

The Invocatory Drive*

"Hope for that which seems beyond hope if you seek
to uncover it, lest it hide from itself from your
quest."
Heraclitus¹

The invocatory drive shall be the guide directing our approach to the purpose (*objet*) of psychoanalysis.

After examining several of its unique aspects, the change it effects in the transference will be more precisely defined, followed by its connections with traumatism, which Freud and Lacan viewed differently.

The conclusion will concern the question of what calls it forth, based on an exploration of the cry of Mozart's *Don Giovanni*.

The Uniqueness of the Invocatory Drive: Drive Reversal

When the unheard is made heard

As the French word *entendre* (to hear) already hints at, hearing presupposes a tension emanating toward the interior of the body. Psychoanalysis states this in positive terms by arguing that this impulse (*mouvement*) is aimed at an inner presence,² a receiver that is unexpectedly created when the primordial Other "suddenly threatens to surprise us and cast us down from the height of its appearance."³

However for the psychoanalyst this act of *hearing* (*entendre*) does not remain mired in pure receptivity. Through his own analysis and that of his analyzands, he has witnessed how the drive is broken down into various components,⁴ and thus knows that this receiver invoked (by the invocatory drive) eventually becomes a "You of devotion."

This "You" is not the second person typically *posited* as object for an "I."⁵ It is a presence that is *presupposed but not yet defined*, who immediately accords an unconscious "yes" to the stunning invocation of the Other, thereby assuring it that it *rightly heard it* (*bien entendue*) and that it is also at the same time seeking to enter into existence as an emitter of a *rightful saying* (*bien-dire*).

This drive reversal shuffles the deck as concerns the everyday meaning of what is made "heard,"⁶ which is no longer limited to conveying reality (*réel*) as controlled by the Symbolic and Imaginary. What is instead made heard is *another aspect of reality*, previously

¹ *Fragments*, 66 (18) PUF

² See my presentation entitled "The Intimate," included in the archives of the Conference "An Anonymous Presence" (Besançon), also included in the archives of the Convergencia Conference of January 2002, as well as other texts available at the *Insistance* website: www.insistance.asso.fr

³ Jacques Lacan, Séminaire, *l'éthique de la psychanalyse*, (Seminar: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis) Seuil, p.69.

⁴ Jacques Lacan, Séminaire, *Les quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychanalyse*, (Seminar: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis) Seuil, pp.147-169.

⁵ But which is in fact the *ego*.

⁶ Tr: "Entendu." This word simultaneously means what is "heard," "understood," and "meant."

under wraps, *the Real (réel) made heard by the limitlessness of sound itself*, unconstrained by the Imaginary and Symbolic.

What is instigated by the impulse which addresses itself to this “You,” who consents to the primordial invocation of the Other, is therefore not particularly straightforward, but rather is something “undreamt-of,” a non-recallable yet unforgettable moment of cohabitation between two opposite kinds of “Reals”⁷ – one transmitted by sound, the other by meaning. Once originary repression separated them from each other, like a pair of strangers they seemed destined never again to meet. But reversal in the invocatory drive effects a return to this forgotten yet unforgettable moment (of originary repression), and the tension of their renewed encounter finds its resolution in the creation of the Subject of the Unconscious, through which the unheard *makes itself heard* as a non-sense that appears and then *slips away*.⁸

In the aftermath of this, nothing is the same. Having *heard*, beyond what is specifically heard by the ears, the *step forward* made by what is *not yet heard*,⁹ causes the consistency of everything that has fallen under the category of the already heard – meaning itself – to vacillate. The way in which this enigmatic drive impulse (*mouvement pulsionnel*) unfolds in the transference is worth delving into.

Its Significance in the Transference

From the Eye Transfixed by What it Sees

The first point to be kept in mind in this respect is that the triggering of this impulse is not something that goes, as it were, “without saying.” As “thinkers” guided by what Freud dubbed the ego, the only thing we typically hear is meaning, so much so in fact that we may even fall (*tomber*) ill from it.¹⁰ In point of fact this fixation with meaning, this “tomb,” is the logical result of the fundamental shortcoming or failing-point inherent to signifyingness as such. Thought reinforces this fixation by enabling us to forget the originary moment when language transformed instinct into drive, opening the door to the limitless world of signifyingness itself. This impulse drives Man, the *humus* of language, to stand up from his horizontal position, and enables the horizon as such to *make itself seen and heard*.

The transference, on the other hand, presupposes the possibility of reorienting oneself in the direction of this forgotten moment. The problem lies in the fact that a guardian has come to stand between the Other’s appeal and the Subject *to come* at whom it is directed.¹¹

⁷ The meeting of these two diametrically opposed Reals commemorates the meeting of Dionysus, god of music, and Apollo, god of form. Tragic theater, itself to be found at the origins of psychoanalysis, arises out this undreamt-of encounter.

⁸ In my opinion, Lacan’s idea of the Subject’s “jouïe-sens” is intended to convey something previously unheard of through a writing that reunites both the ever-elusive Real of music (*son*) and the controllable Real of meaning into a single word that fails to distinguish between them.

⁹ Tr: “*le pas du pas encore entendu*” is a play on words between two meanings of “pas.” On the one hand it means “step” or “advance,” and thus refers to the “unforgettable” mark or footprint left by the reversal in the invocatory drive, on the other hand it is the “not” in “not yet heard,” which is the dimension, opened up by the invocatory drive, of hearing something “being said” within words that was not previously “understood” or “gotten.”

¹⁰ Depression, for example, ensues from the subject’s being transfixed by the fixity of one meaning, leading him to say: “I am nothing but *that*, that fallen object, that bit of refuse made prostrate by a force this keeping me from standing up.”

¹¹ This is clearly Lacan’s Schema L.

This “eye of conscience”¹² oversees the world of human belief, and makes us believe solely in the meanings it reveals. It is perfectly willing to tolerate the possibility that unconscious memories exist in the realm of the repressed, but only subject to the condition that this toleration entail no further consequences. In other words lifting repression is “OK,” but what is definitely *not* “OK” is allowing this repressed material to attain its true meaning as something *never before seen* or *never before heard*. The eye of conscience is unable to divert its attention from what it already knows, and face what it knows not yet – originary repression.

Enconced as it is in its own “for-itself,” it has become transfixed by fixation as such, meaning that which is unable to enter into existence. It sees and oversees this already constituted knowledge, and strategizes new ways to hold on to it. It will allow needs to multiply unmet as a means to nourish itself. The eye is prepared to pay any price indeed, even agreeing to brave the experience of angst, which it will however ultimately seek to reduce through recourse to the superego, and the universe of guilt it holds at its disposal.

It has always chosen to ignore the bad news destined to overturn its position as a “for-itself” – *some things are not subject to oversight*. It spends its time, *all* its time, shoring up the specular borders inside of which it has fabricated its representation of time as discontinuous,¹³ patterned on the image of space.¹⁴ Armed with this definite vision of time and space that will never change, it believes it can know everything, because the uncontrollable as such does not exist.

To the Gaze that Hears What is Seen

The couch is the ideal framework for going beyond this state of egoic unawareness (*me-connaissance*).

The psychoanalysis of transference is based on the sudden appearance of a fissure in this static construction, insofar as it works against this eye that sees but does not hear, whose predominance is premised on a splitting between the object as gaze and the object as voice.¹⁵ Even though Freud does not formulate it in these terms, Lacan’s teaching, and the clinical experience of the transference that arises in response to the dismantling of the drive itself, clearly refer back to this moment of separation in a way that *tends* towards the originary moment when the invocatory and scopical drives were still joined.

The fundamental rule is aimed at this horizon as well, the future existence of a gaze that comes from “who knows where,” because it is not a gaze that sees, but that hears instead.¹⁶ What novel thing appears when the gaze and voice enter into contact? The “*there is*” of the Real that exceeds the Symbolic and Imaginary – bad news for the unhearing eye – is replaced by the totally unexpected good news that *there is* a gaze which *hears* and thus conveys this excessive Real.

Once again however, this transmission does not go “without saying.” The speaking being to-come is only able to *make himself heard* in the world concert after the “thinker” in him has been rendered speechless. Before then he will be unaware of his own capacity to interpret the meaning of the encounter between sense and sound.

¹² TR: or “consciousness.”

¹³ Which replaces the continuous temporal flux of the drive, which is patterned on the model of the temporal continuum envisioned by Heraclitus, promptly forgotten by the temporal discontinuity of Parmenides.

¹⁴ In which the specular image, i(a), is delineated by the knotting of Symbolic, Imaginary and Real.

¹⁵ “Object” here refers to the object of fixation that belongs to the fantasm, as opposed to the object of the drive, which becomes caught up in its forward impulsion.

¹⁶ Alain Didier-Weill, *Lila et la lumière de Vermeer*, (Lila and the Light of Vermeer) Denoël, Février 2003.

The creation engendered by this encounter generates differing perspectives. For the ego the encounter is bad news, what Freud, (citing Lipps), called an experience of “stunning”¹⁷ because it engenders “unintelligibility, incomprehensibility and enigma,”¹⁸ However the experience of stunning transforms bad news into good from another point of view, insofar as it conveys the promise of a completely unexpected existence *to-come*, the Subject of the Unconscious.

The psychoanalyst *tends* in this direction. He listens for something more that is yet to be heard in what his analyzand tells him, because he knows that this moment in the rupturing of meaning may reveal a reversal in the drive out of which a speaking being may be reborn.

Although the experience of “stunning” results in both analyst and analyzand hearing something badly,¹⁹ for the analyst the experience itself does not lead to utter despair, and he does not despair its coming. Primarily this is because he knows it announces the news that *there is* an other kind of time than the one that is carved up and delimited by the specular space where the ego holds sway. He dreams of Heraclitus, and his discovery of an immeasurable time both fluid and continuous, that reminds him of the continuous impulse of the drive, animated as it is by a “constant force”²⁰ that ignores the distinction between night and day.

For his part, the analyzand remains subject to the historical time of repetition which transfixes him in the field of demand and the fantasm, because he has yet to recognize the significance of his hearing something bad during the experience of being stunned. One day though he will find, without knowing why except to say that he feels affected by a certain amount of angst, that he has allowed himself to be *invaded* by an odd tension. Only then, to his own surprise, will he find himself actually acting on the stage of his own life, beyond the ready-made knowledge furnished by the pleasure-unpleasure principle, which before then had reduced him to being its mere spectator.

Why will he finally be able to trust in this stranger in the moment of their encounter? He will not be able to say. He will only be able to invoke this encounter by envisioning the presence of someone capable of *passing it on to him (une passante)*. Someone who will launch it his way and then disappear, giving him the gift of that which she does not have,²¹ asking for nothing in return. Something, he will not know what, will be awakened in him by this fleeting passerby. He will never be able to forget it. It will be unforgettable. Still, what is it that enters into and troubles him in this way?

The Immense Proximity Between the Artist and the Psychoanalyst

¹⁷ TR: For reasons related to context, the French word “sideration” has been translated here as “stunning” rather than “bewilderment,” which is how Freud’s (and Lipps’) term *Verblueffung* was translated in the S.E. version of *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*.

¹⁸ Sigmund Freud, *Le mot d’esprit et ses rapports avec l’inconscient*, (*Jokes and Their Relations to the Unconscious*) Idées/Gallimard 1978, pp.2-3.

¹⁹ TR: The concept of *malentendu* has two meanings. One the one hand it is a “misunderstanding” that arises in the moment of stunning because something in the order of the meaning of the analyzand’s words does not “click,” something in them is still “being said” that “remains to be heard.” It also implies “hearing evil,” (*mal-entendu*), the “bad news” for the ego that is potentially good news for the emergence of the subject of the unconscious. Given the emphasis here on the use of “entendre” as hearing rather than understanding, I have translated *malentendu* as “hearing badly,” here and throughout.

²⁰ Sigmund Freud, *Pulsion et destin des pulsions*, (*Drives and Their Vicissitudes*) Métapsychologie, Idées/Gallimard

²¹ This is how Lacan defines love as it exists beyond the demand for love.

An exchange I had with a singer contributed an element of response to this question. As he put it, when his voice reaches the high notes he has the impression it “escapes” and affords him the opportunity to hear something unexpected with respect to the rules governing shifts in musical key.

It might be surmised instead that what is at stake here is not so much that his voice was “escaping” as such, but that something he does *not yet know* in his voice was escaping *him* and then invading him once more. The unheard (of) itself was being revealed to him. This gave him pause to think...

Testaments such as these point to an immense proximity between between the artist and the psychoanalyst, insofar as both must contend with the insistent tension of the uncontrollable Real wherever and whenever it reveals itself. Will they give their consent to hearing the insistence that arises when the unexpected experience of stunning leads them to “hear things badly” (*mal-entendu*)? Will they instead adopt the position of master who can never be “duped”²² by this “badness” (*mal*), seeking instead to correct it because it disobeys the easier to anticipate laws of words and musical key?²³

Ever since Freud first invented psychoanalysis in response to traumatism, these two unique ways have existed of either using or being used by the revelation of this hidden god – the a-historical Real conveyed by the invocatory drive at the heart of the transference. In the case of the psychoanalyst, who risks becoming overridden with this insistence of the Real in his confrontations with traumatism, the analytic cure may enable them to be re-enacted in a way that uses the invocatory drive to instead make heard the unheard, and the scopic drive in order to make seen the unseen.

Its (Son) Emergence

Freudian Traumatism and the Experience of “Mortification”

In late 1892, Freud and Breuer were referring to the concept of traumatism as a way of accounting for symptoms. They depicted it as an inability to retrieve the memory of a scene or event and abreact its affects, caused by an immobilization of memory and a corresponding bottling of the affects in question.

The pearl unexpectedly hidden in their discourse was the word “Kränkung.” Even though they wrote in a footnote that for them the word implied “*a painful experience endured through self-silencing, like a mortification*,”²⁴ the French translator used the rather more vague term “affliction” rather than “mortification.” Beyond everyday usage therefore, language is still writing the fact that the pain of traumatism is like a putting to death that arises in the middle of the act of taking up speech. What form does this putting to death assume in subjective terms?

More than twenty years would go by before Freud again took up his pen to write about

²² A reference to the function of the Commander as someone who is not to be “fooled with” (*à qui on ne la fait pas*).

²³ Which dictated that the distances between notes, mathematically-derived, form a hierarchy of (half/whole) steps that must be followed... That is until Schoenberg’s atonal music transmitted the possibility of a new Real in the early 20th century.

²⁴ Sigmund Freud., *Communication préliminaire*, Etudes sur l’hystérie, (“Preliminary Communication,” *Studies on Hysteria*), PUF 1973, p.5.

the topic of traumatism, arguing that it corresponds to the visual discovery of the difference between the sexes. When Sergei, the “Wolf Man,” encountered the Real hole of the mother’s lacking phallus, he was immediately reduced as subject to the level of an object ripe for being “dumped.” He became a piece of excrement,²⁵ his subjective position was “put to death” in a way similar to the “putting to death” of his mother’s symbolic presence. It is helpful to word this in terms of the knotting of the Symbolic, Imaginary and Real.

Prior to the traumatic moment the Real was enchained to the Symbolic and Imaginary in a way that enabled Sergei to be in a symbolic relationship with the symbolic presence of his mother, even in her physical absence. But then the gap that was opened by the lacking phallic object revealed to him that there is an other, unknotted, Real, which represents an absence *within* presence – a revelation that overcame and immobilized him. In a way it became all he could see, all he could think of. He *became* it (*ça*), this unsightly (*mal vu*) bit of refuse. Furthermore this was not only true from his own perspective, the perspective that is of the fallen object subjected to the gaze, the excrement or gaze of the Real – it was also the case from the viewpoint of his mother who was reduced to being the gaze of the Medusa, an all-seeing evil eye that eclipsed the Real hole of phallic lack and stared at him eternally. As a pure receiver, he was an occupied territory unable to take up his own existence as emitter.

The gaze of this all-seeing and all-knowing eye he was subjected to made him believe there was something “not right” (*mal foutou*) in him. In fact he became unable to see himself other than as “not right,” and fell deaf to everything but this “badness” or “wrongness” (*mal-*) that was the original cause of his traumatism. This experience of “hearing badly” was incessantly conveyed to him by the voice of the superegoic Other, whose function was to effect a *de*-supposition of his subjective existence: “you are nothing other than that, something that has been *dumped*, downfallen, a bit of refuse.”

But what does this Real unchained from the Symbolic and Imaginary, which Freud unearthed at the origins of traumatism, truly seek beyond this unique putting to death through the fixity of the gaze? The dream that “a child is burning”²⁶ furnishes us with an at least initial response to this question.

Lacan and the Discovery of “Trou-matisme”²⁷

A father who is mourning next to body of his son who has just died, goes into the next room to get some sleep and leaves an old man to tend to the departed. Suddenly he awakes and rushes into the room, where the bed has just caught fire from an overturned candle and is beginning to burn. He had just had a dream in which the “child is standing next to his bed, takes him by the arm and whispers to him with a tone of reproach, ‘Father, can’t you seen I’m burning?’”

The evidence of the dream itself points to its having to do with guilt. Without rejecting this clear implication, which is based on the fact that the sound of the flames was what woke him, the question remains as to whether the dream might also lead elsewhere, particularly in light of the economic theory outlined by Freud in his 1920 “Beyond the Pleasure Principle.” This economic theory was already present as early as 1900 in the *Interpretation of Dreams* in the form of his intuition that the kernel of every dream is a hole in whatever knowledge of it we may glean through free associations. Freud dubbed this kernel the “*unerkannt*” (*unacknowledged*). What exactly is this lack *in* knowledge, towards which the analyst *tends*

²⁵Sigmund Freud, *Cinq Psychanalyses*, (*Five Case Studies*), PUF, p.385.

²⁶ Sigmund Freud, *L'interprétation des rêves*, (*The Interpretation of Dreams*) PUF, Chapitre VII.

²⁷ TR: Lacan replaced the “trau” in “traumatism” with the French word “trou,” or “hole.”

and from which the subject derives his own origin, such that Freud immediately dubbed it the “navel” of the dream?

By naming it this way, Freud allowed himself to remain at a safe distance from its full implications. This was due primarily to his being himself fixated by the superegoic representations that obscured this hole’s true dimensions beyond the domains of the audible and visible – those great purveyors of guilt.

On February 12, 1964, Lacan changed this by letting himself be *invaded* by the audacity of this “navel,” because he had come to realize any knowledge that may be considered truly new originates in non-knowledge. What passage did he take in order to leave the domain of the master-teacher he was, the Subject Supposed to Know, and enter into the realm of the subject of the unconscious, a “knowledge supposed subject,” the true purpose (*objet*) of psychoanalysis itself?

The path was forged through his unfettered proclamation that “the (image of the) flame blinds us to the fact that (the signifier) fire in fact refers to the *Unterlegt*, to the *Untertragen*, to the Real,” and that “what the dream enveloped, hid from us,” was the “Drive to come.”²⁸

What unseen and unheard (of) Real confronted him, whose insistence enabled him to dare take a step forward, alone, toward the idea that the noise of the flames themselves were not as awakening as was the awakening of the subject of the unconscious itself, identifiable in the pure signifier “flame.” What fly was buzzing around his head²⁹ after the masters of the IPA had withdrawn and he found himself alone, faced with this “trou-matisme,” and yet still decided to take the podium in his Seminar despite several months of self-imposed silence? What is glimpsed in the moment when “this turn occurs in which the subject witnesses the capsizing of the assurance he gleaned from the fantasm that is each person’s window onto the Real?”³⁰

An effect whereby the undoing of being takes hold of us, opening a previously walled-up door that allows the impulse of the drive to surge through, an “experience of the fundamental fantasm become drive,” the final message delivered by the end of analysis, which Lacan referred to at the end of this seminar that freed him from the fixating gaze of his IPA colleagues.

Through the navel of the dream’s appearance, it may be surmised, the impulse-ridden movement of the drive’s flow, previously maintained at a safe distance, was funneled towards him, provoking a moment of “jouïe-sense,”³¹ a fluidic temporal flux first postulated, in his own time, by Heraclitus.

What this makes clear is that the currently existing infinitude of ready-made meanings may be made to resonate otherwise than before because *there is* some part of the subject itself that is indeterminate.

Unbelievable in a way...the word “Flame” is an invaluable discovery, the representative representation of the drive bringing the psyche and the Real of the body into contact.

This passage through the limitless world of *jouissance*, which the psychoanalyst is in a position to bear witness to, is also the purview of the artist, as witnessed by the cry of Mozart’s Don Juan.

²⁸ Jacques Lacan, Séminaire, *Les quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychanalyse*, (Seminar: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis), Seuil, pp. 57-59.

²⁹ One way of evoking the ever-elusive Real.

³⁰ Jacques Lacan, *Proposition du 9 octobre 1967 sur le psychanalyste de l’Ecole*, Scilicet I, p.25.

³¹ To be heard in the context of the above footnote on “jouïe-sens”.

An Intolerable *Jouissance*: The Cry of Don Juan

Exeunt Idol

Where shall we look to find Don Juan, beyond the bad readings (*malentendus*) that interpret him as nothing less than the Prince of Evil at what was in fact his ultimate moment of truth, the dialogue he entertained with his Guest of Stone?

It was then instead that Don Juan offered him his hand as proof that for the first time he was not looking to hide from the law of tonality, albeit a minor one, the Commander imposed upon him just prior to his entrance.³² Mozart gives us a Commander not about to be duped – for his part word and music are in perfect harmony, and even the rather unexpected tension to be heard in his seventh chords is quickly resolved and made tolerable.

In fact, this Lord and Master thought he had everything already laid out before coming, but he failed to account for the fact that his subordinate had become a speaking being. “Sisto,”³³ Don Juan proclaims, “Here I stand” ready to answer, undiminished by your appearance. Unprepared for this kind of audacity, the Commander tries to threaten Don Juan with the gravity of his voice, but the latter affirms and reaffirms himself three times over by saying “no.” In the end the force of his subjectivity drove the Commander offstage and left him momentarily alone.

It is not hard to understand why the Commander, referee that he was between the principles of Good and Evil, acted as he did. He had come to collect the confessions of a guilty man, and found himself confronted with a heretic instead who was thoroughly unimpressed with the sudden tension created by his low notes and punctuated syllables, hammered into him by the imperious use of “reciting tones.”

The Unseen and Unheard of the Unforgettable Other

As far as we are concerned, the Commander can exit the scene with the fantasm of his being an idol still intact,³⁴ because an Other scene has surfaced that is inaccessible to those who remain mired in guilt, that is to say the chorus who accuse Leoporello, since all of them continue to believe the same thing: “he was a seducer who deserved hellfire and damnation.”

However Da Ponte and Mozart present this Other scene, bear in mind, only *after* Don Juan’s repeated “no’s” have jarred him loose from the Commander’s, the non-dupe’s, “semblance” of discourse.

Clearly therefore, it was necessary that he be confronted with this “trou-matic” gap, a moment when the earth itself was cracked open and its inside revealed, in order to be able to see and hear the unforgettable primordial Other’s silent invisibility, an invisibility which invoked the presence in him of what Lacan called the “You of devotion.” What was the status of “his” (*son*) cry of “Ah” against the backdrop of this new scene?

³² The Commander’s vision is extended by a minor seventh diminished chord.

³³ Via its original meaning in Latin, “sisto” points in the direction of the action of standing up.

³⁴ Because he is addressing himself to what relates to the gaze and not a “man of words,” contrary to what is usually said in this instance.

It was an initiatory vowel, a pure signifier before the arrival of any signified – his cry, as the cry of the human as such, was the discovery in which already received *jouissance* becomes distinct from the one that had forever been hoped for. It made heard the audacity of his having exceeded the inessential nature of the Subject Supposed to Know.³⁵

Don Juan's Cry, and Feminine *Jouissance*

In this one shining moment therefore, Mozart's opera makes clear that the *Burlador* of Seville had become one with the divas of old who were put to death for having made heard similarly unexpected things. Would he, like them, supposedly be making heard this *jouissance* which Lacan qualified as "feminine." Would he, without saying it out loud, supposedly be presupposing the phallic function as being "not-all?"

At Prague in 1787, then at Vienna in 1788, and then, finally, *urbi et orbi*, Mozart conveyed, through the vehicle of Don Juan's voice, the existence of a "supplementary" *jouissance* that Lacan would identify and denominate nearly two hundred years later in his seminar *Encore*.

The artist has preceded the psychoanalyst in this case.

Paris, April 10, 2003

Jean Charmoille

* This work is a revision of my presentation to the Convergencia conference in Paris, January 2005, entitled "The Purpose Behind 'Mis-Hearing (*malentendu*).'" Don Juan's cry was an important element in a work of transference that had developed in my seminar on "interpretation" that year, and thus it appears in this text because the wager it represents was already present at the time I was writing its presentation. The participants in Alain Didier-Weill's seminar, his readers, also identified ways in which my text gave new impulse to several of his elaborations.

³⁵ Jacques Lacan, *Proposition du 9 octobre 1967 sur le psychanalyste de l'Ecole*, Scilicet I, p.25.