. LACAN I have already written the distich up twice on the blackboard and nobody has asked me for the explanation. *Indem er alles schaft, was schaftet der Hochste? - Sich.* *Was schaft er aber vor er alles schaftet? - Mich.* What was the Almighty doing when he made the creation? - Sich, himself. And what was he before he made anything at all? Mich, myself. It is obviously a risky affirmation. DR LECLAIRE: I don't understand why you translate in the beginning, and not before the beginning. LACAN: I'm not at all engaged in telling you that St John wrote things correctly. I am saying that, in St John, there's in 'principio erat verbum', in Latin. Now, as you saw when we translated the De

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

demander au père BEIRNAERT comment il aurait pu signifier la parole. Il a bien fait quelques trouvailles, mais pas une seule qui nous satisfaisait.	Father Beirnaert how he might have rendered the word. He did come up with a few ideas, but not a single one that satisfied us.[iv]	significatione, verbum means word, the signifier, and not speech.

[i] Serge Leclaire (French); born Serge Liebschutz; 6 July 1924 – 8 August 1994) was a French psychiatrist and psychoanalyst. Initially analyzed by Jacques Lacan, he 'became the first French "Lacanian"'. Wikipedia 22ndOctober 2026

[ii]. The distich was written by Daniel von Czepko von Reigersfeld and is collected in his spiritual writings (Geistliche Schriften, edited by W. Milch, Breslau, 1930, page 226).

Lacan first wrote this distich on the chalkboard to open his lecture on 8th December 1954 (Seminar II).

[iii] This probably refers back to a discussion on signification. 'De significatione' translates from the Latin to 'Of or Concerning the meaning/significance' – see p267 Staferla above – or maybe in a previous seminar.

[iv] see p265 Staferla, translated above for reference to Father Biernaert

1k. ***A similarity between Sigmund Freud's text, Lecture XXXI, & St John's Gospel***

-Where Id (It) was; I (Ego) shall be (SE XXII p71)[i],

Wo Es war; soll Ich warden (GW XV p86)

-…, **so that where I (Other) am, there you (subject) may be also**.[ii]

Gospel according to St John, The Bible, Chapter 14, Verse 1,

[i] Nevertheless it may be admitted that the therapeutic efforts of psycho-analysis have chosen a similar line of approach. Its intention is, indeed, to strengthen the ego, to make it more independent of the super-ego, to widen its field of perception and enlarge its organisation, so that it can appropriate fresh portions of the id. **Where id was, there ego [I] shall be**. It is a work of culture – not unlike the draining of the Zuider Zee.
SE XXII p71, James Strachey's translation, Lecture XXXI (31) – The Dissection of the Psychical Personality (1932), from New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis : 1932 (Published 1933) : Sigmund Freud
Information at this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19330101 or 19320616 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts)
or Wo Es war; soll Ich warden (3 Sigmund Freud/13000000 Quotations from Sigmund Freud)

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

[ii] Jesus said to his disciples, "Do not let your hearts be troubled. Believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house there are many dwelling-places. If it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, **so that where I (Other) am, there you (subject) may be also**.
Gospel according to St John, Chapter 14, Verse 1,

Further Information, see

Two positions – by Sigmund Freud's & from St John's Gospel – and their connection : 4th May 2026 : Julia Evans, see this site /Authors A-Z (Evans)

1k. The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955,

One began only to repeat after Freud the word of his discovery: *Id speaks*, and, no doubt, where it is least expected, namely, where id (it) hurts.

The truth has said: 'I speak'

This is a direct continuation of the quote in 1e.

Écrits 1966 p413-414, The Freudian Thing	Alan Sheridan's translation 1977 p125	Bruce Fink's translation 2002 p344	Translation by Linguée, 13th October 2026
On se prenait seulement à répéter après Freud le mot de sa découverte : **ça parle**, et là sans doute où l'on s'y attendait le moins, là où ça souffre. S'il fut un temps où il suffisait pour y répondre **d'écouter ce que ça disait,** (car à l'entendre la réponse y est déjà), tenons donc que les grands des origines, les géants du fauteuil furent frappés de la malédiction promise aux audaces titanesques, ou que leurs sièges cessèrent d'être	One began only to repeat after Freud the word of his discovery: it *speaks*, and, no doubt, where it is least expected, namely, where there is pain. If there ever was a time when simply listening to what it said was sufficient reply (for hearing it is already a reply), let us suppose therefore that the great ones of the early days, the arm-chair giants, were struck by the curse destined to titanic acts of daring, or that their seats ceased to be	They began merely to repeat after Freud the key to his discovery: it *[ça]* speaks, precisely where it was least expected—namely, where it suffers. If there ever was a time when, to respond to it, it sufficed to listen to what it was saying (for the answer is already there in hearing it), let us assume that the great ones of the early days, the armchair giants, were struck by the curse that befalls titanic acts of daring, or that their	We found ourselves merely repeating, after Freud, the words of his discovery: **"Id speaks"**[i]—and there, no doubt, where we least expected it, **where Id hurts**.[ii] If there was a time when it was enough in order to respond **from listening to what "id" said** (for, upon hearing it, the answer is already there), let us then assume that the great figures of the past, the giants of the armchair, were struck by the curse reserved for titanic

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

conducteurs de la **bonne parole** dont ils se trouvaient investis à s'y asseoir ci-devant. Quoi qu'il en soit, depuis, entre le psychanalyste et la psychanalyse, on multiplie les rencontres dans l'espoir que l'Athénien s'atteigne avec l'Athéna sortie couverte de ses armes du cerveau de Freud. Dirai-je le sort jaloux, toujours pareil, qui contraria ces rendez-vous : sous le masque où chacun devait rencontrer sa promise, hélas! trois fois hélas! et cri d'horreur à y penser, une autre ayant pris la place d'elle, celui qui était là, non plus n'était pas lui.	conductors of the good speech before which they were expected to sit. However, since then, the meetings between the psychoanalyst and psychoanalysis have increased in the hope that the Athenian could be reached with Athene having emerged fully armed from the head of Freud. Shall I tell you of the jealous fate, ever the same, that thwarted these meetings: beneath the mask in which everyone was to meet his promised, alas! thrice alas! and a cry of horror at the thought of it, another having taken her place, he who was there was not he either.	chairs ceased to be conductors of the good word which they were vested to sit before. Be that as it may, since then, there have been more meetings between the psychoanalyst and psychoanalysis in the hope that the Athenian would reach his apex with Athena having emerged fully armed from Freud's head. Shall I tell you of the jealous fate, every the same that thwarted these meetings? Behind the mask where each of us was to meet his betrothed-alas! Thrice alas! And a cry of horror at the thought of it, another woman having taken her place-he who was there was not him either.	audacity, or that their seats ceased to be conduits of the good **speech/word/logos [*parole*]** with which they had previously been entrusted when they sat there hereto in front. Be that as it may, since then, there have been numerous encounters between the psychoanalyst and psychoanalysis, in the hope that the Athenian might come face to face with the Athena who emerged, clad in her armour, from Freud's mind [iii]. Shall I speak of the jealous fate, ever the same, which thwarted these meetings: beneath the mask where each was to meet their betrothed, alas! three times alas! and a cry of horror at the very thought, another had taken her place, and the one who was there was, once again, not him.
Revenons donc posément à épeler avec la vérité ce qu'elle a dit d'elle-même. **La vérité a dit : « Je parle ».** Pour que nous reconnaissions **ce « je » à ce qu'il parle,** peut-être	Let us return, then, quite deliberately, and with the truth spell out what it has said of itself. **The truth has said: 'I speak'**. To recognize **this 'I' by what he speaks**, perhaps we should	Let us thus calmly return and spell out with the truth what it said of itself. **The truth said, "I speak**." In order for us to recognize this "I" on the basis of the fact that it speaks, perhaps we	Let us therefore calmly return to spelling out, in truth, what she said about herself. **The truth said: 'I speak'**. In order for us to recognise **this 'I' in what it speaks**, perhaps it

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

n'était-ce pas sur le « je » qu'il fallait nous jeter, mais aux arêtes du parler que nous devions nous arrêter. **« Il n'est parole que de langage»** nous rappelle que le langage est un ordre que des lois constituent, desquelles nous pourrions apprendre au moins ce qu'elles excluent. Par exemple que le langage, c'est différent de l'expression naturelle et que ce n'est pas non plus un code; que ça ne se confond pas avec l'information, collez-vous-y pour le savoir à la cybernétique; et que c'est si peu réductible à une superstructure qu'on vit le matétialisme lui-même s'alarmer de cette hérésie, bulle de Staline à voir ici.	not have turned to the 'I', but paused at the angle of intersection of the speech. 'There is no speech that is not language' reminds us that language is an order constituted by laws, of which we might at least learn what they exclude. For example, that language is different from natural expression and that it is not a code either; that it is not to be confused with information – and don't forget it when you are dealing with cybernetics; and that it is so irreducible to a superstructure that materialism itself is seen to be alarmed by this heresy – see Stalin's bull[c] on the question.	should not have jumped on the "I," but should have paused at the facets of the speaking. "There is no speech without language" reminds us that language is an order constituted by laws, about which we could at least learn what they exclude. For example, that language is different from natural expression and that it is not a code either; that language is not the same as information-take a close look at cybernetics and you'll see the difference; and that language is so far from being reducible to a superstructure that materialism itself was alarmed by this heresy-see Stalin's pronouncement on the question.	was not the 'I' itself that we ought to have focused on, but rather the contours of speech that we should have examined. **'There is speech/word [*parole*] only from language'** reminds us that language is an order constituted by laws, from which we might at least learn what they exclude. For example, that language is different from natural expression and is not a code either; that it should not be confused with information – look into cybernetics to find out more; and that it is so far from being reducible to a superstructure that even materialism itself is alarmed by this heresy – see Stalin's Bull[iv] here.

[i] Note, ça translates as id or it or that. The translation 'id speaks' is preferred and 'it speaks' could be correct.

1l. (reference (ii) to 1k.) Civilisation and its Discontents : 1929 : Sigmund Freud,

SE XXI p58-145, on this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19290101 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts) or www.Freud2Lacan.com

[ii] where Id hurts.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Neurosis appeared to be the outcome of a struggle between the drive for self-preservation and the demands of the libido, a struggle in which the ego/I had triumphed, but at the cost of severe suffering and sacrifice.

Das Unbehagen in der Kultur, Sigmund Freud, Studienausgabe Band IX, p245-246	Modified translation, JE, 21st October 2026, with help from Linguée	Section VI, SE XXI p117-118, translated by James Strachey, www.Freud2Lacan.com
Es wird sich zeigen, daB dem nicht so ist, daB es sich bloB darum handelt, eine Wendung, die langst vollzogen worden ist, scharfer zu fassen und in ihre Konsequenzen zu verfolgen. Von allen langsam entwickelten Stiicken der analytischen Theorie hat sich die Trieblehre am miihseligsten vorwarts getastet. Und sie war doch dem Ganzen so unentbehrlich, daB irgend etwas an ihre Stelle geriickt werden muBte. In der vollen Ratlosigkeit der Anfange gab mir der Satz des Dichterphilosophen Schiller den ersten Anhalt, daB »Hunger und Liebe« das Getriebe der Welt zusammenhalten [1]• Der Hunger konnte als Vertreter jener Triebe gelten, die das Einzelwesen erhalten wollen, die Liebe strebt nach Objekten; ihre Hauptfunktion, von der Natur in jeder Weise begiinstigt, ist die Erhaltung der Art. So traten zuerst Ichtriebe und Objekttriebe einander gegeniiber. Fiir die Energie der letzteren, und ausschlieBlich fiir sie, fiihrte ich den Namen	It remains to be seen whether this is not the case—whether it is merely a matter of articulating more clearly a shift that has long since taken place and tracing its consequences. Of all the areas of analytical theory that have developed slowly, the theory of drives has made the most painstaking progress. And yet it was so indispensable to the whole that something had to be put in its place. In the utter bewilderment of those early days, a phrase by the poet-philosopher Schiller gave me my first clue that 'hunger and love' are the forces that hold the world together. [2] Hunger could be regarded as representative of those drives that seek to preserve the individual; love, on the other hand, seeks objects; its primary function, which nature has favoured in every way, is the preservation of the species. Thus, the ego drive and the object drive were initially set in opposition to one another. I introduced the term 'libido' to denote the energy of the latter, and exclusively for that purpose [3]; Thus, the contrast	We shall see, however, that this is not so and that it is merely a matter of bringing into sharper focus a tum of thought arrived at long ago and of following out its consequences. Of all the slowly developed parts of analytic theory, the theory of the drives is the one that has felt its way the most **painfully** forward.[1] And yet that theory was so indispensable to the whole structure that something had to be put in its place. In what was at first my utter perplexity, I took as my starting-point a saying of the poet-philosopher, Schiller, that 'hunger and love are what moves the world'. [2] Hunger could be taken to represent the instincts which aim at preserving the individual; while love strives after objects, and its chief function, favoured in every way by nature, is the preservation of the species. Thus, to begin with, ego-instincts and object-instincts confronted each other. It was to denote the energy of the latter and only the latter instincts that I introduced the term 'libido'.[3] Thus the antithesis was between the

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Libido ein [2] ; somit lief der Gegensatz zwischen den Ichtrieben und den aufs Objekt gerichteten »libidinosen« Trieben der Liebe im weitesten Sinne [3]• Einer von diesen Objekttrieben, der sadistische, tat sich zwar dadurch hervor, daB sein Ziel so gar nicht liebevoll war, auch schloB er sich offenbar in manchen Stiicken den Ichtrieben an, konnte seine nahe Verwandtschaft mit Bemachtigungstrieben ohne libidinose Absicht nicht verbergen, aber man kam iiber diese Unstimmigkeit hinweg; der Sadismus gehorte doch offenbar zum Sexualleben, das grausame Spiel konnte das zartliche ersetzen. Die Neurose erschien als der Ausgang eines Kampfes zwischen dem lnteresse der Selbstbewahrung und den Anforderungen der Libido, ein Kampf, in dem das Ich gesiegt hatte, aber um den Preis Schwerer Leiden und Verzichte.	between the 'ego' drives and those directed at the object, the 'libidinal' drives of love in the broadest sense. [4] One of these object drives, the sadistic one, did indeed stand out in that its goal was by no means loving; indeed, in some respects it evidently aligned itself with the ego drives, yet it could not conceal its close kinship with power drives devoid of libidinal intent, but this inconsistency was overlooked; after all, sadism was clearly part of their sex life, this cruel game could take the place of tenderness. **Neurosis appeared to be the outcome of a struggle between the drive for self-preservation and the demands of the libido, a struggle in which the ego/I had triumphed, but at the cost of severe suffering and sacrifice.**	ego-instincts and the 'libidinal' instincts of love (in its widest sense [4]) which were directed to an object. One of these object-instincts, the sadistic instinct, stood out from the rest, it is true, in that its aim was so very far from being loving. Moreover, it was obviously in some respects attached to the ego-instincts: it could not hide its close affinity with instincts of mastery which have no libidinal purpose. But these discrepancies were got over; after all, sadism was clearly a part of sexual life, in the activities of which affection could be replaced by cruelty. Neurosis was regarded as the outcome of a struggle between the interest of self-preservation and the demands of the libido, a struggle in which the ego had been victorious but at the price of severe sufferings and renunciations.

Footnotes to Civilisation

[1] [James Strachey notes] [Some account of the history of Freud's theory of the instincts will be found in the Editor's Note to his paper 'Instincts and their Vicissitudes' (1915c), *Standard Ed.,* 14, 113 ff.]

See **Drives (mistranslated as Instincts) and their vicissitudes : 1915c : Sigmund Freud**, [Triebe und Triebschicksale. *Internationale Zeitschrift für (ärztliche) Psychoanalyse*, III, p. 84-100; *G.W.*, X, p. 210-232; SE XIV p117-140] at this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19150101 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts)

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

[2] [James Strachey notes] ['Die Weltweisen.'] [3] [James Strachey notes] [In Section II of the first paper on anxiety neurosis (1895b).]

See Section II INCIDENCE AND AETIOLOGY, SE III p102-106 of **Grounds for Detaching a Particular Syndrome from Neurasthenia under the Description "Angst (Anxiety) Neurosis' : June 1894 [1895b] : Sigmund Freud** [*Uber die Berechtigung von der Neurasthenie einen Bestimmten Symptpmenkomplex als "Angstneurose" Abzutrennen*, SE III p85-115,] Notes, availability & citations this site /3 Sigmund Freud (18940601).

Note : The problems with the James Strachey translation are explored in,

Angst translated as Anxiety in Sigmund Freud's texts : 26th February 2025 : Julia Evans,

see this site /Authors A-Z (Evans)

[4] [Civilisation, James Strachey notes] [i.e. as used by Plato. See Chapter IV of *Group Psychology* (1921c), *Standard Ed.,* 18, 99.] See **Mass (mistranslated as Group) Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego : 1921 [1922] : Sigmund Freud**, at this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19210101 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts)

1m. Footnote [4] to (1l.) Mass Psychology and the analysis of the Ego 1921

...when the Apostle Paul, in his famous Epistle to the Corinthians, extols love above all else, he certainly understood it in the specific 'broader' sense SE XVIII p91

Civilisation, Thus, the contrast between the 'ego' drives and those directed at the object, the 'libidinal' drives of love in the broadest sense. [4] SE XXI p117

[4] [James Strachey] [i.e. as used by Plato. See Chapter IV of *Group Psychology* (1921c), *Standard Ed.,* 18, 99.]

Mass (mistranslated as Group) Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego : 1921 [1922] : Sigmund Freud,

SE XVIII p69-143. [*Massenpsychologie und Ich-analyse*]

on this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19210101 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts).

P86 IV. Suggestion und Libido, Freud2Lacan	Translated by James Strachey, SE XVIII p91	Modifications then translation with Linguée, August 2026
Wir meinen also, daß die Sprache mit dem Wort »Liebe« in seinen	We are of opinion, then, that language has carried out an entirely justifiable	We therefore believe that, through the word 'love' in its manifold uses, language

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

vielfaltigen Anwendungen eine durchaus berechtigte Zusammenfassung geschaffen hat und daß wir nichts Besseres tun konnen, als dieselbe auch unseren wissenschaftlichen Erorterungen und Darstellungen zugrunde zu legen. Durch diesen Entschluß hat die Psychoanalyse einen Sturm von Entriistung entfesselt, als ob sie sich einer frevelhaften Neuerung schuldig gemacht hatte. Und doch hat die Psychoanalyse mit dieser »erweiterten« Auffassung der Liebe nichts Originelles geschaff en. Der *»Eros«* des Philosophen Plato zeigt in seiner Herkunft, Leistung und Beziehung zur Geschlechtsliebe eine vollkommene Deckung mit der Liebeskraft, der Libido der Psychoanalyse, wie Nachmansohn und Pfister im einzelnen dargelegt haben [1], und wenn der Apostel Paulus in dem beriihmten Brief an die Korinther die Liebe über alles andere preist, hat er sie gewiß im namlichen »erweiterten« Sinn verstanden [2], woraus nur zu lernen ist, daß die Menschen ihre großen Denker nicht immer ernst nehmen, auch wenn sie sie angeblich sehr bewundern.	piece of unification in creating the word 'love' with its numerous uses, and that we cannot do better than take it as the basis of our scientific discussions and expositions as well. By coming to this decision, psycho-analysis has let loose a storm of indignation, as though it had been guilty of an act of outrageous innovation. Yet it has done nothing original in taking love in this 'wider' sense. In its origin, function, and relation to sexual love, the 'Eros' of the philosopher Plato coincides exactly with the love-force, the libido of psychoanalysis, as has been shown in detail by Nachansohn (1915) and Pfister (1921) ; and when the apostle Paul, in his famous epistle to the Corinthians, praises love above all else, he certainly understands it in the same 'wider' sense.[1] But this only shows that men do not always take their great thinkers seriously, even when they profess most to admire them.	has provided a perfectly valid summary, and that we can do no better than to use it as the basis for our scholarly discussions and expositions. This decision sparked a storm of indignation against psychoanalysis, as though it were guilty of some sacrilegious innovation. And yet psychoanalysis has not created anything original with this ‘expanded’ conception of love. The ‘Eros’ of the philosopher Plato, in terms of its origins, nature and relationship to sexual love, corresponds perfectly with the ‘love force’, the libido of psychoanalysis, as Nachmansohn and Pfister have explained in detail [1], and **when the Apostle Paul, in his famous Epistle to the Corinthians, extols love above all else, he certainly understood it in the specific ‘broader’ sense** [2], from this we can only conclude that people do not always take their great thinkers seriously, even if they claim to admire them greatly.
Diese Liebestriebe werden nun in der Psychoanalyse *a potiori* und von ihrer Herkunft her Sexualtriebe geheißen.	Psycho-analysis, then, gives these love instincts the name of sexual instincts, *a potiori* and by reason of their origin.	In psychoanalysis, these love-drives are now termed sexual drives *a potiori* [i] and on the basis of their origin.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Freud/Strachey's notes

[1] NACHANSOHN, M. (1915) 'Freuds Libidotheorie verglichen mit der Eroslehre Platos', *Int. Z. ärztl. Psychoanal.,* 3, 65.

PFISTER, O. (1921) 'Plato als Vorläufer der Psychoanakyse', *Int. Z. Psychoanal.,* 7, 264

[2] [James Strachey gives] 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity [love], I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.' The Letter of St Paul to the Corinthians, 1 Corinthians Chapter 13 Verse 1

AND/OR Julia Evans suggests, "Charity [love] suffereth long, and is kind; charity [love] envieth not; charity [love] vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up". 1 Corinthians Chapter 13 Verse 4, King James Version (KJV),

KJV actually translates the Greek word for love as "charity" rather than "love".

Julia Evans notes that as Freud cites the epistle or letter to the Corinthians, both passages should be considered, indeed the complete Epistle.

JE's note

[i] [From Wikipedia August 2026], *a potiori* – Etymology-Learned borrowing from Latin denominatio a potiori ("naming from the stronger"). Adjective – a potiori (not comparable). First usage – (of an argument) from the stronger or more important; according to the majority.

Footnotes to 1k. The Freudian Thing continued

1n. [Footnote to 1l] "Medusa's Head" (Das Medusenhaupt) : 1922 : Sigmund Freud

The Freudian Thing-[iii] in the hope that the Athenian might come face to face with the Athena who emerged, clad in her armour, from Freud's mind.

"This symbol of horror is worn upon her dress by the virgin goddess Athena"

Sigmund Freud owned a bronze statuette of Athena & refers to it in "Medusa's Head" (Das Medusenhaupt) : 1922 : Sigmund Freud, SE XVIII p273)

Downloaded from https://www.freud.org.uk/collections/objects/3007/ on 21st October 2026,

This bronze statuette depicts Athena, goddess of war.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

She wears a Corinthian style helmet with a long crest and an aegis, or breastplate, with a Medusa head, a typical attribute of Athena. In her one hand she holds a decorated patera or libation bowl, and in her raised left hand she would have held a spear, now lost.

This solid-cast figurine of Athena presents the goddess of wisdom and war in a frontal pose. The overall style of the figure is Roman, however, its *contrapposto* pose is classical Greek, suggesting the influence of a fifth century B.C. Greek work.

Freud displayed his attachment to this bronze Athena by placing her in the centre of his desk and by selecting her as the first piece to be smuggled out of Austria in 1938, when the loss of his entire antiquities collection was threatened. It could be said that this was his 'favourite' piece.

In a short manuscript dated 1922 ("Medusa's Head" (German: Das Medusenhaupt), SE, 18, p273), Freud discusses the sexual symbolism of the decapitated, serpent-trussed head of the Medusa, which Athena wears on her breast plate. According to Freud, decapitation represents castration, and the horrifying decapitated head of Medusa symbolizes the female genitals, which lack a phallus.

Freud asks us to see how strange it is that the fear in this myth is associated with the sight of something, rather than any threat which the object of fear might pose. Paradoxically, the snakes which adorn the head of the Medusa serve to lessen the gruesomeness of the image of castration by symbolically replacing the penis which has been lost. Freud wrote:

*"**This symbol of horror is worn upon her dress by the virgin goddess Athena**. And rightly so, for thus she becomes a woman who is unapproachable and repels all sexual desires – since she displays the terrifying genitals of the Mother. Since the Greeks were in the main strongly homosexual, it was inevitable that we should find among them a representation of woman as a being who frightens and repels [a male] because she is castrated."*

**

Reference to 1k.

Lacan, The Freudian Thing, see Stalin's Bull [iv] here.

[iv] Possibly, "The rabbit is Stalin's bull." This ridiculous slogan of the early 1930s is almost forgotten today. But at the time it was emblazoned on the front pages of newspapers, on posters and enormous street banners. … this slogan encapsulated the mood and ideology of the era.
[https://www.themoscowtimes.com/2023/02/11/when-rabbits-were-golden-a80203 August 2026]

SECTION 3

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

2. SEMINAR IV

See Seminar IV The Relation from Object [*La Relation d'objet*] & Freudian Structures (1956-1957) : from 21stNovember 1956 : Jacques Lacan at this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19561121)

2a. 5th December 1956

'…before 'I' [*je*] emerges from 'self' [*soi*] or 'id' [*ça*], there was something that the 'id' was, of course. It is simply a question of knowing what this 'id' [*ce ça*] is.'
P2 of EC Collective's translation, published at www.LacanianWorksExchange.net. See Session of Seminar IV (The signifier and the Holy Spirit) : 5th December 1956 : Jacques Lacan, on this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19561205 or 19561121)

P21 Staferla downloaded 29 September 2026, http://staferla.free.fr/S4/S4.htm	P2 of EC Group's translation, 5th December 1956, www.LacanianWorksExchange.net
À la vérité, il y a là plusieurs remarques à faire. La première est celle-ci : c'est qu'ayant à vous parler de la réalité, et ayant commencé par la définir par la Wirklichkeit, par l'efficacité de tout le système, dans l'occasion le système psychique, qu'ayant d'autre part voulu vous préciser le caractère mythique d'une certaine façon de concevoir cette réalité, et l'ayant située par cet exemple, je ne suis pas arrivé au troisième point qui est encore celui sous lequel peut se presenter ce thème du réel, c'est à savoir justement ce qui est avant, nous y avons constamment affaire.	In truth, there are several remarks to make here. The first one is in having to speak to you about reality, and having started by defining it as Wirklichkeit, as the efficacy of the whole system, in this case the psychical system. Then, secondly, in also having wanted to specify the mythical character of a certain way of conceiving this reality and having located it through this example. I didn't get to the third point which is the one under which the topic of the real can be presented – namely, precisely what was there before [avant]. We are constantly dealing with it.
Bien entendu c'est encore justement une façon de considérer la réalité, ce qui est avant qu'un certain fonctionnement symbolique se soit exercé, et bien entendu c'est là ce qu'il y a de plus solide dans le mirage qui repose dans l'objection que l'on m'a faite. Car à la vérité je ne suis pas du tout en train de nier ici qu'il y ait quelque chose qui soit avant : **avant par exemple que « je » advienne du « soi » ou du « ça », il y avait quelque chose dont le « ça » était, bien entendu. Il s'agit simplement de savoir ce que c'est que ce « ça ».**	Of course, it is precisely another way of considering reality, what was there before a certain symbolic operation has taken place. And, of course, this is the most substantial part of the mirage which is implicit in the objection that was made. For, in truth, I am not at all denying here that something was there before. **For example, before 'I' emerges from 'self' [*soi*] or 'id' [*ça*], there was something that the 'id' was, of course. It is simply a question of knowing what this 'id' [*ce ça*] is.**[3] (Translation altered)
On me dit que dans le cas de l'usine, ce qu'il y a avant c'est en effet l'énergie.	I am told in the case of the power plant that what comes first is effectively the energy.

2b. (Footnote [3] to 2a) Wo es war, soll Ich werden SE XXII p71

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

[3] There is an echo here of Freud's phrase "Wo es war, soll Ich werden", which Strachey translates as "Where Id was, there Ego shall be." Probably Lacan's translation is, "Where Id was, there I shall be'. The phrase appears in the last but one sentence of 'Lecture XXXI: Dissection of the personality' in Freud, S. (1933 [1932]). New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis (SE XXII p51-71), See this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19320616 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts & also see 1j. for full quote.

2c. 5th December 1956

The Es. … that is, that which in the subject is liable to become 'I',

p4 of EC Collective's translation, published at www.LacanianWorksExchange.net. See Session of Seminar IV (The signifier and the Holy Spirit) : 5th December 1956 : Jacques Lacan, on this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19561205 or 19561121)

P22 of Staferla, downloaded September 2026, http://staferla.free.fr/S4/S4.htm	5th December 1956 p4 of EC's Transl. , www.LacanianWorksExchange.net
Le *Es* donc, celui que nous avons l'habitude de considérer lui aussi à sa manière comme quelque chose qui a le plus grand rapport avec les tendances, avec les instincts et avec en quelque sorte justement la libido, qu'est–ce que c'est? Et à quoi cette comparaison nous permet-elle justement de le comparer?	The Es, then, which we are also in the habit of considering to have, in its own way, the greatest relation to inclinations, instincts, and in a sense, precisely to the libido... what is the Es? And to what, precisely, does this comparison allow us to compare it?
Il nous est permis, le Es de le comparer à quelque chose qui est très précisément l'usine, à l'usine pour quelqu'un qui la voit et qui ne sait absolument pas comment elle marche, à l'usine comme vue par un personnage inculte, qui pense en effet que c'est peut-être le génie du courant qui à l'intérieur se met à faire des farces et à transformer l'eau en lumière ou en force.	We are allowed to compare the Es to something which is, quite precisely, the power plant, to the power plant for someone who sees it and knows absolutely nothing about how it works, to the power plant as seen by an uneducated person, who in fact thinks that it is maybe the genie of the current inside who is pulling pranks and transforming water into light or power.
Mais le *Es*, que veut-il dire ? Le Es, c'est-à-dire ce qui dans le sujet est susceptible de devenir je, car c'est cela encore la meilleure définition que nous puissions avoir du Es. Ce que l'analyse nous a apporté, c'est qu'il n'est pas une réalité brute, ni simplement « ce qui est avant », il est quelque chose : – qui est déjà organisé comme est organisé le *signifiant*, – qui est déjà articulé comme est articulé le *signifiant*. C'est vrai comme pour ce que produit la machine, déjà toute la force pourrait être transformée, à cette différence près tout de même, qu'elle est non seulement transformée, mais qu'elle peut	But the Es, what does it mean [que veut-il dire]? **The Es. .. that is, that which in the subject is liable to become 'I',** for that is still the best definition that we can have of the Es. What analysis has brought to us is that it is not a brute reality, nor simply what comes first. It is something -which is already organised like the signifier is organised, -which is already articulated like the signifier is articulated. It is true, just as with what the machine produces, that all the power could already be transformed, with the difference being that, even so, it is not only transformed but can be accumulated. This, here, is exactly

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

être *accumulée*, c'est même là l'intérêt essential du fait que l'usine soit une usine hydroélectrique et non pas simplement par exemple une usine hydromécanique.	the essential point of interest in the fact that the power plant is a hydroelectric power plant and not simply, for example, a hydromechanical plant
Il est vrai bien entendu qu'il y a toute cette énergie, néanmoins personne ne peut contester qu'il y a une différence sensible - et pas simplement dans le paysage, mais dans le réel – quand l'usine est construite, l'usine ne s'est pas construite par l'opération du *Saint-Esprit* - seulement le Saint-Esprit - si vous en doutez vous avez tort. C'est précisément pour vous rappeler la presence du *Saint-Esprit,*absolument essentielle au progrès de notre compréhension de l'analyse que je vous fais cette théorie du *signifiant* et du *signifié*.	Nevertheless, nobody can deny that there is a perceptible difference -not only in the landscape but in the real, when the power plant is built. The power plant was not constructed by an act of the Holy Spirit - only the Holy Spirit – if you have doubts you are wrong. It is precisely in order to remind you of the presence of the Holy Spirit, absolutely essential for the progression of our understanding of analysis, that I am giving you this theory of the signifier and the signified.

2d. 27th February 1957

It (phallus) is never really there where it (self or me or Ego) [*le moi*] is, it (phallus) is never quite absent there where it (self or me or Ego)[*le moi*] isn't.

See Session of Seminar IV The phallus and the unfulfilled mother : 27th February 1957 : Jacques Lacan, on this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19570227 or 19561121)

P277 of Staferla, Séminaire 4	Via Linguée 26th October 2026	P11-12 of EC Collective's translation, 28th March 2022
Ce *phallus*, qui est fondamental en tant que significant dans cet imaginaire de la mère qu'il s'agit de rejoindre pour des raisons absolument fondamentales, puisque c'est sur cette *toute-puissance* de la mère que le *moi* de l'enfant repose, il s'agit de voir où il est et où il n'est pas. Il n'est jamais vraiment là où il est, il n'est jamais tout à fait absent là où il n'est pas.	This phallus, which is fundamental as a signifier within this imaginary of the mother that it acts by itself (*s'agit*) to rejoin for absolutely fundamental reasons, since it is on top of this omnipotence of the mother that the child's self [*le moi*] is grounded, it acts by itself [*s'agit*]to see where it is or it isn't. **It (phallus) is never really there where it (self) [*le moi*] is, it (phallus) is never quite absent there where it (self)[*le moi*] isn't.**	We must see where this phallus is and is not. It is fundamental as a signifier within this imaginary of the mother, which must be encountered for absolutely fundamental reasons, since the child's ego is resting on the mother's total power. **The phallus is never really where it is, and it is never completely absent where it is not.**[34]

Footnote 34, (EC Collective's translation, 34 Probably a reference to 'Wo es war soll Ich werden': Where it was there I become. Last paragraph of "Lecture XXXI - Dissection of

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

the personality" Freud Sigmund (1932) SE XII. Two previous citations in Seminar IV 5th December 1956

2e. 13th March 1957

...at the level of the big Other there is someone who is able to respond in any event, and who only responds in all cases the phallus, the truth, the real penis

See Session of Seminar IV On the Oedipus Complex : 13th March 1957 : Jacques Lacan, on this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19570313 or 19561121)

P324 Staferla, Séminaire 4	P12 of EC Collective's translation, 29th September 2022
Il y a la notion de quelque chose qui ajoute à la dimension qu'on attendait sur le plan de *la relation symbolique*, à savoir que ce qui n'était jusque là dans l'apport de *la relation symbolique* que cet appel et rappel don't je vous ai parlé la dernière fois qui caractérise la mère symbolique, devient *la notion qu'au niveau du grand Autre il y a quelqu'un qui peut répondre en tout état de cause, et qui répond qu'en tout cas le phallus, le vrai, le pénis réel, c'est lui qu'il l'a*. C'est lui qui a l'atout maître et qui le sait. C'est *cette introduction de cet élément réel dans l'ordre symbolique* - inverse de la première position de la mère qui se *symbolise* dans le *réel* par *sa présence* et *son absence*.	There[21] is the notion of something that adds to the dimension which was waited for on the groundwork [*sur le plan*] of the symbolic relation [*relation*], to know that what was until then only within the contribution of the symbolic relation [*relation*] that this call and recall I told you about last time, which characterises the symbolic mother, becomes the notion that **at the level of the big Other there is someone who is able to respond in any event, and who only responds in all cases the phallus, the truth, the real penis**[22]. He is the one who has it. He's the one with the trump card, and he knows it. It is this introduction of this real element within the symbolic order - inverse of the mother's first position, who symbolises herself [*se symbolise*] within the real through her presence and her absence. [translation altered 29th October 2026]

Footnotes from EC Collectives' translation
[21] This paragraph has been very difficult to translate and despite having taken advice from others, it remains difficult.
[22] Given the Biblical references further on (p13-14 of EC Collectives' translation of this session), this may be a reference to John chapter 14, verse 6. 'Jesus said to him, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.' English Standard Version

2f. 13th March 1957

But he can only enter within this order of the law if for at least a moment he has had a real partner in front of him, ... someone who responds to him. ...

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

... insofar as he is the symbolic father, it is the one who could say as the God of monotheism said: I am the one who am ...

... in other words that everything goes to be resolved through the: 'You are the one who is'. Don't believe it, because in order to say this to whomever this from other should be (in place), who am I?

P113 Staferla, Séminaire 4, accessed 29th October 2026	P13-14 of EC Collective's translation-13th March 1957, 29th September 2022
C'est dans cette relation à quelque chose qui est le réel dans le symbolique, celui qui est vraiment le père et dont personne ne peut dire finalement ce que c'est vraiment que d'être le père, si ce n'est que c'est justement quelque chose qui se trouve déjà là dans le jeu, c'est par rapport à ce jeu joué avec le père, ce jeu de qui perd gagne, si je puis dire, que l'enfant peut conquérir la foi qui dépose en lui cette première inscription de la loi.	It is within this relation [*relation*] to something that is the real within the symbolic, the one who is really the father and of whom no-one can finally say what it is really like to be the father, if that is not precisely something that is already there within the game, it is through relationship [*par rapport*] to this game enjoyed [joui from joué] with the father, this game of 'who loses wins', if I may say so, that the child can conquer the belief which deposits in him this first inscription of the law.
Que devient ce drame où il est - comme on nous le décrit dans la dialectique freudienne - un petit criminel. C'est par la voie de ce crime imaginaire qu'il entre dans l'ordre de la loi. Mais il ne peut entrer dans cet ordre de la loi que si, au moins un instant, il a eu en face de lui un partenaire réel, quelqu'un : qui effectivement a apporté à ce niveau de l'Autre, quelque chose qui n'est pas simplement appel et rappel, qui n'est pas simplement couple de la présence et de l'absence, élément foncièrement néantisant du symbolique, …mais quelqu'un qui lui répond.	What becomes of this drama in which he is, as described to us within the Freudian dialectic, a petty criminal. It is through the way of this imaginary crime that he enters within the order of the law. **But he can only enter within this order of the [p210] law if for at least a moment he has had a real partner in front of him,** someone who effectively has provided this level of the Other, something that is not simply 'call and recall', which is not simply a couple of the 'presence and absence', a fundamentally collateralising [24] [*néantisant*] element of the symbolic, **but someone who responds to him.**
Or si les choses peuvent ainsi s'exprimer sur le plan du drame imaginaire, c'est au niveau du jeu imaginaire que cette experience doit être faite. Ce n'est pas sans raison que de cette exigence de cette dimension de l'altérité absolue de celui qui a simplement la puissance et qui en réponde, ne naît aucun dialogue particulier. Elle est incarnée dans des personnages réels, mais ces personnages	But if things can be expressed in this way on the groundwork [sur le plan] of the imaginary drama, it is at the level of the imaginary game that this experience must be made. It is not without reason that from this demand for this dimension of absolute otherness of the one who simply has the power and who responds to it, no particular dialogue is born. It (the power) is embodied within those real characters,

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

réels eux-mêmes sont toujours dépendants de quelque chose qui, par rapport à eux, se présente en fin de compte comme un éternel alibi.	but these real characters themselves are always dependent on something that, through relationship [*par rapport*] to them, ultimately presents itself as an eternal alibi.
Le seul qui puisse répondre absolument à cette position du père en tant qu'il est le père symbolique, c'est celui qui pourrait dire, comme le Dieu du monothéisme l'a dit : « Je suis celui qui suis ». Mais c'est une chose qui - mis à part le texte sacré où nous le rencontrons - ne peut être littéralement prononcée par personne. Vous me direz alors : « Vous nous avez appris que le message que nous recevons, c'est le notre propre sous une forme inversée, autrement dit, que tout va se résoudre par le « Tu es celui qui es » ». N'en croyez rien, parce que pour dire cela à qui que ce soit d'autre, qui suis-je ?	The only one who can absolutely respond to this position of the father **insofar as he is the symbolic father, it is the one who could say as the God of monotheism said: I am the one who am** [25]. But it is one thing that, apart from the sacred text where we encounter it, cannot be literally pronounced by anyone. So you tell me: you have learnt for yourselves that the message we receive, it is our own under [*sous*] an inverted form**, in other words that everything goes to be resolved through the: 'You are the one who is' [26]. Don't believe it, because in order to say this to whomever this from other should be (in place), who am I?** (Translation modified 1st November 2026)[27]...
En d'autres termes, ce que je veux vous indiquer là , c'est que le Père symbolique est à proprement parler impensable : il n'est nulle part, il n'intervient nulle part, et la preuve en est, c'est qu'en même temps cela nous démontre qu'il a fallu un esprit aussi lié aux exigences de la pensée scientifique et positive qu'était FREUD, pour faire cette construction, à laquelle JONES nous confie qu'il tenait plus qu'à toute son œuvre. Il ne la mettait pas au premier plan, car son oeuvre majeure et la seule, il l'a écrit, affirmé et ne l'a jamais démenti, c'est La Sciences des rêves, mais celle qui lui était la plus chère, comme d'une réussite qui lui paraissait une performance, c'est Totem et tabou, qui n'est rien d'autre qu'un mythe moderne, un mythe construit pour nous expliquer ce qui restait béant dans sa doctrine, à savoir : où est le père?	In other words, what I want to point out here, it is that the symbolic father is strictly speaking unthinkable, he is nowhere, he does not intervene anywhere, and the proof is that, at the same time, this shows us that it took a mind [*un esprit*] as bound to the requirements of scientific and positive thinking as Freud was, in order to make this construction to which Jones confides to us that he held onto more than to his entire work.[28] He did not put it in the foreground (au premier plan), because his major work, and the only one, he wrote it, affirmed and never denied it, it is the 'Interpretation of Dreams'[29] but the one that was most dear to him as a success that seemed to him an achievement, it is 'Totem and Taboo'[30], which is nothing more than a modern myth, a myth constructed in order to explain to us what remained open in his doctrine, namely: where is the father?

Footnotes from EC Collectives' translation
[24] NÉANTISATION, subst. Fém. - Philosophy

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

[In Sartre] Action of neantising or of being neantised; action of the being of consciousness (the for-itself) insofar as it frees itself from reality (the in-itself) `` (Miq. 1967). Reduction to nothing, to nothingness. For Sartre, "neantisation" refers to the operation by which one eliminates certain sectors from one's intentional world and makes them unreal, treating them as if they were not: one treats them as not counting. - (Jacqueline Russ, France Farago, Les méthodes en philosophie, 3rd ed., 2017, Armand Colin) From https://www.lalanguefrancaise.com/dictionnaire/definition/neantisation
[25] Je suis celui qui suis Exodus, chapter 3, verse 14, 'God said to Moses, " I AM WHO I AM." And he said, "Say this to the people of Israel: ' I AM has sent me to you.'"
English Standard Version
[26] Tu es celui qui es(t) Probably, Mathew chapter 11 verse 2-3, 'Now when John heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ, he sent word by his disciples and said to him, "Are you the one who is to come, or shall we look for another?"'
English Standard Version
[27] Qui suis-je? Probably, Matthew chapter 16 verses 13-17
'13 Now when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, "Who do people say that the Son of Man is?"
14 And they said, "Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets."
15 He said to them, "But who do you say that I am?"
16 Simon Peter replied, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God."
17 And Jesus answered him, "Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven". '
English Standard Version
[28] Couvre is given in the transcript which translates as cover. It is suggested that this is a transcription error. Oeuvre is a possibility and means work.
[29] The Interpretation of Dreams: 6th November 1899 (published as 1900): Sigmund Freud , SE IV & V, See www.LacanianWorks.org /The Interpretation of Dreams : 6th November 1899 (published as 1900) : Sigmund Freud, at this site /3 Sigmund Freud (18991106 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts) & www.Freud2Lacan.com . la Sciences des rêves in the original French translation - 'the science of dreams'
[30] Totem and Taboo: 1912-1913: Sigmund Freud, SE XIII p 1-162, See www.Freud2Lacan.com or Totem and Taboo : 4th June 1913 [1912-1913] : Sigmund Freud on this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19130604 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts)

SECTION 4

3. TRUTH & SCIENCE 1st DECEMBER 1965 SEMINAR XIII

Session of Seminar XIII- Science & Truth : 1st December 1965 : Jacques Lacan.
See this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19651201 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts)

3a. Jacques Lacan's citation - 19th June 1968 Seminar XV

And actually, before I articulated it precisely as I did here one day…
and as if wearing a perfectly logicised label, the article titled "Truth and Science" in my *Écrits*

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

P142 of Staferla, Séminaire XV	With help from Linguée 30th October 2026	p7 of Cormac Gallagher's transl. 19th June 1968 LacaninIreland.com	P9 of Anthony Chadwick's transl. 19th June 1968, Freud2Lacan.com,
Il y a un mot que j'ai fait rentrer ici il y a quelques années dans cette dialectique, c'est le mot « *vérité* ». Et puis à vrai dire avant de l'articuler précisément comme je l'ai fait ici un certain jour… et comme en porte *la marque parfaitement logicisée* l'article qui s'appelle dans mes *Écrits* : *La vérité et la science* [119]	There's a word I introduced into this dialectic a few years ago: "truth." And actually, before I articulated it precisely as I did here one day… **and as if wearing a perfectly logicised label, the article titled "Truth and Science"** in my *Écrits*	There is a word that I brought in here a few years ago, into this dialectic. It is the word truth. And then, in truth, before articulating it precisely as I did here on a particular day, the perfectly logical mark of the article Truth and Science, in my Écrits bears witness to,	There is a word that I brought back here a few years ago, it's the word "truth". And then, to tell the truth, before articulating precisely as I did here one day and as carries the perfectly digitised mark the article which is called in my Écrits "Truth and Science",

Footnote 119 (Staferla,) « La science et la vérité », Écrits p. 855. See 3b.

3b 1st December 1965
... but because the logical form given to this knowledge [*ce savoir*] includes the mode of communication as suturing the subject that it implies.

See Session of Seminar XIII- Science & Truth : 1st December 1965 : Jacques Lacan.
See this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19651201 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts)

P16 Staferla, Séminaire 13, Downloaded 30th October 2026	With help from Linguée, 1st November 2026	p24-25 of Bruce Fink's translation, 2002
Ai-je besoin en effet de dire que dans la science, à l'opposé de la magie et de la religion, le savoir se communique?	Do I really need to say that in science—unlike in magic and religion—knowledge is shared?	Need it be said that in science, as opposed to magic and religion, knowledge is communicated?
Mais il faut insister que ce n'est pas seulement parce que c'est l'usage, mais que la forme logique donnée à	But it must be emphasized that this is not merely because it is customary, **but because the logical**	It must be stressed that this is not merely because it is usually done, but because the logical form given this

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

ce savoir inclut le mode de la communication comme suturant le sujet qu'il implique.	**form given to this knowledge [*ce savoir*] includes the mode of communication as suturing the subject that it (the mode) implies.**	knowledge includes a mode of communication which sutures the subject knowledge implies.
Tel est le problème premier que soulève la communication en psychanalyse : le premier obstacle à sa valeur scientifique est que la relation à la vérité comme cause sous ses aspects matériels est resté négligée dans le cercle de son travail.	This is the first problem that poses communication in psychoanalysis: the first obstacle to its scientific value is that the relation [*relation*] to truth as cause under its material aspects has been left neglected within the circle of its work.	That is the main problem raised by communication in psychoanalysis. The first obstacle to its scientific value is that the relation to truth as cause, in its material guises, has remained neglected by the circle of its elaborators.
Conclurai-je à rejoindre le point d'où je suis parti aujourd'hui : division du sujet ? Ce point est un nœud.	Should I conclude by returning to the point from where I started today: the division of the subject? This point is a knot.	Shall I conclude in returning to the point with which I began today: the division of the subject? This point constitutes a knot.
Rappelons où Freud l'ouvre : sur ce manque du pénis de la mère où se révèle au sujet, la nature du phallus.	Let us recall where Freud opens it : on this lack of the penis of the mother, where the nature of the phallus is revealed to the subject.	Let us recall that Freud unties the knot in his discussion of the lack of the mother's penis, where the nature of the phallus is revealed.
Le sujet se divise ici - nous dit Freud - à l'endroit de la réalité, voyant à la fois s'y ouvrir le gouffre contre lequel il se rempardera d'une phobie, et d'autre part le recouvrant de cette surface où il érigera le fétiche, c'est-à-dire l'existence du pénis comme maintenue, quoique déplacée.	Here, Freud tells us, the subject splits at the place of reality, seeing at the time the abyss open up there—against which he/she will fortify themselves from a phobia—and, on the other hand, the portion overlying it from this surface where he will erect the fetish, that is to say, the existence of the penis as supported, yet transposed. [Fetishism : 1927 : Sigmund Freud-see note [i] below]	He tells us that the subject divides here regarding reality, seeing an abyss opening up therein against which he protects himself with a phobia, and which he at the same time covers over with a surface upon which he erects a fetish, i.e. the existence of the penis maintained albeit displaced.
– D'un côté extrayant le « pas de... » du « pas de pénis », à mettre entre parenthèse, pour le transférer au « pas de	- On the one hand extracting the "no from…" from the "no from penis" to put between parentheses in order to transfer it to the	Let us, on the one hand, extract the (no) *[pas-de]* from the (no-penis) *[pas-de-penis],* to be bracketed out *[a mettre*

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

savoir » qui est le pas-hésitation de la névrose.	"no from knowledge" which is the hesitation-step of neurosis.	*entre parentheses],* and transfer it to the no-knowledge *[pas-de-savoir]* that is the hesitation step *[pas-hesitation]* of neurosis [48]
– De l'autre, reconnaissons l'efficace du sujet dans ce gnomon qu'il érige, à lui désigner à toute heure le point de vérité, révélant du phallus lui-même qu'il n'est rien d'autre que ce point de manque qu'il indique dans le sujet.	- On the other hand, let us recognise the effectiveness of the subject within this gnomon that he erects, to assign to him at every moment the point of truth, revealing from the phallus itself that it is nothing from other than this point of lack that it indicates within the subject.	Let us, on the other hand, recognize the subject's efficacity in the *gnomon* he erects, a *gnomon* that constantly indicates truth's site [49] to him. Revealing that the phallus itself is nothing but the site of lack it indicates in the subject.
Cet index est aussi celui qui nous pointe le chemin où nous voulons aller cette année, c'est-à-dire là où vous-même reculez d'être en ce manque - comme psychanalystes - suscités.	This index is also the one that points to us the way where we want to go this year, that is to say, there where you yourselves retreat within this lack —as psychoanalysts—generated.	This is the same index that directs me to the path along which I want to proceed this year, i.e. the path away from which you· yourselves shy, as you are called forth as analysts in that lack.
		[48] "pas" in French can mean both "no" (or "not") and "step". [49] "le point de vérité:" the point, place or position of truth: "site of lack" in the next sentence corresponds to "ce point de manque". I have translated "à toute heure" by "constantly", but the combination in French of something being erected that at every moment or hour designates the place of something else could be taken to have sundial overtones. Lacan is here playing off the expression "l'heure de vérité" the moment of truth in writing "à toute heure le point de vérité"

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

3c. Footnote to 3b. Fetishism : 1927 : Sigmund Freud

the fetish is a substitute for the penis

To put it more plainly, the fetish is a substitute for the phallus of the woman (the mother), in which the little boy believed and which – for reasons we know – he is unwilling to do without.
Fetishism : 1927 : Sigmund Freud, this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19270101 or Index of Sigmund Freud's texts)

Fetischismus (1927) GW XIV p312-313 www.Freud2Lacan.com	Translated, unchecked, via Linguée, 4th November 2026	Fetischism (1927) Translated by James Strachey SE XXI p152-153
Die Auskunft, welchc die Analyse iiber Sinn und Absicht des Fetisch gab, war in allen Fallen die namliche. Sie ergab sich so ungezwungen und erschien mir so zwingcnd, daB idl bereit bin, dieselbe Losung allgemein fur aile Faile von Fetisdtismus zu erwarten. Wenn ich nun mitteile, der Fetisch ist ein Penisersatz, so werde ich gewiB Enttauschung hervorrufen. Ich beeile mich darum hinzuzufiigen, nicht der Ersatz eines bcliebigen, sondern cines bestimmtcn, ganz besonderen Penis, der in frühcn Kindcrjahren eine groBc Bedeutung hat, aber später verlorengeht. Das heiBt: er sollte normalerweise aufgegeben werden, aber gerade der Fetisch ist dazu bestimmt, ihn vor dem Untergang zu behüten. Urn es klarer zu sagcn, der Fetisch ist der Ersatz fur den Phallus des Wcibcs (dcr Mutter), an den das Knablcin geglaubt hat und auf den es- wir wissen warum- nicht verzichten will [1].	The insight provided by the analysis of the meaning and purpose of the fetish was, in every case, the same. It arose so naturally and struck me as so compelling that I am quite prepared to expect the same solution to apply generally to all forms of fetishism. If I were now to suggest that **the fetish is a substitute for the penis**, I would certainly cause disappointment. I hasten to add, therefore, that it is not a substitute for just any penis, but for a specific, very special penis, which is of great significance in early childhood but is later lost. In other words: it should normally be abandoned, but it is precisely the fetish that is intended to protect it from destruction. **To put it more plainly, the fetish is a substitute for the phallus of the woman (the mother), in which the little boy believed and which – for reasons we know – he is unwillingto do without** [1].	In every instance, the meaning and the purpose of the fetish turned out, in analysis, to be the same. It revealed itself so naturally and seemed to me so compelling that I am prepared to expect the same solution in all cases of fetishism. When now I announce that the fetish is a substitute for the penis, I shall certainly create disappointment; so I hasten to add that it is not a substitute for any chance penis, but for a particular and quite special penis that had been extremely important in early childhood but had later been lost. That is to say, it should normally have been given up, but the fetish is precisely designed to preserve it from extinction. To put it more plainly: the fetish is a substitute for the woman's (the mother's) penis that the little boy once believed in and-for reasons familiar to us-does

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

		not want to give up.[SE XXI p153 Footnote l]
[1] Diese Deutung ist bereits 1910 in mciner Schrift. *Eine Kindheitserinnerung des Leonardo da Vinci* ohne Bcgründung mitgeteilt worden. *[Studienausgabe,* Bd. 10, S. 122. Vgl. dic >Editorischc Vorbemerkung<, oben, S. 381 f.]	(Via Linguée) 'This interpretation was already presented in 1910 in my essay "A Childhood Memory of Leonardo da Vinci" without any justification. [Critical Edition, Vol. 10, p. 122. See the "Editorial Preface" above, S. 381f.]	SE XXI p153 Sigmund Freud's Footnote 1, This interpretation was made as early as 1910, in my study on Leonardo da Vinci, without any reasons being given for it. [SE XI p96][i]

3d. Footnote [i] to 3c. Leonardo da Vinci (1910)

It is by no means irrelevant what a person believes they remember from their childhood; as a rule, hidden within the fragments of memory which they themselves do not understand ...

The erotic attraction emanating from the mother soon culminated in a longing for her genitals, which were perceived as a penis. With the realization, acquired only later, that the female does not possess a penis, this longing often turns into its opposite, giving way to a sense of revulsion...
See Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood : 1910c : Sigmund Freud. See this site /3 Sigmund Freud (19100101)

Footnote [i]

GW p153, www.Freud2Lacan.com	Linguée translation, 4th November 2026	SE XI p84, translated by James Strachey
Es ist nicht gleichgültig, was ein Mensch aus seiner Kindheit zu erinnern glaubt; in der Regel sind hinter den von ihm selbst nicht verstandenen Erinnerungsresten unschatzbare Zeugnisse für die bedeutsamsten Züge seiner seelischen Entwicklung verborgen.	**It is by no means irrelevant what a person believes they remember from their childhood; as a rule, hidden within the fragments of memory which they themselves do not understand** lie invaluable insights into the most significant aspects of their psychological development.	What someone thinks he remembers from his childhood is not a matter of indifference; as a rule the residual memories-which he himself does not understand- cloak priceless pieces of evidence about the most important features in his mental development.
GW p166, www.Freud2Lacan.com	Linguée translation, 4th November 2026	SE XI p96, translated by James Strachey

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Die erotische Anziehung, die von der Person der Mutter ausging, gipfelte bald in der Sehnsucht nach ihrem für einen Penis gehaltenen Genitale. Mit der erst spat erworbenen Erkenntnis, daB das Weib keinen Penis besitzt, schlägt diese Sehnsucht oft in ihr Gegenteil um, macht einem Abscheu Platz, der in den Jahren der Pubertät zur Ursache der psychischen lmpotenz, der Misogynie, der dauernden Homosexualität werden kann. Aber die Fixierung an das einst heiBbegehrte Objekt, den Penis des Weibes, hinterläBt unauslöschliche Spuren im Seelenleben des Kindes, welches jenes Stück infantiler Sexualforschung mit besonderer Vertiefung durchgemacht hat. Die fetischartige Verehrung des weiblichen FuBes und Schuhes scheint den FuB nur als Ersatzsymbol für das einst verehrte, seither vermiBte Glied des Weibes zu nehmen; die “Zopfabschneider" spielen, ohne es zu wissen, die Rolle von Personen, die am weiblichen Genitale den Akt der Kastration ausführen.	**The erotic attraction emanating from the mother soon culminated in a longing for her genitals, which were perceived as a penis. With the realization, acquired only later, that the female does not possess a penis, this longing often turns into its opposite, giving way to a sense of revulsion** which, during the years of puberty, can become the cause of psychological impotence, misogyny and persistent homosexuality. But the fixation on the once-coveted object – the woman’s penis – leaves indelible traces in the child’s psyche, which has been subjected to that particular piece of infantile sexual research with particular rigour. The fetishistic worship of the female foot and shoe seems to treat the foot merely as a substitute symbol for the female genitalia, once revered but since lost; the ‘pigtail-cutters’, without realising it, play the role of those who carry out the act of castration on the female genitalia.	The erotic attraction that comes from his mother soon culminates in a longing for her genital organ, which he takes to be a penis. With the discovery, which is not made till later, that women do not have a penis, this longing often turns into its opposite and gives place to a feeling of disgust which in the years of puberty can become the cause of psychical impotence, misogyny and permanent homosexuality. But the fixation on the object that was once strongly desired, the woman's penis, leaves indelible traces on the mental life of the child, who has pursued that portion of his infantile sexual researches with particular thoroughness. Fetishistic reverence for a woman's foot and shoe appears to take the foot merely as a substitutive symbol for the woman's penis which was once revered and later missed; without knowing it, *'coupeurs de nattes'* [1] play the part of people who carry out an act of castration on the female genital organ. [1] [Perverts who enjoy cutting off females' hair.]

SECTION 5

4.The Return to ‘Me the truth I speak – 19th June 1968 Seminar XV

Seminar XV - The Psychoanalytic Act (1967-1968) : from 15th November 1967 : Jacques Lacan, on this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19680619 or 19671115)

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

4a. 19th June 1968

"Me [Ego/self] the truth, I speak."

Who is this "I" who speaks?

Session of Seminar XV : 19th June 1968 : Jacques Lacan, see this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19680619)

Note on Seminar XV L'acte psychanalytique (1967-1968) by Richard G. Klein, August 2026, www.Freud2Lacan.com.
The last session was 17th May 1968. A month later, Lacan had an additional session on Wednesday, June 19th, 1968.
The timeframe of this specific session is vital. Seminar XV was severely disrupted and cut short by the student strikes and civil unrest of 18th May 1968 in Paris. Because of the political upheaval, Lacan only delivered about half of what he originally planned to articulate regarding the analytic act.

Conférence du 19 juin 1968, P163 Staferla, Séminaire 15, unedited	With help from Linguée, August 2026, unedited	Annex I – Session of 19th June 1968, 19.6.68 p7 of Cormac Gallagher's translation, LacaninIreland.com, unedited	P9 of Anthony Chadwick's translation, edited by Richard G. Klein. Freud2Lacan.com. From an edited version (1985) of this session.
Ce document de travail a pour sources principales : — L'Acte psychanalytique, version critique de l'E.L.P. (qui est la base de ce travail), sur le site de l'E.L.P. — L'Acte psychanalytique, sténotypie au format P.D.F. sur le site de l'E.L.P.		This translation is from a tape-recording of this session and is unedited.	From Pas-tout Lacan. The "Talk from Wednesday the 19th of June 1968" was published in the Bulletin de l'Association freudienne no. 35, p3-9 in November 1985 with the following comment: "During his work on the Analytical Act during the summer week in 1989, Claude Dorgeuille brought to light and commented on a little-known talk by

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

			Jacques Lacan on the 19th of June 1968 [...]”
Dans ce rapport du sujet avec l’Autre, la psychanalyse apporte une dimension radicalement neuve.	In this relationship between the subject and the Other, psychoanalysis introduces a radically new dimension.	To this relation of the subject to the Other, psychoanalysis contributes a radically new dimension.	In this relationship between the subject and the Other, psychoanalysis brings a radically new dimension.
C’est plus que ce que j’ai appelé à l’instant, comme ça, « une découverte », découverte ça garde encore quelque chose d’anecdotique, c’est un profond remaniement de tout le rapport.	That's more than what I right now called, this way “a discovery”, discovery it still holds something anecdotal, it is a major overhaul of the entire relationship.	It is more than what I called just now, called just now, like that, a discovery. A discovery still preserves something anecdotal about. This is a profound modification of the whole relationship.	It’s more than what I just called a discovery; even that still retains something of the anecdote. It’s a complete reworking of the whole relationship.
Il y a un mot que j’ai fait rentrer ici il y a quelques années dans cette dialectique, c’est le mot « vérité ».	There’s a word which I introduced here into this dialectic a few years ago, and it is the word “truth.”	There is a word that I brought in here a few years ago, into this dialectic. It is the word truth.	There is a word I brought back here a few years ago, it’s the word “truth”.
Et puis à vrai dire avant de l’articuler précisément comme je l’ai fait ici un certain jour...	And then, to tell the truth, before precisely articulating it as I did here one day...	And then, in truth, before articulating it precisely as I did here on a particular day,	And then, to tell the truth, before articulating precisely as I did here one day
et comme en porte la marque parfaitement logicisée l’article qui s’appelle dans mes Écrits : La vérité et la science [120]	and as if wearing a perfectly logicised label, the article titled “Truth and Science”[i] in my *Écrits*	the perfectly logical mark of the article Truth and Science, in my Écrits bears witness to,	and as carries the perfectly digitised mark the article which is called in my Écrits “Truth and Science”,
...j’avais donné à ce mot une autre fonction, dans un article qui s’appelle La chose freudienne [121], où on peut lire ces termes :	...I had given this word a different function, in an article titled *The Freudian Thing*[ii], where one can read these terms:	I had given to the word another function, in an article called The Freudian Thing[ii], where one can read these terms:	I had given to this word another function in an article called “La chose freudienne” where one can read these terms:

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

« Moi la vérité, je parle. » [Écrits, Seuil, 1966, p.409].	**“Me [Ego/self] the truth, I speak.”**	‘*Me[Ego/Moi], the truth, I speak.*’	“I the truth speak”.
Qui est ce « je » qui parle? Ce morceau... à la vérité : une prosopopée, un de ces jeux enthousiastes ...il se trouve que je me suis permis de l’articuler pour le centenaire de Freud, et à Vienne. C’était un cri plutôt de l’ordre de ce qu’un Münch [122], a si bien mis (d)ans une gravure célèbre: cette bouche qui se tord où nous voyons surgir l’anéantissement sublime de tout un paysage.	**Who is this “I” who speaks?** This morsel... at the truth, a prosopopoeia[iii], one of those enthusiastic games ...it so happens that I permitted myself to articulate it for the centenary of Freud[iv], and in Vienna. It was a scream rather of the order of what one Münch[v] so aptly put in one famous engraving: that mouth which twists itself where we see arise the sublime annihilation of an entire landscape.	Who? The *I* that is speaking? This piece, in truth a prosopopoeia, one of these Enthusiastic games that I happened to allow myself to articulate for the centenary of (302) Freud, and at Vienna. It was rather a scream of the order of what Münch[v] put so well into a celebrated engraving, this twisted mouth in which we see arising the sublime annihilation of a whole landscape.	Who? This I who speaks? This new thing, in truth, a prosopopea, one of these games for enthusiasts, it so happens that I allowed myself to articulate it for Freud’s centenary, and in Vienna: it was rather a cry of the order of what a Munch so well expressed in a famous engraving, that mouth which twists itself where we see rise up the sublime annihilation of a whole countryside.
120 Cf. - séance du 15 janvier 1964, du séminaire « Fondements de la psychanalyse », éd. du Seuil : - « La science et la vérité », Écrits p. 855. 121 « La Chose freudienne », Écrits p. 401 ou t.1 p. 406. 122 Edward Münch (1863-1944). « Le Cri » date de 1893.			

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

Footnotes 19th June 1968, JE August 2026.

(i) Science and Truth 1st December 1965,
See Session of Seminar XIII- Science & Truth : 1st December 1965 : Jacques Lacan.
See below or this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19651201 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts)

(ii) The Freudian Thing 7th November 1955, (1b., 1c., 1e., 1l.)
See The Freudian Thing or the Meaning of the Return to Freud in Psychoanalysis : 7th November 1955 (Vienna) : Jacques Lacan at this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19551107 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts)

[iii] From Wikipedia, August 2026, A prosopopoeia (Ancient Greek: προσωποποιία, /prɒsoʊpoʊˈpiːə/) is a rhetorical device in which a non-human element speaks or is spoken to as a human. The term derives from the Greek words prósopon (transl. face, person) and poiéin (transl. to make, to do. Prosopopoeiae are used mostly to give another perspective on the action being described.

4b. Reference [iv] to 4a. The Situation of Psychoanalysis and the Training of Psychoanalysts in 1956 30th September 1956 :

See, The Situation of Psychoanalysis and the Training of Psychoanalysts in 1956 : 30th September 1956 : Jacques Lacan at this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19560930)

Also in Écrits : 1966 : Jacques Lacan. See this site /4 Jacques Lacan (19661001 or Index of Jacques Lacan's texts)

...Freud's discovery is this truth that the truth never forfeits its claims, and that sheltering its credentials in the field/domain devoted to the immediacy of the instincts, only its register permits conceiving this inextinguishable duration of the desire

[This quote is one of several possibles]

From Pas-Tout Lacan, 1956-09-30 SITUATION DE LA PSYCHANALYSE ET FORMATION DU PSYCHANALYSTE EN 1956, Paru dans Études Philosophiques 1956, n° 4 (numéro spécial), pp. 567-584.	With help from Linguée, November 2026,	p391 of Bruce Fink's translation, Écrits, 2002
Aussi bien dirions-nous que la découverte de Freud est cette vérité que la vérité ne perd jamais ses droits, et qu'à réfugier ses créances jusque dans le domaine	Will we say as well that **Freud's discovery is this truth that the truth never forfeits its claims, and that sheltering its credentials in the domain**	Thus I will say that Freud's discovery is the truth that the truth never loses its rights, and that, although it may hide its claims even in the domain destined to the

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

voué à l'immédiateté des instincts, seul son registre permet de concevoir cette durée inextinguible du désir dont le trait n'est pas le moins paradoxal à souligner de l'inconscient, comme Freud le fait à n'en pas démordre.	**devoted to the immediacy of the instincts, only its register permits conceiving this inextinguishable duration of the desire** of which the trait is not the least paradoxical underlining from the unconscious, as Freud makes it none of it loosens.	immediacy of instincts, its register alone allows us to conceptualise the inextinguishable duration of desire**,** a feature of the unconscious which is hardly the least paradoxical, even though Freud never gives it up.

4c. Reference [v] to 4a. The Scream 1893 Edvard Munch

See
https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/c/c5/Edvard_Munch%2C_1893%2C_The_Scream%2C_oil%2C_tempera_and_pastel_on_cardboard%2C_91_x_73_cm%2C_National_Gallery_of_Norway.jpg?utm_source=en.wikipedia.org&utm_campaign=imageinfo&utm_content=original

Type, Oil, tempera, pastel and crayon on cardboard,
Movement, Proto-Expressionism,
Dimensions, 91 cm × 73.5 cm (36 in × 28.9 in),
Location National Museum and Munch Museum, Oslo

Further details

The Scream : 1893 : Edvard Munch, on this site /6 Artists (Munch)

This picture is also
- on the picture slider
- and at Sigmund Freud's & Jacques Lacan's use of the Pictures shown in the Slider : first posted 8th February 2023 : Julia Evans, see this site /August of this year or last's.

4d. 19th June 1968 Seminar XV

But if you take the prosopopoeia seriously 'Me the truth, I speak', Id can above all have, unfortunately for those who put themselves within this path, some large inconveniencies.

If I say that the unconscious is structured as a language,
it is because this unconscious which interests us is what can say itself, and then saying itself, it generates the subject.

Conférence du 19 juin 1968, P164 Staferla, Séminaire 15, downloaded 7th	With help from Linguée, August 2026, unedited	P8 of Annexe 1, 19th June 1968, Cormac Gallagher's translation,	P11-12 of Anthony Chadwick's translation from an edited version of this

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

November 2026, unedited From Staferla, The main sources for this working paper are: — *The Psychoanalytic Act*, critical edition by the E.L.P. (which forms the basis of this work), available on the E.L.P. website. — *The Psychoanalytic Act*, stenographic transcript in PDF format, available on the E.L.P. website.		LacaninIreland, Translated directly from unedited, tape-recordings.	session, edited by Richard G. Klein. Freud2Lacan. From Pas-tout Lacan. The "Talk from Wednesday the 19th of June 1968" was published in the Bulletin de l'Association freudienne no. 35, p3-9 in November 1985
C'est bien pour ça qu'il est utile que la vérité soit quelque part, dans un coffre-fort. Le privilège de la révélation, ça, c'est le coffre-fort. Mais si vous prenez au sérieux la prosopopée « Moi la vérité, je parle. », ça peut avoir d'abord hélas pour celui qui se met dans cette voie, de grands inconvénients.	It is well for Id that it's useful that the truth should be* somewhere— in a safe. The privilege of revelation, Id, this is the safe. **But if you take the prosopopoeia seriously** **'Me the truth, I speak',** **Id can above all have,** **unfortunately for those who put themselves within this path, some large inconveniencies.** * Soit is the third person subjunctive of 'to be'/être.	That is why it is useful for the truth to be somewhere, in a strongbox. Privilege, revelation, is the strongbox. But if you take seriously Me, the truth, I speak this can at first have. alas. great disadvantages. for the one who takes this path.	It's indeed for that reason that it is useful to have truth somewhere, in a strongbox. But if you take seriously the prosopopea "I the truth speak", that may have first of all, for the one who sets out on that path, large inconveniencies.
Voyons quand même ce que nous, analystes, pouvons	Let's see, all the same what we, analysts, may	Let us see all the same what novelty	All the same, let's see what we analysts

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

peut-être avoir apporté là-dessus de nouveau. Évidemment, notre champ est très limité. Il est au niveau de la bulle.	perhaps have contributed new there-on-top. Obviously, our field is very limited. It's at the level of the bubble.	we analysts may have contributed to it. Obviously our field is very limited. It is at the level of the bubble.	may be able to bring to it something new. Obviously, our field is very limited. It is at the level of the thought-bubble.
La bulle, comment elle se définit ? Elle a une portée très limitée. Si, après tant d'années, après en avoir montré ce qui en est proprement la structure, c'est maintenant de logique que je vous parle, ce n'est pas un hasard : c'est parce que tout de même il est clair que ce savoir, qui nous intéresse, nous analystes, n'est proprement que ce qui se dit.	How is the bubble defined? It has a very limited range. If, after so many years, after it has been shown this which is properly its structure, it is now from logic that I speak to you, this is not by chance: it is after all because it is clear that this knowledge, which interests us, we analysts, is properly only what says itself.	How is the bubble defined? Its import is very limited. If after so many years. after having shown what is properly speaking its structure, I am now speaking to you about logic, it is not by chance. It is because, all the same, it is clear that this knowledge that interests us analysts is properly speaking only what is said.	How is the thought-bubble defined? It has a very limited range. If, after so many years, after having shown what is its proper structure, it is now of logic that I am speaking, it is not by chance; it's because all the same it is clear that this knowledge which interests us analysts, is properly only what is said.
Si je dis que l'inconscient est structuré comme un langage, c'est parce que cet inconscient qui nous intéresse est ce qui peut se dire, et que se disant, il engendre le sujet. C'est parce que le sujet est une détermination de ce savoir, qu'il est ce qui court sous ce savoir,	**If I say that the unconscious is structured as a language,** **it is because this unconscious which interests us is what can say itself, and then saying itself, it generates the subject.** It is because the subject is a determination of this knowledge, that it is what runs under this knowledge,	If I say that the unconscious is structured like a language, it is because this unconscious that interests us is what can say itself and that in saying itself, it generates the subject. It is because the subject is a determination of this knowledge that it is what runs under this knowledge	If I say that the unconscious is structured like a language it's because that unconscious which interests us is what may be said and that in speaking it engenders the subject. It's because the subject is a determination of this knowledge that he is what runs under this knowledge

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

mais qu'il n'y court pas librement, qu'il y rencontre des butées.	but it does not run there freely, that it encounters there obstacles.	but does not run there very freely, that it encounters stumbling blocks.	but (8) he does not run there freely; he runs up against abutments.
C'est en cela, et en rien d'autre, que nous avons affaire à un savoir. Qui dit le contraire est amené sur les voies que j'ai appelées tout à l'heure celles de la mystification.	It is in that, and in nothing else, that we have business with a knowledge. Who says it to the contrary is led on the paths that I earlier called those of mystification.	It is for this reason and for none other that we have to deal with a knowledge. Anyone who says the contrary is led onto paths that I earlier called those of mystification.	It is in that and in nothing else that we deal with a knowledge. Whoever says the contrary is led along paths that I just now called paths of mystification.
C'est parce que l'inconscient est la conséquence de ce qui a pu se cerner, qui a montré que ce rapport au discours a des conséquences beaucoup plus complexes que ce qu'on avait vu jusque-là, c'est nommément que le sujet, d'être second par rapport au savoir, il apparaît qu'il ne dit pas tout ce qu'il sait, point dont on ne se doutait pas, même si depuis longtemps on soupçonnait qu'il ne sait pas tout ce qu'il dit.	This is because the unconscious is the result of what can determine itself, which showed that this relationship to discourse has consequences much more complex than this which had been seen until then, namely that the subject, from being second through relationship to knowledge, it seems that he doesn't say all this that he knows, point of which one had long suspected, even if one had long suspected that he doesn't know all this which he says.	It is because the unconscious is the consequence of what has been able to be circumscribed that has shown that this relation to discourse has much more complex consequences than had been seen up to then. It is specifically that the subject by being secondary with respect to knowledge, appears not to say everything that it knows, a point that was not doubted, even if for a long time people suspected it does not know everything it says	It's because the unconscious is the consequence of what has been able to be circled which has shown that this relationship to discourse has much more complex consequences than what we have seen up to this point, namely that the subject by being second in relationship to knowledge, appears not to say all that he knows, a point which he did not suspect*, even if for a long time we suspected that he does not know what he is saying. *TN:French text is suspect. There is no credible referent for "elle". I have

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.

			substituted “il ne se dooutait pas”.
Tel est le point qui a permis la constitution de la bulle, il réside très précisément en ceci qu’à ce propos nous apercevons comment se produit la dimension de la vérité.	Such is the point that led the constitution of the bubble, it dwells very specifically in this that in this regard we glimpse how the dimension of truth produces itself.	This is the point that allowed the constitution of the bubble: it resides very precisely in the fact that in this connection we grasp how the dimension of truth is produced.	Such is the point that allowed the constitution of the thought-bubble; it resists very precisely in this that we perceive how the dimension of truth is produced.

© Julia Evans, JuliaEvans@LacanianWorks.org, 9th November 2026.
For personal use only. Not for publication.