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The dream shows us that the unconscious, with its tireless work of enciphering, interprets. Lacan calls this wild interpretation. In this Papers 1, you will encounter the theme of the dream as interpretation of the unconscious, a problematic that was considered in different terms before Lacan, that is: the dream as a formation of the unconscious *grosso modo* and the analyst’s task of interpreting it, deciphering it, giving it a meaning. That the unconscious is already an interpreter in the dream before the analyst is an irrefutable fact at this point; ergo, the issue to think and resolve is: what does the analyst do with this, what is the path he can take if the unconscious is already in advance of him?

The works that follow this editorial not only attempt to elucidate this crossroads, but also bring precision to the notion of the dream as interpretation of the unconscious.

To begin with, you will find the work of Jorge Assef, who presents the bases of this problematic very clearly: on the one hand, the properly Freudian interpretation and the interpretation of the unconscious; then, the navel of the dream as an obstacle that both encounter; and, finally, the properly Lacanian interpretation as an alternative to this predicament. He thus advances towards the notion of the use of the dream as what allows the analysand to go beyond the point of anguish of the nightmare, pointing to another type of awakening.

We then have the work of Carolina Koretzky, who locates the text in which Lacan introduces the notion of the dream as interpretation of the unconscious, a wild interpretation, in contrast to the reasoned interpretation of the analyst that aims at awakening, providing a precious clinical example of the use of the dream.
Following the trajectory, you will find the contribution of Amanda Goya, centred on the question about the status of the final dreams of an end of analysis, dreams which precede a demand for the pass.

Taking up the well-known opposition between transferential unconscious and real unconscious, she proposes a knotting between them in those dreams that are culminating events of the end of a treatment.

Half-way through this Papers, Laura Rubião offers us a very precise work on awakening in Freud. She proposes a hypothesis: awakening is the product of the limit of the possibility of representation by the unconscious, the Unerkannt. She calls on us to think from that perspective the reading that Lacan makes about the dream of Irma's injection, based on the radical suspension of meaning.

Next, Cyrus Saint Amand Poliakoff develops in a very incisive and poetic way the continuity-discontinuity between sleep and awakening. There, he proposes the polarities of transferential unconscious and real unconscious, truth and event, as linked by the knot of the dream.

In his contribution, Fernando Gómez Smith then takes a radical approach, in which he proposes locating the interpretation of the dream on the side of the unconscious, and awakening on the side of the analyst, establishing in this way an interesting dichotomy between the subject supposed to know and the subject who knows how to manoeuvre.

We end the series with the work of Silvano Posillipo, who indicates very well the interpretation of the analyst in relation to the dream, proposing it as the introduction of the act in the re-translation of the text of the dream. It is worth spending time with the end of his text to examine how he develops this idea.

As a bonus track in this edition of the Papers, we have two contributions by Irene Kuperwajs, AS, and Paola Francesconi, AMS.

With a dream that marks the entrance to her last analysis, which will lead her to the pass, Kuperwajs shows us the inaugural trauma of the impact of lalangue on the body, giving us a very beautiful clinical
illustration of the use of the imaginary in the very late teaching of Lacan.

And Francesconi shows with great precision that when we dream that we are dreaming, the scene is not really being duplicated, but rather a reduction to an index of the real is being produced.

This is just a modest anticipation of the magnificent Papers 1 that you are about to read.

Enjoy it!

Translation: Roger Litten

Revised by: Natalia Velez L. and Thomas Svolos
The Dream and its Interpretation in the Direction of the Treatment Today

Jorge ASSEF - EOL

The exact translation of Die Traumdeutung is "The Interpretation of the Dream". This allows for the equivocation between: 1) Interpreting the dream, referring to the symbolic-imaginary potential of the formations of the unconscious, and 2) The dream interprets, which refers to the experience of the real.

Thus, with this equivocation, psychoanalysis was born in 1900.

Interpreting the Dream

If Freud proposed the dream as the royal road of access to the unconscious, it is because it responds to the laws of language according to the metaphorical aspect that promotes an effect of quilting which takes up and modifies what has come before, and the metonymic aspect that introduces the path of allusion or half-saying.

Here we have the communion between the imaginary-symbolic field and the dream as a formation of the unconscious, the result of a work of signifying articulation. This is what we call with Lacan, the transference unconscious. The classical model of dream interpretation that Freud taught us follows this path, producing meaning around the suffering of the symptom, the consequences of history, the marks of the family romance, etc.

However, Freud recognized that in the field of the dream there was also a limit to the symbolic, which he designated as "the navel of the dream": "...the truly real unconscious."¹

**The Dream Interprets**

For Lacan the navel of the dream, besides being a hole in meaning, is a scar that makes a knot in the body but cannot be said because it is at the root of language: "In the field of speech there is something that is impossible to recognize, to the degree that here the Un has another value (...) it designates the impossibility, the limit"\(^2\) The Un that Lacan here refers to is a question of that isolated S\(_1\) which "... contingently percussed the body, creating a *parlêtre*, initiating the series and, through the iteration in its articulation with other signifiers, it became a cause of jouissance."\(^3\)

In any case, the notion of “navel” implies that the dream itself bears the mark of the limitations of the symbolic and imaginary registers. In many instances it becomes the interpreter of that experience, in this way managing to capture a real effect. It is here that the free association fails because meaning escapes. This type of dream nevertheless allows us to consider the properly Lacanian model of interpretation, the one that isolates an S\(_1\) by disrupting the signifying articulation.

**The Use of the Dream and its Interpretation in the Direction of the Treatment Today**

Let us return to the equivocation.

On the one hand, the phrase "the use of the dream and its interpretation" takes us to the first path that we located as the field of the transferential unconscious, where the interpretation of dreams consists in deciphering and re-enciphering.

This aspect is necessary in our clinic, even today. It serves to promote confidence in the subject supposed to know and allows the installation of the analytic dispositif, given that believing in the

---


\(^3\) Serra, M., "Un sueño es un despertar que empieza", unpublished.
unconscious via transference is a primary condition of every possible treatment.

Throughout an analysis interpretation in the enciphering-deciphering mode is the key, sometimes for scanning a line of associations, at other times for punctuating a moment of passage. Nonetheless, Miller clarifies that this type of dream interpretation "... is not the way of a true awakening for the subject." 4

With this notion of awakening, we approach the real unconscious.

Precisely, the other sense of the phrase “the use of the dream and its interpretation” leads us also to those dreams that operate by giving an account of the degree to which an analysis involves an experience of the real. The nightmare is an example. In relation to this question, Miller proposes that an effective interpretation acts as a nightmare: "...a nightmare from which you cannot flee." 5 He highlights that the progress of the treatment can be noted with that precise index: when the dream manages to prolong itself beyond the point of anguish that used to be its end.

Clearly what counts at this point is a sustained position of the analysand. In order for the “instant of awakening,” 6 produced by an interpretation that does not function defensively, as in the nightmare, a subjective decision is needed. This is the courage that Lacan attributes to Freud when faced with Irma’s throat 7.

When an effect of the real appears in the dream, moving the subject, it sometimes takes the form of an aspect of the object a, or a trace of the trauma, or the dismantling of a defensive construction. This commotion manages to go beyond the nightmare by opening a cleft

---

towards that uninterpretable remainder that we call “the navel of the dream”. It is possible that the dream itself writes something new, for example “...a know-how with the signifiers of one’s own history facilitated by the possibility of playing on linguistic homophony.”

Here we have a list extracted from the testimonies of the pass: Eidolon, Rhinocéros, Twingo, Niteroi, ZZZ. Each of these, through transference, could give an account of Lacan’s proposal that “...the real is also specified by an Un, in the sense of an impossible. This should be demonstrable, and the whole analytical experience does nothing but converge in demonstrating it.”

These dreams reveal the current use that we make of the dream in the direction of the treatment as an instrument of awakening. They could be framed by what Miller proposes: "The une bévue reclaims a signifier that would be new, not in order for there to be a supplementary signifier, but rather because instead of being contaminated by the dream, this new signifier would trigger an awakening.”

That these types of dreams appear at the end of the analysis is not accidental. As Lacan puts it: “It’s possible for a whole psychoanalysis to go by before what might well happen does happen: we’ve reached the point where we wake up.” Of course it is here that the erotics of the time of each analysand is played out.

Translation: Carolina Vignoli
Revised by Roger Litten and Cyrus Saint-Amand Poliakof

---

The Interpretation of the Dream: From Meaning to Failure

Carolina KORETZKY - ECF

In the Seminar *From an Other to the other*, Lacan revisits his “Interpolated report of the Seminar on Ethics,”¹ where he provides an invaluable distinction of what we call “interpreting” a dream: the savage interpretation is the one delivered by the unconscious and the reasoned interpretation, the one from the analyst.

For Lacan, the analyst should start by taking note of a fact: that “from the dream one only gets from the unconscious the incoherent meaning that one fabulates in order to dress up what is articulated in terms of sentence.”² If for Freud the essence of the dream is to be found in the dream work, it is because the latter produces a language transformation into image, which he calls representability.³ This mechanism of the dream consists in rendering the thoughts visible, in other words, in transforming an abstract thought into a “pictorial and concrete expression.”⁴ The technique of the signifying cutting of the narrative allows to avoid confusion with this often eccentric imaginary dressing up. The logic of the return of the repression conditions interpretation, because once this phrase is reconstructed, the unconscious desire, forbidden and infantile, can be stated.

---

Though Lacan continues: “what one gets from there (from the dream) is already an interpretation that we can call savage, and the reasoned interpretation, which one substitutes, only brings out the failure that the sentence denotes.” Therefore the dream is an interpretation, on one hand because it is a *rebus*, that is to say, an image translation of signifying terms and on the other hand because its formation leads to the creation of a new meaning. In that case, if it is already interpretation, what does the analyst do when substituting this so-called savage interpretation by another one, called reasoned? If the dream is a *savage* interpretation—in the sense that it creates a new meaning—we can deduce that the so-called *reasoned* interpretation should aim at something else than the production of meaning. For Lacan, when listening to the narrative of the dream, the question of the analyst is not so much: *what does it want to say?* but: *what, by saying, it wants?*

In this last question, the quest for the meaning of the dream is less prevailing than the quest for the desire that pushes for its formation. The deciphering aims at the desire, which animates the sleeper by forming this dream. It is not the *meaning* of the main sentence of a dream but the *failure* that is foregrounded: “In this reasoned interpretation it is all about a reconstructed sentence and to perceive the *tip of the* failure where, as sentence and not at all as meaning, it lets us see what is wrong. And what is wrong is the desire.” It is in the default of signification that the desire is caught. Indeed, if “the desire of the dream is nothing else than the desire to make meaning, (...) it is not the path to a real awakening for the subject. Freud emphasized the fact that anxiety interrupts the sleep when the dream is about to open onto the real of the desired. Therefore, the subject only wakes up to continue dreaming.”

An unusual expression of Lacan: “The real of the desired!” Let us try

7 Ibid, p. 197.
to find out what is at play with a clinical example from Serge Cottet. The patient is dreaming of an exhausting session of analysis, at the end of which his analyst tells him: “Would you like to rest? Lie down.” Cottet recalls the way with which an analyst, subject to Freudian orthodoxy, would have proceeded faced with an evident dream of transference: it is a portrayal by its contrary because the dream shows a patient being congratulated by his analyst for his hard work, when in reality the analytical work advances very slowly with sessions where anecdotes and chatting predominate. For the analyst, this dream tells the contrary of what he really wants to tell him, “wake up, you don’t get tired enough.” The analyst intervenes with a punctuation that almost takes to the letter the central sentence of the dream: “lie down” and adds straight away “but you already are!” This intervention that the analyst adds to the text of the dream signals the enunciation point of the subject and shows the failure in the dream phrase. If this dream “is a pleonasm with the experience itself” it is by featuring a session that is repeated to infinity. The dream illustrates well the Lacanian thesis according to which “one wakes up to only continue dreaming” as the dream itself contradicts and eludes the impasse of the cure. Cottet suggests reading the dream as presenting two sequences inverted in time: it is not like in the dream, a session followed by relaxation as a reward, but a relaxation too prolonged tending towards the entry in analysis. This inverse interpretation compared to the interpretation made by the unconscious, corresponds to the position of jouissance of the patient: following a period of sexual permissiveness, this subject resorted to a woman in position of authority who relieved him from a defense work in order to defer his jouissance as much as possible, “he erases his jouissance so as not to awaken the wrath of his master.”

This is “the real of desire:” it is the drive. This dream is an irony because it is quite true that he works hard, “he exhausts himself to say as little as possible about the fantasy that torments him. The

---

hard labor by the obsessional symptom deserves a reward.”\textsuperscript{11} If the interpretation suggested by the analyst is oriented toward the real, it is because it “extracts its interpretation from the Name-of-the-Father,”\textsuperscript{12} that is, it aims to pass from transference to drive. The unconscious interprets savagely: in the dream, it gives the analyst the position of the father (interdictor or benevolent) that he always had in the transference, positioning the subject in life in an in-between, between anxiety and guilt. The signaling of the failure in the sentence of the dream, “but you already are” does not add a meaning reinforcing the position of the analyst in the transference. On the contrary, this reasoned interpretation, allows the subject the recognition of the permission to jouissance that he seeks to obtain from the Other. The real of his symptom, his phobia of the relation between the sexes, is masked by this permission attached to the Name-of-the-Father which turns out to be only a fiction. From transference to the drive, from an Other to the other, this passage allowed the patient to address himself to the woman in the same terms of his enunciation: “lie down.”

\textit{Translation: Tracy Hoijer-Favre}

\textit{Revised by: Polina Agapaki and Natalie Wulfin}
For as long as the analytic practice lasts, Lacan said, in *The moment to conclude*, that it will never cease being a practice of charlatanism that is not without risks and has to be taken seriously, because what is said implies consequences. The main consequence is to trap that which the speaking being is captive to: “the unconscious . . . the real face of what keeps us entangled.”

How does one know when an analysis ends?

In many of the testimonies of the Analysts of the School, we can verify that the decision to end the analysis and demand for pass to the School is usually preceded, even immediately, by a dream: in particular, one of those we call “conclusive.”

Of what substance are these dreams made of? What is the use the future Analyst of the School makes of this dream?

Along the line suggested by Jesús Santiago, the dream can be lived in a dimension of eternity, consubstantial with its meaning, auspicious temporary mode of the transferential unconscious calling to be decoded. The real unconscious reclaims another temporality, as well as another way of naming the function that connects the dream with its navel, its non-interpretable remainder, and as is reiterated in the orientation texts: a “use of the dream,” a “use of the real that is at

---

3 *Cf. Santiago, J., “Clínica del despertar imposible: sueño, eternidad y tiempo”, Rebus 03, Textos de orientación (Available on-line).*
4 Harari, A., ”La diferencia absoluta del sueño”, Rebus 03, Textos de orientación (Available on-line).
the base of the dream formation,” as articulated by Santiago.

Is the decoding of the dream opposed to the use? Or, could it mask the possibilities of its use? the author inquires. And so, he proposes to the Lacanian analysts to make use of the dream from the mediation permitted by time by the function of the cut. Where would we point the cut if not in the proper rhythm of the logical time?

Numerous testimonies talk about a culminating event at the end of the cure, where simultaneously the transferential and the real unconscious are knotted through a dream that interprets the desire for the pass, at the same time transmitting the drive’s force that pushes the parlêtre towards the exit door: conclude and ask for the pass.

Two illustrations: A woman, French: Aurélie Pfauwadel. A man, Italian: Domenico Cosenza. I was fortunate to listen to them in our school at Madrid.

She, whose original wound was constituted by the abandonment of a womanizing father, and who had found the compass of her desire through the alienation from the Other woman, to whom she supposed the knowledge, obtains a nomination: “the passion for the approximation,” from a dream she has towards the end. Nomination that is not unknown to her way of naming her hysterical passion: “Approximate to the father’s object.”

Two conclusive dreams precipitate the end; in one of them the visit of the sensual Scarlett Johansson, who rapidly transforms into a patient of hers. The analyst says to her: “I don’t open my eyes but I listen you. Go on.” And concludes: “the know-how acquired there towards the gaze allows me to occupy the place of the analyst. The dazzling

---

5 Santiago, J., “Clínica del despertar imposible: sueño, eternidad y tiempo”, op. cit.
7 Ibid, p. 325.
8 Ibid, p. 326.
mirage of the Other woman, as glamorous as she may be, is no longer an obstacle for listening. This star that is Scarlett also refers to the analyst whose name signifies ‘star,’” the one she had chosen at the instant of seeing the whirl of her body dancing a tango.

The final act takes place when a dream emphasizes a phrase directed to the analyst: “‘I disagree [T.N. The original word in Spanish is acuerdo.] (accord) with you!’ The signifiers a-greement [a-cuerpo, translated to English is a-body] (a-corps) and disagreement (déssacord), that were produced in the exact crossing of my connection on the body of the Other and of my connection (agraphe) to the knowledge of the Other, were the last seeds of the unconscious that I used to separate from her.” Luminous metaphor “seeds of the unconscious,” of the double purpose of the conclusive dreams: to interpret the desire of the pass, and propel the act of passing through the devise.

He, whose neurosis spun around a ghostly mission that took away his breath: to save the Other from the fall, supported by a premature asthma that he had suffered, precipitates the end of his last analysis from an encounter with the analyst’s voice which finally remains stripped away from its value of demand.

But two dreams are the ones that bring the end: the first one is produced... “the following night of an earthquake that took place in the center of Italy. The scene is very simple: the earth trembles, I fall.” The dream reveals to him that he does not fall because he is distracted, which was how the pediatrician interpreted his repeated falls during his childhood. “It is a real without law that would open and start trembling, causing my falls (…) The second dream is about the analyst, it is the last one, the end of analysis. I’m at the analyst’s office, I communicate that I have decided to conclude. He says

---

9 Ibid, p. 326.
12 Ibid, p. 274.
goodbye in an affable manner. I am at the metro and I encounter him, but he transforms into a woman, a patient of his waiting room, anyone. I try to get closer to talk to him but there is no communication.”

A mysterious bond connects this last dream of transferential disinvestment, with a shocking revelation that comes to light in the last sessions, providing the secret clue to the case. He then visits the analyst to add something remaining to be said, and that by surprise had been made present upon leaving the office.

There was a traumatic event prior to his birth: the fall of his mother when she was pregnant with her first born child that led to the loss of this child, “who would have carried, by family tradition, my name. The one of the paternal grandfather. Suddenly, something illuminates me on the base of the real that is at the bottom of the construction of my obsessive ghost of saving the Other from the fall, from being the savior of the Other. I have to save the Other, because if the Other falls, the child dies . . . This scene was written in the real of the unconscious, leaving an indelible mark in my destiny’s drive. . . That scene had always been there, but I could not see it. Like Lacan’s stolen letter, it was before my eyes forever, but I could not read it. . . The child’s life was at stake, that of the unborn brother which, suddenly revealed, not without a shudder, that I had identified myself with. . . My road is then opened to the pass.”

There is a road that each analyst travels during a certain time moved by a desire of transmitting, as Lacan points out in The moment to conclude, “that which one is captive of,” in his own words.

---

13 Ibid, p. 274.
Could this elucidation contradict the generalized risk of sleepiness of which the Lacanian psychoanalysts are not exempt?

Translation: Pany Dimitrakis

Revised by: Andrea Hellemeyer, Lina Petraglia and Thomas Svolos
The Dream and the Limits of Interpretation
Laura RUBIÃO - EBP

Young Freud, concerned about the rigorousness of psychoanalysis in the scientific circles of his time, finds a prolific field of clinical research in the hypothesis in which dreams tend to have the same structure as that of the neurotic symptom. The manifest content of dreams would hide, under a facade of incongruity and unintelligibility, a call to unconscious elucidation.

Freud defines his method with precision, distinguishing it from a static symbolism guided by the capture of a universal semantic content or of the revelation of a pre-fixed meaning.

The publication of "The interpretation of dreams" is preceded by an interpretation exercise of many biographical dreams, a product of Freud's own anxiety and of what he could gather from his patients’ enunciation. Early on he concludes that the dream is nothing other than the account of the dream, therefore utterly inseparable from the (material) conditions of its representativity. It is enough to follow the book’s sharp analysis of dreams to verify the textual importance of vocables and the way in which Freud rigorously works under the auspices of the letter’s instance. The meaning of a dream could only be sought, as Lacan insists, as an effect of significance, to which the dreamer is subordinated.¹

Another crucial aspect of dream analysis is that, as the desire is indestructible, there would be no decisive target of decipherment. Freud is concerned not only with the success of interpretation, but also with what opposes it in the form of gaps and failures: dream elaborations and censorships, as well as facilitations and resistances. Every dream, he says, contains within itself the failure of the desire

to sleep, an awakening effect\(^2\) generated by \(^2\) the intensity of the drive motions’ cathexis. He had already drawn attention to the point at which the dream “reaches down into the unknown,”\(^3\) pointing to a kind of short circuit or radical halt in the process of dream elaboration.

To what clinical consequences would this premature encounter with the question of the limit of the art of interpretation have led him? Freud connects the stagnation of the dream activity, which often leads to awakening, to a production of displeasure from an increase of intrapsychic tension. The dreams of anxiety are, in this case, the most expressive ones. It is interesting to notice that the examples collected by Freud\(^4\) always point to a castration anxiety correlative to a desire for punishment. In this matter, what is announced as a cut or as an expression of a limit in the possibility of representation is reintegrated via interpretation. The reintegration to a scenario or a fantasmatic border could make the repressed sense reappears. If the dream awakens, we could say, the interpretation puts to sleep.

In what way did Freud use the radical limit of interpretation that he himself intuited from his work with dreams? Has he always attributed it to the wall of castration and to the emergence of an incompatible idea, as the Oedipal fantasy?

Lacan elevated the dignity of Freud’s famous dream navel idea as a crucial clinical tool for the recognition of the emergence of the Real, which sprouts from the significant fabric. In ‘a Note threaded Stitch by Stitch’ for reading seminar 23, Miller highlights Lacan’s interest in the term *unerkannt*: “Lacan translates *unerkannt* as ‘unacknowledged.’ He identifies it with what Freud calls the *Urverdrängt*, the primary or primordially repressed which he reads as


\(^3\) Freud, S., *The Interpretation of Dreams*, *op. cit.*, p. 525.

a knot in the utterable comparable to the hole in the drive.”

Two famous dreams interpreted by Freud and later revisited by Lacan, allow us to glimpse at an opaque point which shows the real presence of jouissance and that, nonetheless, awaits in an analysis the possibility of interpretation.

In the analysis of Irma's dream, Freud faces the crossroads of the hysterical solution (Losüng). It refutes both the existence of an organic substance causing the disease, as well as the semantic elucidation of the symptom. However, the dream can’t be without the symptom. Lacan proposes something new: he understands it as a series that goes from the mouth that closes (dodging the sense) to the hole that opens, passing through the rambling discourse of the “Professors” who stutter things without meaning, until the emergence of the formula of Trimethylamine, which is imposed as a pure cipher of jouissance.

Nevertheless, it is in the analysis of Dora's second dream that we see more clearly the way in which the obscure and enigmatic element escapes Freud’s understating. He prefers to rely on his position as the father's interpreter, without exploring the central question about what a woman wants.

Dora receives a letter from her mother announcing the death of her father with the following words: "Now he is dead, and if you like you can come.” She is lost in a strange city, she does not find the station (she misses it) and is taken by an anxious immobility. She arrives and everyone is at the cemetery. She goes up to the room and reads a book. Dora does not go towards her father, she dwells in her

---


reading, in her associations, remembering how she hastily prostrated herself in front of the image of the Madonna. What does she really want? Lacan invites us again to read the dream basing on its holes. He highlights to what extent Dora is captured by the mystery of femininity. Similarly to Irma, the feminine opens itself to a point of non-recognition, of radical suspension of the sense.

These two dreams date from the beginnings of psychoanalysis. Later on Freud indicates in "Beyond the pleasure principle" the strange presence of death drive in the dreams of people traumatized by war. He gives a theoretical and clinical importance to the question of its interpretable element. The theories of trauma and the repetition compulsion highlight the presence of that "knot of the unspeakable", the main vector of Lacan’s late formulation of the Real Unconscious.

Translation from Portuguese to Spanish: Gabriela Medín
Translation from Spanish to English: Polina Agapaki
Revised by: Ana de Melo, Anna de Filippi and An Bulkens

---

By returning to Freud, Lacan interprets Freud. As a Lacanian interpretation, his reading of Freud’s dream theory marks the precise junctures at which Freud’s constructions of psychoanalysis already interpret themselves. The Freudian dream of interpretation in the service of meaning, became the Freudian nightmare. Freud indexes the *Interpretation of Dreams* with the dream of the burning child. Why does Freud fixate on this nightmare as a paradigm for Chapter VII of his dream book?

*Father don’t you see I’m burning.*

It is a dream reported to Freud, already borrowed from another dream, ‘re-dreamed’ by his patient. The dream of the unconscious in the service of the Name-of-the-Father is burning. It burned for Freud, and he could not avert his gaze. The dream, structured by desire, already smoldered with a white-hot core, the nightmare of the encounter with the real of the drive.

With a little help from *Seminar XI* and the formulations of Jacques-Alain Miller, the 1900 Freudian dream thesis belies the vector of the real unconscious just as soon as Freud sets out to elevate what we now understand as the transferential unconscious. Freud’s recursive and paradoxical dream logic stumbled on the knot discovered in the relation between two signifiers: *asleep* and *awake*. The dream itself is a knotting of the unconscious as transferential and the unconscious ‘that is, the real unconscious.’

In Chapter VII of *Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud refers to Aristotle, who posited the dream as ‘thinking that persists ... in the state of

---

sleep. Thought aside, if we isolate ‘persists’, the formations of the unconscious, awake and asleep, establish a continuity. The unconscious persists by interpreting, humming along from word to word in the chain of associations that Freud utilized, pointing to the production of sense at stake in dreaming and waking psychic functioning. The continuity here is the logic of the fantasy that finds consistency across dream and life, awake and asleep. This is the ‘life is a dream’ which Lacan interrogated.

Yet Freud remains curious about anxiety dreams. The traumatic aspect of the dream exposes the function of discontinuity. Here we can locate the other side of the interpretation of dreams, the vector that runs against meaning. The operation of the cut in psychoanalysis produces a discontinuity in the production of meaning across the signifying chain, to introduce a point of rupture in the daydreaming of our everyday life. Following the axis of the real unconscious, when we dream, we can produce a cut. In Freud’s dream theory, the moment of awakening, too close to the real for the comfort of the sleeping-being, produces a momentary interruption at the juncture between our sleeping dream and waking dream. The anxiety of awakening cuts the dream, so that we can continue sleeping in waking life after a brief encounter with the real of drive. And so we proceed from bubble to bubble, dream to daydream, a chain of pearls of signifiers, but not without gasping for air in between each semantic episode.

We can isolate the two vectors of the unconscious as interpretation in metaphors that Freud employs in the Interpretation of Dreams. On the side of the transferential unconscious, Freud describes the dream as the fruiting body of a mushroom that grows from the mycelium of the network of signifiers, the dream as a fungi of the symbolic order. Later Freud casts the dream as fireworks, it takes ‘hours to prepare


and goes off in an instant. The dream has the quality of eruption. The dream flashes like a chemical reaction that accelerates as repressed signifying material burns up through the atmosphere of the imaginary. It appears as a perceptual event that demands to be understood, and also to remain silent. If we read Chapter VII of the *Interpretation of Dreams* through the Lacanian Orientation, the dream takes on the quality of an event. It is an encounter on which the speaking being accretes meaning. To interpret a dream can stimulate the production of meaning around this enigmatic eruption.

Or the analyst can direct the dream back to its function as a puncture. Oriented by the real unconscious, the dream is an event of the speaking being, one in which language and the body collide. The course of an analysis may oscillate between truth and event, two polarities outlined by Eric Laurent in his orientation text for the 2020 Congress of the NLS. In the development of Freud’s dream theory, both polarities appear at the level of the text, not one before the other, but inextricably bound by the knot of the dream. In *Seminar XI*, Lacan throws down the gauntlet of his orientation by re-reading the dream of the burning child. Freud wrote that the father of the burning child desired to extend his life. Lacan countered that the father was awakened by the blinding fire that ignited around the impossibility to see death. Life is but a dream if it were not for the core of the experience of psychoanalysis: the real. The dream is rendered as the encounter with the real that always eludes us. Lacan hails it as an ‘appointment.’ In as much as our appointment with the signifying Other articulates the transferential unconscious, we dream for analysis. We dream to pave the royal road, laying each stone as we traverse the landscape of sense and meaning.

But what about our appointment with the real that Lacan marks in *Seminar XI*? The moment of awakening is a *tuché*, an encounter with

---


the real that is always narrowly missed, a breathless vacuum encountered in between the bubble of the dream and the bubble of life. We are awakened by the real of the drive, the burning empty core that can’t ever be seen but compels us to look again and again.

The dream has the function of the little reel of the Fort-Da, a representation of repetition animated by trauma. The unconscious as interpretation, ciphering (Fort) and deciphering (Da), envelopes a hole, sealing it off from the dreamer. The dream of the burning child evokes the real unconscious, the slumber of the symbolic is awakened by the fire-alarm-clock of the impossible encounter, the space between the fantasy and trauma of the real.

---

8 Ibid, p 62.
In proposing a new version of the unconscious in his very late teaching,\textsuperscript{1} Lacan establishes a clinic in the perspective of the sinthome.

One in which the use of the dream stands out, different from deciphering, oriented towards a practice of the One based in the primacy of the jouissance of the body. “J.-A. Miller indicates that there are dreams that can make present a jouissance not taken up in the fictional machinery of interdiction, where jouissance is made present as an event of the body.”\textsuperscript{2} What in the dream corresponds to the field of Oedipal fiction is thus distinguished from the field of lalangue, referred to the so-called navel of the dream which interprets the inaugural traumatism.

In \textit{Seminar X} Lacan indicates that the anxiety belonging to the nightmare is experienced as “that of the Other’s jouissance.”\textsuperscript{3} Working on this affirmation, Palomera says that “...the nightmare puts into play an obscure jouissance that is not presented in the form of language: nothing can be said about it, it is opaque, unthinkable and unmentionable”\textsuperscript{4}

It is the presentification of the real, the navel of the dream that submits the parîêtre to a jouissance that appears foreign to him but is actually his own, and is lived in this way by the loosening of the knot. The nightmare as a massive experience of anxiety embodies the impact that shows that jouissance is felt in the body. Jouissance overflows the image and allows the experience of the shock, that


\textsuperscript{2} Baudini, S. and Naparstek, F., ”Presentation of the XIIth WAP Congress”, \textit{Rebus 01}, available online.


jump of the body that awakes up in order to continue dreaming.

Awakening reveals that the marks of the real would not be in the awakening itself, but rather in that which in the dream causes the awakening. It indicates the not want to know anything, to forget the real found in the dream and to continue dreaming, but this time with open eyes.

If the knotting functions, the jouissance that is present in the dream is moderated, but when the symbolic in the knot is loosened, it is confirmed as a body event, that jouissance that awakens in a double manoeuvre, as Hebe Tizio points out: “...it activates the subject and liberates the body from that oppression by allowing him to recover his dream activity.”

It is the body that awakens, it is a recomposition of a reality when the defence is restored, at the same time that the real is made present in that awakening.

The New Clinic

A perspective for the practice emerges from the very last teaching, on the basis of which it is important to ask ourselves about the formation and position of the analyst in the analytical experience. It is the analyst who must put into action the wild interpretation on the basis of an orientation that follows the line of the act more than words.

It is not the same to be oriented by the perspective of the ghost than to do so on the basis of the “There is something of the One,” “Yad’l’Un.” This also has consequences for the analyst's listening. Now, from the outset, what is heard is what iterates, that singular jouissance that is out of meaning and does not tie.

A clinic where the use of a pragmatic is raised where the forcing is

---


6 Ibíd, p. 63.
oriented to destructuring the symbolic system in order to introduce a logical use of the *sinthome*. The clinic of the *sinthome* proposes a new discipline of interpretation: *the analyst nightmare, the analyst surgeon*.⁷

Thus in his last teaching Lacan makes use of the knot, a modality of treatment of the interruption of jouissance by means of the *une-bévue*.

“In order to do this, he revises the classical terms of the instruments of the psychoanalytic operation: the unconscious, transference and interpretation to propose new ones: the *parlêtre*, the act, *jaculation*, subject to the logic of ”*Yad’l’Un”*, a *jaculation* that is central in all of the consequences Miller has drawn out for us. This set of reprises defines the theoretical framework for a clinic of madness under transference and the treatment of the disruption of jouissance...⁸ An orientation that is directed towards the capture of this trace/trait of the *une-bévue* translated as the one-blunder.

A new conception of interpretation emerges in its dimension of forcing. “It is an interpretation that does not aim at the concatenation or the production of a significant chain. It takes act in the new goal of the tightening [*serrage*] of the knot around the body event and the inscription that can be noted as (a) in a renewed use”.⁹

An analyst in a function very different from that of interpreting meaning, would rather be in a position to know how to manoeuvre, to know how to cut. The cut of the session is like an abrupt awakening, as if a loud alarm clock ripped us out of a dream, and more than the content of the unconscious would aim at its mode of advent: rupture, surprise, an irruption that indicates an impossible to say.

---


In this way, instead of subject supposed to know, interpretation becomes rather know how to manoeuvre. Manoeuvre, where what is emphasized is the use, not the decipherment, not the significant interpretation, but rather outlining, verifying, surprising... the nightmare. It is an interpretation where the S1 is on the side of the analyst, but it is the analysand who contributes the S2.

An interpretation whose essence “is the return of speech in writing, that which was written in the equivocation.” What Lacan called wild interpretation and what Miller has called interpretation as awakening, one that has to do with what happens in the nightmare. This is why Miller will propose that “...the effective interpretation of the analyst is a nightmare.”

It is an extraction of the “It wants to enjoy” passing via an “It does not mean anything”, because the unconscious masks the “It want to enjoy” with an “It wants to say.”

Translated by Roger Litten
Revised by Luciana Mendez Ferrer and Cyrus Saint-Amand Poliakoff

---

10 Laurent, É., “Interpretation: From Truth to Event”. Lecture given in Tel-Aviv, June 12, 2019, available online.
12 Cf. Ibid., p. 452.
'It’s that Freud, in the *Interpretation of Dreams*, doesn’t do better: on the dream, with free association, he dreams on the dream.'

The interpretation of the dream, as an aspect of the psychoanalytical practice, is brought as an example of the functional existence of the unconscious. Following the scheme of the bungled act, as in the case of the name ‘Signorelli,’ we can see that beyond the literal fragments that propagate, routing the intention from one signifier to another, Freud comes to an *impasse*, oblique with respect to the game of metonymy and metaphor and he can say nothing more apart from the restlessness that catches him as a subject beyond the fantasy.

In the “beautiful butcher’s wife” dream, the “salmon” signifier, evoked in the dream of Freud’s patient, is well beyond the grid of interpretation, the role of the analyst who knows, alerts the attentive reader that this knowledge, supposed in the transference, is yet an insurmountable obstacle for the interpretation: the true enigma of jouissance bestowed upon the subject that the signifier mentioned above points to, but cannot reach.

If on one side, we can see the interpretative value of the unconscious in his work with the signifier, both as word and as image, on the other side, as the latest Lacan illustrates and J.-A. Miller explains, there’s an edge: a border that goes beyond the Other and that suggests the logical continuity between the unconscious as interpretation and the real unconscious.

---


Real, condition of the Symbolic⁴, which in the dream ties itself into the plot, whose tale in second grade interpretation cannot be further sublimed.

The real speaks in its speech, but doesn’t talk, it keeps silent, anchored to the death drive.⁵

*Resistance* is the Freudian signifier used to indicate the mode of the encounter, in the *tychê*, with the real: the mark between the signifier and the jouissance it aimed to represent, its meaning (if there ever was one) is not only an impossible recovery, but an illegible writing, a mark of *ex-sistence* out of any signification.

Analysis is not a successful sublimation, if anything it’s a failure, Lacan says, a “swindle”⁶, if one is to pretend to make of the unconscious something universal.

It’s about trying to speak of the place of the real in relation to the *une-bévue*, another way to say the real unconscious,⁷ the *une-bévue* necessary for the speaking being to introduce himself to the bond with the Other within the dream.

The One of jouissance, the One-All-Alone, couldn’t hold up inside the body-Other. If the signifier has this mortifying function on the body of jouissance, at the same time, it is a condition to turn these traumatic events into the field of eroticism, of repetitions, always failed, on the cusp of the object, so that the subject would believe itself as being in Truth.

Love is an effect. It is a good partner-semblant with the knowledge that fills the void of the impossible, of the sexual relationship. In

---

⁵ Ibid.
transference, dreams give depth, measure, plot placing oneiric work in the field of love of knowledge. They function as a question aiming to complete the meaning of the scene set up by the semantic of the unconscious.

The clinic of hysteria guides Freud towards what he will define as the bedrock of castration, a stumbling point arising from the signification of the lack; and yet he had the navel of the dream available, a witness to a flight of sense, whose limit is S(A/). 8

In the double reversal of elaboration, one realizes how the interpretation of dreams is already in the oneiric transformation. Transformation, Lacan says, a true virtue of the interpreting unconscious, which insofar as it is unconscious, doesn’t think, doesn’t calculate, doesn’t desire, but intends. 9 It ciphers so that the speaking being remains, by decoding, in relation to the Other. To the name of jouissance, the metaphorization of the ciphering.

The letter, litter remains from the real operation of separation. The symbolic cannot say it All, and the imaginary bears a part of the image that the letter captures.

The letter in, The Purloined Letter, beginning with Poe’s text, 10 is from the image, but it is in the scene that its power operates. It feminizes, as the object of seduction, whomever dreams its possession. The dream is of the dreamer who believes to have reality under control.

Reality, which makes use of lalangue, with the broken pieces that flutter about and fall back into letters, in extraneous fragments to the plot, to the dream’s story: the signifier looks for the literal in the littoral of lalangue.

---


The oneiric task of interpretation specifies more-than-jouissance, obtained by metonymy for the dreamer and this constructs the lying truth. There is the tangible risk for analysis to perpetuate this collection of jouissance through the interpretation of sense.

In *Radiophonie* Lacan insists on sense as something that is lost, which encounters as impossible only to have it certainly lost.  

Where is the subject in the dream? As experience shows, it is often reduced to the gaze, object and subject coincide; we can find, in this, the major virtue of the unconscious interpreter in keeping the *une-bévue* of the real. *Une-bévue* of the real and not *une-bévue* on the real, underlying the participation of the void in the oneiric construction, which is the *cause* that the oneiric work knots into the three toric dimensions.

The dream, like an analysand, turns around its own dictum, to be able to say. The cause remains out of sense and outside of the productions of the master signifier.

The unconscious interpreter is therefore an entropic machine, and it works in the service of the real: the hole of the dream, Lacan affirms, is what is left from the cause after putting into work, the research, the ciphering, the production of sense necessary to grant the dreamer the guarantee to live in connection to his own jouissance.

Lacan in the seminar, *L’Une-bévue*, claims that the dream, like any formation of the unconscious, is a false aim of truth. It has an exchange value.  

In the analytic discourse, $S_1$ is produced for interpretation. Its truth effect is, however, always aleatory, therefore, if the effects are understood, it’s not analytical, as J.-A. Miller reminds us.  

---


If we follow J.-A. Miller’s orientation, in the analytical work, the subject is faced with his own subjective splitting, but it’s necessary to move away from the ontology of revelation, from believing in the Freudian good faith of the unconscious.

What does the analytical interpretation come down to with dreams? How does it introduce the act in the re-translation of the dream text?

The analyst’s answer is in the reading. To grasp the letter, rather than the signifier, its effects of sense;\(^{14}\) to cut at the equivocation, where the traumatic may be detected, the trou (hole) in the relationship with the real jouissance. Being able to read the border, the littoral of the hole, are active functions of the analyst’s presence and of his silence. Silence of the dictum and of the interpretation, which resonates with the presence, something of the saying in the body of the speaking-being, silence that may uncover what does not cease to not be written, so that the patient’s words from their stories would become memories of a real body event, inscriptions of jouissance in the contingency to which the dream belongs.

*Translation: Carla Antonucci*

*Revised by: Monica Vacca and Cyrus Saint-Amand Poliakoff*

---

A Dream that Shows the Real
Irene KUPERWAJS

Throughout my analytical experience, dreams functioned as clues, buoys which many times indicated to me where I was and where to go. Some of them knotted a real of the drive to the fabric of analysis that echoed into the inaugural trauma caused by the impact of lalangue on the body. A dream that marked the entrance to my last analysis illustrates this perspective.

After the death of the analyst, with whom I had been doing analysis for eight years, I began the analysis that would lead me to the pass. A dream burst into the first session with the analyst. It was about an image in which “the previous analyst lies on the couch of his office with sewn lips.” This dream pointed towards the oral object that presented itself through silence, pure oral drive, which sealed in its own satisfaction, residue that had not been previously touched. Of that, I had wanted to know nothing.

The autistic jouissance of the symptom, silence, is linked to the Other in the transference through the dream. Thus, it not only pursues deciphering, but the analyst becomes partenaire of the jouissance of the subject. “A closed mouth attracts no flies,” it’s the sentence I add when I tell it. The sewn lips, the closed mouth, denote the word fastened to silence and death. It was about my own sewn lips, the mouth eating the silence, core of the pathos, navel of the dream.

What does this dream teach me? That the imaginary in the dream can indicate a real, a point of failure, which causes anguish. As Jacques-Alain Miller argues, “the imaginary in the dream sometimes offers to what is foreclosed by the symbolic a “pathetic visual illustration” that is paid with anxiety.

---

This image of the dream at the beginning of the analysis indicated the real drive at play. Opening the mouth in order to speak made it possible, in the analytical work, to locate the oral object and then the summoner as partners of the subject, in the construction and crossing of the fantasy. I was able to reveal that in my program of jouissance, the new analyst had been selected for her “clear speaking.”

The encounter with that image and its waking effect left a deep imprint that guided my experience. Disentangling myself to, “rediscover that of which one is prisoner... it is the face of the Real of that in which one is entangled,” took me fifteen more years. Fifteen years of analytical work to finally verify that it was no longer about the closed mouth but rather about the impossibility of saying and of the opaque jouissance of the sinthome, of the “it jouit there where it does not speak,” the silence of the real.

Translation: Polina Agapaki

Revised by Natalia Vélez and Cyrus Saint-Amand Poliakoff
From the Other Scene to the One Scene

Paola FRANCESCO

“I dreamed that I was dreaming that...”

Which position, regarding the oneiric work, would indicate this apparent duplication of the Other scene?

The dream is often the best way to locate the coordinates of a subject regarding his own jouissance and the desire of the Other. The dream does not only call upon the Subject Supposed to Know, but indicates from where, and how, the subject does it, thus allowing the analyst to precisely understand the conditions of staging, so to speak, of the jouissance of the subject at that moment, and the limit of his inscription in his unconscious. What do the signifier and the letter convey in this scene? And what, on the other hand, isolates the real, the limit, or the haunting that pierces such a dream scene, the so-called navel of the dream? As Lacan says, Freud stops at this point, calling it primordial repression, "at the root of language", the real, a hole, "which is the best figuration that can be given." Therefore a dream often represents the royal road of the passage to the couch, to the analytical work itself.

It is a push to be recognized, where the paths of saying in free association allow the subject of the unconscious, who does not initially realize how the desire of the Other interrogates him, to understand. In the dream, the transposition onto the Other scene affords greater closeness to the conditions of allusiveness of the lalangue that agitates the subject, and to how is perceived by the good listener.

The Other scene in which the questions concerning the subject and its engagement on the call upon the Subject Supposed to Know take

---

place, designs the unconscious as prone to transference, “Freudianly” speaking, as an interpretation that frees a response and a possibility of invention of a new knowledge.

Jacques-Alain Miller\(^2\) says in Lacan’s *Seminar XX* that the emphasis shifts from the Other to the One, with decisive consequences for both the unconscious and the status of *jouissance*. A new unconscious appears, no longer the transferential unconscious, but the real unconscious, centered on the One of *jouissance*.

The subject of the sentence quoted at the beginning ... dreams that he is in front of three doors, opening and closing them in succession. Each opening introduces one of the three women that divide his fantasmatic life: the wife whom he simultaneously embraces and separates from, the lover lying on the bed *a tergo*, deprived from his face and therefore his masculine *jouissance*, and the woman of love, whom he sees from the bottom of a staircase, beautiful but with the stain of death on her face.

How could we ignore a reference here to the motif of the three caskets, where Freud attributes an underlying structure to man’s relationship with the Other sex?\(^3\)

The three women here are the wife/mother, the companion, and the impossible beloved. Yet in this dream about dreaming of a tripartite scene, a point of *naveling* of the dreamer is revealed, not addressed to the Other, but rather as a response of the real, the unconscious that is given in the beat of the opening and closing of the three doors that places it in the point of real, not reducible to the sense of each scene, and which is given in the interstices of this real passage from the enactment, to its non-writability.

As in other cases, in this or in other forms, one touches the dimension where the nonsense in the structure corresponds to the

---


real unconscious in the dream.

It can perhaps be said that we are dealing here with the dream not as an Other scene, but as One scene, in that the One casts its shadow over the Other. "I dreamed that I was dreaming that" is the opposite of a duplication of the scene, rather it is the index of a real.

Not duplicated, but reduced. It’s the reverse of Pirandello’s thesis of "theater in the theater".

Translation: Carla Antonucci

Revised by Natalia Vélez, Jeffrey Erbe and Cyrus Saint-Amand

Poliakoff