



# PAPERS 5

## The Limit of Dream Interpretation, Between Meaning and Letter (English)

### **Action Committee of the School One 2018-2020**

Lucíola Macêdo (EBP)

Valeria Sommer-Dupont (ECF)

Laura Canedo (ELP)

Manuel Zlotnik (EOL)

María Cristina Aguirre (NLS)

Paola Bolgiani (SLP)

Coordinator: Clara María Holguín (NEL)

### **Translation Team**

Coordinator: Valeria Sommer-Dupont

Responsible Translation: Silvana Belmudes

Responsible Translation revision: Melina Cothros

Translators: Polina Agakapi, Silvana Belmudes, Linda Clarke,

Joanne Conway, Pany Dimitrakis, Caroline Heanue,

Lorena Hojman, Dominique Rudaz

Revisers: Isabel Aguirre, An Bulkens, Linda Clarke,

Joanne Conway, Anna De Filippi, Neil Gorman, Gary Marshall,

Bruna Meller, Raphael Montague, Dominique Rudaz,

Cyrus Saint Amand-Poliakoff

### **Edition – Graphic Design**

Secretariat: Eugenia Serrano / Partners:

Daniela Teggi - M. Eugenia Cora

# CONTENTS

EDITORIAL, Laura CANEDO.	03
1-Claudia IDDAN (A.M.S.) / Double Transferential Movement.	07
2- Jacqueline DHÉRET - ECF / <i>I,a</i> A Dream only Lives by the One who Speaks it.	09
3- Heloísa CALDAS - EBP / Between Text and Writing: the “Boot in the Mouth” Dream.	13
4-Leonarda RAZZANELLI- SLP / $\mathcal{S}$ [ $S_1 (S_2, S_2, S_2, S_2, \dots)$ ].	17
5- Joanne CONWAY - NLS / Reading Zero.	20
6- María Victoria CLAVIJO - NEL / The Dream, a Body Trapped by the Letter.	24
7- Marta SERRA - ELP / The Psychical (Which is) True Real.	28
8- Silvia PINO - EOL / Dream and Writing.	32
9- Patricia TASSARA ZÁRATE - (A.S.) / It’s an Unspeakable Dream.	37

## Editorial

Laura CANEDO

In this issue of *Papers*, we encounter an axis divided by a split. On the one hand, in the path of deciphering, knowing its structural solidarity with the function of language, how are we to think about the limit of meaning that puts us to sleep? How to capture the inherent metabolism of *jouissance* in a dream? It is around these questions that the second path opens, since the path of meaning appears to have no possible limit. This is what Freud had already highlighted when, starting from the “Dream of Irma’s Injection,” he pointed, in the navel of every dream, to that unfathomable place that connects with the unknown, a path that would not bring new contributions.

It is there where a new path opens up, which involves taking into account the limit of the real itself, that is, the impossibility to write the sexual rapport as a hole that language covers. Although we encounter several references to the navel in Lacan’s work, it was in an answer to a question asked by M. Ritter that he made his greatest development in this regard, situating in the dream the mark on the *parlêtre* of the exclusion of one’s own origin, impossible to recognize. And he guided us to articulate the limit based on mathematical logic.

Putting this logic into play, numerous perspectives open up. They result in the texts of this issue of *Papers*, in which we find elaborations that allow us to think about the orientation of the analytical act in order to halt the entanglement of meaning in the dream. Following the path that Lacan offers us by indicating that “that which is repressed manages to lodge itself in the reference to the letter,” these works account for the reading of the dream from the resonances of *lalangue* in the body and the modalities of *jouissance*.

## PAPERS 5 / Editorial

In the end, it is about the question: in the interpretation of dreams, what does it imply to think about the unconscious, as Miller suggests, starting from the raw iteration and not from meaning?

As you will find in the texts presented here, there are numerous ways this question can be answered, corresponding to different ways of articulating this limit.

Our **NLS** colleague, **Claudia Iddan**, whom we invited on this occasion as **AMS**, states that in the course of the analysis the appearance of the dream is subject to a double movement: from writing to text and from text to writing, in which two mechanisms of transference are brought into play. Faced with this, it will be the analyst who establishes a limit to interpretation on the side of meaning, orienting his intervention on writing, the letter and resonance in the body. Her text leads us to the next paper, on the analyst's intervention. In it, **Jacqueline Dhéret**, of the **ECF**, gives an account of the manoeuvres and articulation that allow the *parlêtre* to talk about the drive to which it is subjected, illustrating this with a clinical vignette. It is through the isolation of a writing that the bodily resonances of the word take on relevance, which will allow a separation from the regime of death drive.

Following the line that traces the axis of the analyst's intervention, our colleague from **EBP**, **Heloísa Caldas**, invites us to think about the orientation of the interpretation, starting from the transferential unconscious and the real. Starting from the dream as a rim around a hole, in her text both the symptom (what does not cease to be written) and the real (what does not cease not to be written) are present; she shows us how its reading allows us to touch the real, by excavating the void that the meaning attempts to cover.

Following the path of speech, involved in every formulation of a dream, our colleague **Leonarda Razzanelli**, of the **SLP**, guides us to think of  $\$$  as a function in the field of the written, of the

impossible to say, that directs the repetition commanded by *jouissance* on the body level; and shows us, with a clinical case, the analytic act as a cut that allows to capture the structural elements that organize *jouissance* in the dream.

The author of the text from the **NLS**, **Joanne Conway**, shows us how Lacan, Freud's reader, pushes the interpretation to the limit in the "dream of the dead father," starting from the presence that implies the elision of signifiers in the text, and pointing to the dimension of being and existence. It will be the orientation to the real, she tells us, which will allow us to read the fundamental and crucial questions of which the subject wants to know nothing.

Starting from the question of whether we can locate the order of the signifier in the dream as letter, as a shoreline of *jouissance*, **María Victoria Clavijo**, of the **NEL**, shows us that Freud already theorizes with his method the interpretation from the perspective of the letter. And how in Lacan it is the irreducible enjoying substance that forces us to bet on what in analysis functions as writing. Thus, based on the testimony of an AS, she outlines the point in which, starting from the dream, one can access a new satisfaction.

Outlining Freud's definition of the unconscious as "the psychical (which is) truly real," **Marta Serra**, of the **ELP**, points beyond the articulation between signifiers to isolated signifiers, outside of meaning, as letters that impacted the body, committed to the emergence of the *parlêtre*. And she guides the reading of the dream towards the production of the  $S_1$ s that participate in the *lalangue* of each one.

Following the path offered by Lacan, of taking the dream as an equivocation, **Silvia Pino**, of the **EOL**, locates the limit by pointing to a writing whose paradigm is neologism. It is about the dream as a saying, reduced in itself to an equivocation. And she tells us that, although dreams do not give us a fixed formula that would reach "tis written," some, at the end of the analytical

## **PAPERS 5** / Editorial

experience, write a letter as a singular, neological support that can determine the way out.

In the last contribution to this issue of *Papers*, **Patricia Tassara**, our guest **AS** on this occasion, through a dream, testifies to the possibility of going beyond a mortifying identification as a defense against the real that obstructed the void proper to the *feminine*. Taking the dream as a signifying montage made from the residues of the *lalangue* that is read, she tells us that this is an interpretation of the letter of the unconscious.

As we close this new issue of *Papers*, we hope that, like us, you will be able to find the texts instructive.

Enjoy the reading!

*Translated by Polina Agakapi*

*Revised by Cyrus Saint Amand-Poliakoff and Isabel Aguirre*

# Double Transferential Movement

Claudia IDDAN- NLS

Within the framework of the analysis, the movement of speech is characterized schematically by a double binary relation of say-listen and write-read. The first binary relation refers to the structure of language and the creation of meaning, while the second is located at the level of *lalangue*, and focuses on how *lalangue* resonates within the body and on the mode of *jouissance*. This brings up the question: How then to situate the unconscious formation of a dream in relation to these two binaries?

During the analysis the appearance of a dream is subject to a double movement: the first movement is the writing of the dream as the text, and in terms of the latter, the second is writing of the dream as an effect of speech that delimits the impossible. These represent two different mechanisms of transference, and therefore a different staging. Lacan said, "Let us say, then, that dreams are like the parlor game in which each person, in turn, is supposed to get the spectators to guess some well-known saying or variant thereof solely by silent gestures."<sup>1</sup>

The images of the dream, these silent gestures, are in themselves a rebus, of the kind defined by Freud, a writing that Lacan already presents in the *Instance of the Letter* as a literal, material figuration, and thus the function of reading.

The very act of dreaming produces an autistic formation of the unconscious by means of a transference-work based on the laws of the signifier. From the moment when, during the course of the treatment, the *parlêtre* enunciates the text of the dream to the analyst, this functions first of all as a call for the analyst's interpretation of a hidden want-to-say, but no doubt it also stages

---

<sup>1</sup> Lacan, J., "The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious," *Écrits*, The First Complete Edition in English, trans. Bruce Fink, W.W. Norton and Co., London/New York, 2006, pp. 425-426.

## PAPERS 5 / Double Transferential Movement

[enacts] the sexual reality of the unconscious and the drive circuit. Both movements imply a shift from meaning toward *jouissance*; in other words, from language to *lalangue*.

Freud found in the dream of Irma's Injection the ultimate secret of this formation of the unconscious, a point where associations stop and slide into the domain of the *Unerkannt* [the unknown], that he called the navel of the dream. This unknown terrain is the *Urverdrangung* [primary repressed], it is the place that Lacan attributes to the hole, to what *does not cease not to be written*, a symbolic hole that is analogous to the essence of a knot, identified with an opacity of the drive, a point of closing which delimits an impossibility.<sup>2</sup>

Lacan adds in his response to Marcel Ritter that what is called the drive, "is something that leaves the formulation of the relationship of one sex as such to another completely gaping."<sup>3</sup> This obscure point lacking any possibility of representation, highlights the presence of There is Something of the One [*Y a d'Un*], of the signifier-letter which resonates on the body. On the side of the analysand this double movement implies a small step that fulfils the function of a partial extraction of *jouissance*, while for the analyst the obscure point establishes a limit to everything that relates to the interpretation of meaning and places a stronger emphasis on the place of writing by way of equivocation or of the act, as that which resonates on the body.

Translated by Joanne Conway

Revised by Neil Gorman and Isabel Aguirre

---

<sup>2</sup> Lacan, J., "L'ombilic du rêve est un trou", *La Cause du désir*, No. 102, Navarin Editeur, Paris, 2019, p. 41. Unpublished in English.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.



**I,a**

## **A Dream Only Lives by the One Who Speaks it**

Jacqueline DHÉRET - ECF

This title owes a lot to Jacques-Alain Miller's text, *Introduction to the Erotics of Time*.<sup>1</sup> Reading it has led me to revise how the subject supposed to know relates to the formations of the unconscious, and to their fate in the treatment. The author cites Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*, which emphasized the "indestructible" character of unconscious processes: "In the Unconscious, nothing can be brought to an end, nothing is past or forgotten."<sup>2</sup> When an analysis ends, there are some dreams that are no longer corrected by future dreams, although the analysand continues to dream. Freud's remark suggests that the real that causes dreams cannot be translated and that its indestructible base belongs neither to the past nor to the present.

From a Freudian point of view, dreams and analysis seem to be closely connected: one dreams as soon as one begins a treatment, one wonders what the dream told in a session means, one asks about what it hides. And that one calls for another: this is logical since the formations of the unconscious are based on the work of signifiers that whet your appetite. In analysis, the dream does not lend itself to formalization: it sets in motion the signifying chains that give rise to the hypothesis of the unconscious. The function of the dream is interpretation. In the session the analysand speaks his/her dream, he/she involves the analyst on the side of an enigmatic "I want to know, I can know," that is never completed. The voice of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Miller, J.-A., "Introduction to the Erotics of Time," *Lacanian Ink*, N° 24/25, New York, winter 2005, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

## **PAPERS 5 / I,a** A Dream Only Lives by the One Who Speaks it

analysand who carries the images of the dream, the associations, animates the words and creates a space that involves speaking bodies: his/her own, and that of the analyst. Some dreams are accompanied by a *jouissance* in saying, others are emitted with anguish, others bring a heavy gift, an "I don't know what to say about it," which discourages.

The analyst's interpretive maneuver favors at certain moments the writing of the memorable, of the unconscious meaning that takes shape, supporting its elements of surprise and its audacity. At other moments it attaches to emptiness, to silence, which are not an erasure. The dream spoken in analysis lends itself to deciphering, to the analyst's interpretations, but it is not a *rebus*. This is what Lacan's sentence on the cover of *La Cause du désir* No. 102, *Inquiétantes étrangetés*, captures:<sup>3</sup> "The Navel of the Dream is a Hole." A treatment is not an abundance of dreams.

Note that the dreams at the end of a treatment told by the AS's ask little. They find: the incomprehensible that they evoke is said in a few sentences. There is a dream that lasted only a few seconds, the accidental product of many years of work on the couch. It is not proof, it does not announce any end. It surprises, drives out the superfluous, and highlights something that still fails to reveal. These dreams, which I will describe as *grains of sand*, bring down monuments. The linguistic discovery, which is isolated, speaks the drive to which the *parlêtre* (*speaking being*) is constrained. The indestructible is there, and the hole that the formula of fantasy enveloped shows its edges.

When the subject perceives in the treatment the illusion of the subject supposed to know who supported the work of the unconscious, what is experienced in the body no longer refers to the anonymity of knowledge. The deceptive *jouissance* that animated the subject, the share of libido that supported the production of dreams, deflates and becomes impoverished. Analysis isolates a writing that

---

<sup>3</sup> *La Cause du désir*, Review of l'Ecole de la Cause freudienne, "Inquiétantes étrangetés," N° 102, Navarin, 2019. (direct translation)

## PAPERS 5 / *l,a* A Dream Only Lives by the One Who Speaks it

highlights the bodily resonances of speech. The One all alone that served as a staple to the subject lives in the present of the session when the analysand speaks his dream, in a new speech addressed to the analyst partner. Behind the discourse of the Other, which is a true dream factory, one discovers the contingency, the body-event that imposed its necessity. A *jouissance* is extracted.

So, Delphine dreams of a silent *la*; a writing that spreads like wildfire. In the session, she spells the two letters in a whisper. A(h)..., said the analyst softly. Then they say goodbye.

Delphine pursued an analysis of more than 20 years in order to be able to “put up with music.” A professional violinist, she long believed that she suffered from having been for the Other the child prodigy meant to be a soloist. After graduating at the age of 15, Delphine had to leave her family and enter a prestigious conservatory. The symptom of which she complains is, since that date, linked to rehearsals: “when there is no one to hear me, I can hear myself playing like a *broken arm* (*bras cassé*)<sup>4</sup> and it's unbearable. In concert, however, *it's incredible!*” The analyst did not allow work to close on this absolute Other. That day, the analysand forgot the silent and inert violin in a corner of the waiting room.

A dream follows this session: she witnesses a scene where a frightful monster cuts her little brother's arm, himself a renowned pianist. She screams, treats him, is agitated. Of course, she can always say that she was “put” (on *l'a mise*) on the violin in order to reserve the piano for her brother: being a pianist is far more prestigious! Addressing the analyst, she adds: “I can no longer believe that...” Delphine then hears the law that she gave herself, which she obeys: “play, or I'll cut your arm.” In her fantasy, she enjoys a connection between violence and violin. *Jouissance*, in fact, requires the imaginary function of the phallus so that something can be symbolized.

---

<sup>4</sup> [TN]: In the original in French, “*bras cassé*” is an equivocal expression between “broken arm” and the Corsican character Brancassi, a stereotype of the “good for nothing”.

## **PAPERS 5 / I,a** A Dream Only Lives by the One Who Speaks it

"I'm in pain, *there (là)*."<sup>5</sup> To avoid tendonitis when she was a child, her mother wrapped her right arm. Living *jouissance* is in the little pain that could not be said: "I've always had pain *there (là)*. In concert, I need to experience this little pain to be able to play. When I rehearse, I'm not in pain and then I'm afraid of my violin, the sounds that come out of it and that I don't recognize." The analytical work has removed a morbid *jouissance* regime from Delphine. Delphine went through deciphering, elucubrations, as she says very well, but between the lines, a mode of enjoyment has emerged. On this slope, the signifier bites the body.

Delphine continued her analysis for another three years. A dream, not a grain of sand, but a light cloud was at the last session: it brought about a transformation, a new *la: I, a*. She (*Elle-I*) precedes the letter *a*, whose grave accent (*accent grave*) has disappeared.<sup>6</sup>

*Translated by Caroline Heanue*

*Revised by An Bulkens and Isabel Aguirre*

---

[TN]: <sup>5</sup> *I, a* echoes the sonority of language, the different meanings of "la" in French – la (the definite article); là (with a grave accent, adverb of place); I, a (with a comma separating "I" and "a" (the third person singular - has); and it resonates with object a.

<sup>6</sup> The letter *I* and the third person singular feminine personal pronoun 'elle' (she) are homophones in French. Also *I, a* can be read as "she has" (*elle a*).

# Between Text and Writing: the “Boot in the Mouth” Dream

Heloísa CALDAS - EBP

The interpretation of the dream, from which Freud began to give body to his concept of the unconscious, keeps the value of foundation in the psychoanalytic experience. In commenting on “the dream of dreams,” Irma's famous dream, Lacan highlights “two operations - having the dream and interpreting it.”<sup>1</sup> In the first one, we have the rebus dream that interprets with the treasure of the images-letters, so fond of meaning. In the second one, the presence of the analyst is taken into account, directing the dream, whose interpretation must be of another order, with the purpose of pointing out the real around which dreams turn. Even if dreams vary, on the conveyor belt of the subject of the signifier, they also repeat themselves around that which escapes meaning. Then, unconscious, repetition and drive are interlaced, demonstrating that the object of the dream is neither its image nor its meaning, but rather the edge around a hole - the navel of the dream, as Freud called it -, limiting the games of meaning.

With the distinction made by J.-A. Miller between transferential unconscious and real,<sup>2</sup> we can think of the two faces of the analytical interpretation. The transferential unconscious is woven by the chain of signifiers mobilized by the subject supposed to know. We cannot disregard its material, even though we do not trust it. The real unconscious, on the other hand, is in the space of a lapse and does

---

<sup>1</sup> Lacan, J., *The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis* (1954-1955), *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book II*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Sylvana Tomaselli, W.W. Norton, New York/London, 1988, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> Miller, J.-A., *El inconsciente real*, Orientacion Lacaniana, lesson of 15 November 2006. Available in: [http://www.eol.org.ar/template.asp?Sec=publicaciones&SubSec=on\\_line&File=on\\_line/jam/curso/2006/06\\_11\\_15.html](http://www.eol.org.ar/template.asp?Sec=publicaciones&SubSec=on_line&File=on_line/jam/curso/2006/06_11_15.html)

## **PAPERS 5** / Between Text and Writing: the “Boot in the Mouth” Dream

not produce meaning. As homologous to trauma, it is formulated as a limit, external to knowledge and the other side of language.

We can consider the dream according to these two aspects present simultaneously, since neither the dream nor its navel would exist without the words that weave it. The text is this spun yarn pattern that, at the same time, spins and promotes holes. It is in that *tessitura* that one can touch the real that the dream circumscribes; less because it is about saying something, than by the transferential work of “to be said [...]”,<sup>3</sup> as Lacan pointed out. The real is written in the text of the dream as much as that which does not cease to be written - the symptom - as much as that which does not cease to be not written - the real. The management of the interpretation then sits on this paradox: lack or excess of words to say *jouissance*, lack or excess of *jouissance* when weaving words in the form of a text.

I present a dream of a patient that allows me to illustrate that point, where the text of the dream matters, because a simple interpretative reading touched the real. I start with the patient's question from the previous sessions. She was anxious to find a loving partner. The attempts always failed, by structure, due to the inexistence of sexual relation and the effects of contemporary discourses whose semblances melt away in the dance of the sexes. On one occasion, she found someone who could give her love. He promised he would call her. The next session, closer to the probable call, she arrives very anxious and complains that she is unable to eat. She knew this was due to anxiety. She always ate little and was very thin. She had been told that she might have eating disorders, but she dismissed this possibility; being thin and eating little was her way of being and she liked that. However, something was exaggerated, out of her control, she could “eat nothing.” I underlined that syntagm in the form of a question: “eat nothing?” seeking to open a question from the subject that would pierce the text of her Ego so illusory recognized by her slimness. It did not help much, it was only through the following

---

<sup>3</sup> Lacan, J., “O aturdito” (1973), *Outros escritos*, Jorge Zahar, Rio de Janeiro, 2003, p. 448. Unpublished in English.

## **PAPERS 5** / Between Text and Writing: the “Boot in the Mouth” Dream

dream narrated by her that some of that writing of the anorexic symptom could be touched.

The dream narrated the following: “I was walking alone on a path in the middle of a dense forest, like the one in the Amazon rainforest. The path was made of mud and on its edge I found something extremely strange.” She immediately interprets, in the dream itself. “It is a mailbox, in the middle of nowhere, made of a piece of tree nailed to the ground, which holds the carcass of an animal's head. The open jaw marks the mouth and is used to place the mail.” That would have been enough to wake her up, but she continues to dream. “To my surprise, there was a boot there, badly fitted in the opening. And she concluded, still in the dream: ‘someone passed by here and did this as a joke, put a boot in the mouth.’”

That exuberant imaginary that made dream, rebus and joke coincide, could have diverted the work through the paths of meaning. However, as Miller points out, “the secret of the image is castration.”<sup>4</sup> She made some associations about the dream, but a certain eloquent silence of the analyst favored the possibility of touching the real in the text. When she returned to the subject of whether the young man would call or not, I closed the session by underlining: “as in your dream: it is not correspondence, but boot<sup>5</sup> in the mouth.”

As Laurent points out, “it is not a question of looking for information in the text of the dream, but its resonance, by valuing the material that connects sound with meaning. She unveils what Lacan called “*moterialisme*,” which at its core contains a void.”<sup>6</sup> In other words, the analyst does not point to the effects of meaning. On the contrary, she seeks to excavate in the non-familiar, in the emptiness that

---

<sup>4</sup> Miller, J.-A., *Silet, os paradoxos da pulsão de Freud a Lacan (1994-1995)*, A orientação Lacaniana, Jorge Zahar, Rio de Janeiro, 2005, p. 322, lesson of 12 July 1995, unpublished in English.

<sup>5</sup> Here “boot” has the value of a equivocation, because of its homophony between the boot - the shoe - and to boot - to kick, to throw, or to give someone the boot, meaning to be dismissed or discharged.

<sup>6</sup> Laurent, É., “Interpretation: From Truth to Event,” speech delivered in Tel-Aviv, 2 June 2019, available in: <https://www.nlscongress2019.com/speechesfr/-linterprtation-de-la-vrit-lvnement-argument-du-congrs-2020>

## **PAPERS 5** / Between Text and Writing: the “Boot in the Mouth” Dream

meaning tries to cover. We can recall here Lacan's conclusion when, retaking the affirmation that there is no sexual relation, he tells us: “[...] the result is that there is always some-one-to-boot between the psychoanalyst and the psychoanalysand. There is what I shall pronounced to be, not a *representation*, but a *presentation* of the object. This presentation is what in such instances I call the object *a*.”<sup>7</sup>

In the following session, she tells me something that indicates that the oral *jouissance* was touched. “I left the previous session hungry, came home and prepared an appetizing dish.” This small effect of the real on the body, mobilized the *jouissance* and the support of the desire for loving desire, dealing better with the dissatisfaction of failed love encounters. The imperative of the compulsive Superego to “eat nothing” could leave room for a partial satisfaction. The young man did not contact her, as she had anxiously anticipated, but life went on... Other opportunities have arisen, and the work of digging the drainage paths of the drive, preferably less deadly, continues.

*Translated by Silvana Belmudes and Pany Dimitrakis*

*Reviewed by Bruna Meller and Isabel Aguirre*

---

<sup>7</sup> Lacan, J., “Aristotle's Dream,” *The Lacanian Review* No. 8, New Lacanian School, Paris, Fall 2019, p. 17.



# ✂ [S<sub>1</sub> (S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>,...)]

Leonarda RAZZANELLI - SLP

"The saying is demonstrated, and escapes from what is said."<sup>1</sup>

The dream is a story (S<sub>2</sub>), but with a fundamental implication: it is "this thinking which is not I,"<sup>2</sup> and furthermore, "[...] this thinking remains singularly independent of any logic."<sup>3</sup> In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud talks about the "navel of the dream" and fifteen years later, in the article *Repression*, he will make the hypothesis of primal repression. The reference is to something definitively opaque, something that gets tangled, and is rooted in tortuous meanders. To primal repression and navel of the dream we can add the concept of fundamental fantasy, which Freud grasps in what he calls the second phase of the fantasy, the one impossible to remember, but which can be reconstructed through a logical demonstration; this second phase is that which presides over repetition.

Navel of the dream, primal repression and second phase of the fantasy constitute the central question of every analysis and which Lacan articulates in terms of logic and topology. The crucial point is the subject, in that its place is the real: it's precisely in these points, where the subject is stripped of words, that we can grasp the dimension of the real where the subject finds its place as excluded from meaning. In other words, what remains excluded from the meaning is not the story of the dream, however absurd, nor the associations about it, but rather the saying [*le dire*] itself (S<sub>1</sub>): "the saying comes from where the real determines the truth."<sup>4</sup> So, "[...] I cannot say this expression: "that it has no kind of existence," but I

---

<sup>1</sup>Lacan, J., "L'étourdit", *Autres écrits*, Seuil, Paris, 2001, p. 453.

<sup>2</sup> Lacan, J., *La logique du fantasme: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book XIV*, unpublished, lesson of 18 January 1967.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Lacan, J., "L'étourdit" op. cit. p. 453.

## PAPERS 5 / § [S<sub>1</sub> (S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>,...)]

can write it"<sup>5</sup> (\$) . That is why in the graph we find the crucial point in the matheme S(A), where the missing signifier is the subject (\$).

Freud, in the seventh chapter of *The Interpretation of Dreams* and, even earlier in the letter 112 to Fliess, had already made the hypothesis that lived experience had to be conceived according to the concept of transcription. And it is precisely here that Freud lays the foundation for what he will later call repetition, insofar as he argues that subjectivity arises from the difference in the experiences that are deposited, transcribed as mnemonic-traces. These have a relationship with a historical fact; however, in referencing from one to the other, they lose the relationship with the referent and will lastly constitute the fantasy scene.

In a dream, the presence of the I (Je) is disguised and is present in all the dream thoughts, that is, dispersed in them. And Freud stresses that it is necessary to consider the dream as a rebus, that is, something that must be translated into a language different from the images it presents to us, as these images are nothing but signifiers, or rather pieces of signifiers, phonemes, letters. These pieces also include the vacillations, the uncertainties, the comments, the silences through which the enunciation (*énonciation*) can be grasped from the statement (*énoncé*).

From where the analyst shakes the sleep of the sense of the dream via an intervention that is of the order of an act, the enunciation implicated in the repetition of the statement emerges. A dream is a statement, what is said (*un dit*); but always in what is said (*dit*) there is a saying (*dire*) involved, and "That one might be saying remains forgotten behind what is said."<sup>6</sup> Then the saying, what Lacan in Seminar VI calls "intentionality" and subsequently S<sub>1</sub>, is exactly that which is impossible to pass to the said (*au dit*). It is the subject of the unconscious, understood as the Real unconscious, which has no other existence than the transcription that Freud spoke of. We can consider \$ as a function and as such it's in the field of the written. But for a

---

<sup>5</sup> Lacan, J., *La logique du fantasme*, op. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Lacan, J., "L'étourdit" op. cit. p. 449.

## PAPERS 5 / § [S<sub>1</sub> (S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>, S<sub>2</sub>,...)]

subject who speaks in analysis, what does *written* mean? *Written* is what - as impossible to say- presides over repetition as an organization of enjoyment (*jouissance*), at the level of the body.

An *analysand* has a recurring dream, she's not able to take a vehicle: bus, plane, train; in one of these dreams she loses the number 165 bus; in her home area there is no bus with this number, but there is the 615; a few years later she speaks for the umpteenth time about the fact that as a child she lets her little brother's wheelchair fall down the stairs; as she speaks, she makes a gesture of opening her hand. The analyst intervenes: "5 like the years you were when you did this act," The prohibition to succeed in her work, to take the means of transport or the propitious opportunity (as was said in her family: "don't miss the train, because it only passes once"), the laziness and the apathy constituting the *sinthome* underline a death wish that has its quilting point in the episode of the wheelchair. The writing "165" presupposes a "one (1) you are (6), five (5)" as a reversal of "you are (6) a (1) five (5)." The number, in dreams, is always a reference to the real.

If we consider the analytical act as the central cut on a Moebius strip, we can see that it makes another strip appear in the cut itself. The only single cut that is possible between  $\$$  and  $a$ . "(...) the Moebius strip is nothing other than this very cut, the one by which it disappears from its surface [of the torus]. Hence, this cut = the Moebius strip."<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the dream will no longer be the story, but the putting into logic of the structural elements:  $\$, \text{Å}$  and  $a$ , which organize the enjoyment (*jouissance*) for which it is necessary to find a name.

*Translated by Dominique Rudaz*

*Revised by Raphael Montague and Isabel Aguirre*

---

<sup>7</sup> Lacan, J., *Ibid*, p. 470-471.

# Reading Zero

Joanne CONWAY - NLS

Lacan in Seminar VI, following Freud, states that the desire of the dream has two aspects. First, there is the safeguarding of sleep, wherein reality is suspended for the subject. The second is via a death wish. He tells us that through this second pathway, the first – that is the suspension of reality – can be satisfied.

For Lacan it is a satisfaction *by being* that is at stake here – “by (coming into) being, it is satisfied.”<sup>1</sup> The wishes of the dream, the images, the appearances, are for Lacan nothing other than words, signifiers. He further tells us “there is nothing substantial in being other than the word itself.”<sup>2</sup>

To lay bare the very structure of desire itself and its relation to being, Lacan takes up a dream from the *Traumdeutung*.<sup>3</sup> The dream about the dead father is one that Freud made use of in terms of understanding the desire at stake in what he terms as “absurd” dreams. It is the dream of a son in mourning, who has a recurring dream after the death of his father in which his father appears. The text of the dream “His father was alive once more and was talking to him in his usual way. But it was exceedingly painful that the father had really died, only without knowing it.”<sup>4</sup>

Freud interprets this dream by adding two clausulae “in consequence of his wish” after “that his father had really died” and further adding “that he (the dreamer) wished it” to the last words. For Freud, the dreamer was consciously aware of his wish for an end to his father’s long suffering and pain and so wished for his death as the means to

---

<sup>1</sup> Lacan, J., *Desire and its Interpretation, The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VI*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Bruce Fink, Polity Press, Cambridge, MA, 2019, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Freud also refers to this dream in *Formulations on the Two Principles of Mental Functioning*, 1911, S.E. Vol. XII, p. 225. It was later added to the dream book in 1930.

<sup>4</sup> Lacan, J., *Desire and its Interpretation, op. cit.* p. 53.

## PAPERS 5 / Reading Zero

end it. So why then the guilt and pain of this dutiful son? What satisfaction can be experienced here?

For Freud, it points to the reactivation of archaic Oedipal wishes related to the death of the father, this is what is at stake here. The opposition between life and death in dreams of this sort for Freud speak to the ambivalence of the dreamer in relation to the dead person, or even, he says, his indifference. Indifference seems a peculiar explanation of the suffering of his patient. Freud admits to a limit in terms of dreams of this kind “[...] I willingly confess to a feeling that dream interpretation is far from having revealed all the secrets of dreams of this character.”<sup>5</sup>

For Lacan, inserting these clausulae, or the process of the addition of signifiers, does not equate to interpretation, that is, the reconstruction of unconscious desire in the dream. Not satisfied by Freud’s conclusion, Lacan will push the interpretation to its limit based on the scant information about the dreamer.

The mechanisms of the primary processes elided these clausulae, which Lacan later terms as the real repressed [*Real verdrängt*].<sup>6</sup> Why this subtraction? Why this work of editing on that which the dreamer already knows consciously? Why is the text hidden?

Here Lacan introduces an extremely fine point. Certain signifiers are designated by the very fact that they are not in the text of the dream. Lacan equates this with a blank or zero – that is something to be read. This elision creates a signifying effect, via the substitution of a blank or zero, which is not the same as nothing.<sup>7</sup> It has a metaphorical effect. The elision indexes a presence, a presence of an unsaid.

---

<sup>5</sup> Freud, S., *The Interpretation of Dreams*, VI, *The Dream Work*, *Absurd Dreams- Intellectual Activity in Dreams II*, P.F.L. Vol. 4, p. 560.

<sup>6</sup> Lacan notes that the elements are repressed, yet the dream makes use of them via this elision that will have effects depending upon the structure.

<sup>7</sup> Lacan, J., *op. cit.* p. 56.

## PAPERS 5 / Reading Zero

Lacan demonstrates what is at stake for the dreamer in this dreaming when he maps out the signifiers *he did not know, as he wished, and he was dead* on the graph of desire.<sup>8</sup>

This dream scene is a structured encounter between a dead father who speaks to a son who is struck dumb on account that his father *does not know*. The not knowing at stake here is related to both father and son, the father must be suspended in a state of not knowing in order that something remain in place for the son – that is the refusal of his own castration. His father appears as living in the dream in order that something of desire can remain in play for this son. It points to the oedipal dimension of Freud's formulation, but Lacan goes beyond castration to the dimension of being and existence.

This son, this dreamer suffers pain that Lacan equates to the pain of existence reduced to itself – the pain he witnessed his father experience when “nothing any longer inhabits it [existence] other than existence itself.”<sup>9</sup> The signifiers *he was dead* and *as he wished* point to the son's own question – that it is better not to have been born when desire is extinguished.<sup>10</sup> The father's pain that the son now carries touches the core of the question of being and existence itself. A suffering that extinguishes the “desire to live.”<sup>11</sup> Only *he does not know* what it is he carries.

What does this dream, this death wish satisfy when its consequence is pain of the “most profound kind”<sup>12</sup> that inhabits the dreamer not only in sleep but in waking life? The father is made use of in an attempt to keep something of desire alive, a means to obfuscate the real wherein it is the dreamer who experiences himself as dead, or

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 89.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 91.

<sup>10</sup> Reference to Oedipus' exclamation “me phúnai”.

<sup>11</sup> Lacan, J., *op. cit.* p. 91.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* p. 90.

## **PAPERS 5** / Reading Zero

dead to desire.<sup>13</sup> A point of real where the question of existence is posed for the subject. It is a failed attempt. He is accompanied by death – a tightrope walker crossing an abyss, of which he attempts to remain in ignorance.

Via this dream Lacan teaches us that in reading zero, the most fundamental and crucial questions posed by the subject and about which he does not want to know, may be realised.

*Revised by Isabel Aguirre*

---

<sup>13</sup> Lacan points out that this is a dream where the status of the “not knowing one is dead” is uncertain, as this can precipitate within all clinical structures.

# The Dream, a Body Trapped by the Letter

María Victoria CLAVIJO - NEL

Freud discovered that the dream revealed a history, which *"it was written"* before the very experience of the present,<sup>1</sup> distorted, censored. Interpreting it was to retrieve those chapters of the forgotten history by the means of the signifying chain. It is a writing of virtual, evanescent images, made with an erasable marker, because the only fundamental desire of the dream is to sleep: *"it consists in suspending what it is in my tetrad - semblance, truth, jouissance, and surplus jouissance. (...) sleep is designed to suspend the ambiguousness that there is in the body's relation to itself, namely the deriving of jouissance therefrom. (...) What Freud says is that, during this time, the signifier is still on the go. This is indeed why, even when I'm sleeping, I'm preparing my seminars."*<sup>2</sup>

Jacques-Alain Miller says that *"the symptom is correlative to an inscription and this is what distinguishes it from the dream, the joke, the lapsus, the failed act (...) that is why in the field of language it is the symptom that forces to introduce the instance of the writing."*<sup>3</sup> However, it is necessary to ask oneself about the status of this signifier that disturbs in the dream. Can one locate in the dream the order of the signifier as letter, shoreline of jouissance? Would it be a different order from that of the dream as a chapter of the history censored by the subject? This signifier that disturbs, even in sleep, it personifies that body trapped in the discourse.

Lacan leaves aside the reference to the history and focuses on *"it was written"* in such a way that *"a new conception of interpretation*

---

<sup>1</sup> Laurent, É., "Interpretation: From Truth to Event," *The Lacanian Review* N° 8, NLS, Paris, fall 2019, p. 123.

<sup>2</sup> Lacan, J., *...Or worse, The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XIX*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. A.R. Price, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2018, p. 193.

<sup>3</sup> Miller, J.-A. "Más allá del pase," *Freudiana* 69, Barcelona, 2014, p. 11. *Original in French* : L'Un tout seul, 2011, lesson N°11, 4 May 2011, p. 132



## PAPERS 5 / The Dream, a Body Trapped by the Letter

emerges from the power of 'it was written' and it's through the homophonic play on words that the word is forwarded to the writing."<sup>4</sup>

Freud recounts the following dream: "(...) In the course of a mass of dream fragments that I could scarcely remember, I was brought up short, as it were, by a word which I saw before me as though it were half written and half printed. The word was "erzefilisch," and it formed part of a sentence which slipped into my conscious memory apart from any context and in complete isolation: "That has an erzefilisch influence on the sexual emotions."<sup>5</sup> Freud associates with *erzieherisch*, or perhaps more correctly, *erzifilisch*, which leads him to the occurrence of syphilis, and also to remember a conversation between him and the governess (*Erzieherin*) about prostitution, to influence her *erzieherisch* (pedagogically), telling her (*erzählen*) about the consequences of not having a normal sentimental life. The association continues with the "literal meaning" of the word syphilis: "The verbal malformations in dreams greatly resemble those which are familiar in paranoia (...). The linguistic tricks performed by children, who sometimes actually treat words as though they were objects and moreover invent new languages and artificial syntactic forms, are the common source of these things in dreams (...) the text remaining the same but being given, if possible, several meanings (...) a word appears in a dream which is not in itself meaningless but which has lost its proper meaning and combines a number of other meanings to which it is related in just the same way as a 'meaningless' word would be."<sup>6</sup>

Although it is interpreted as repressed truth, Freud finds in this dream the Lacanian dimension of the letter. The forcing of the signifier with its writing effects at the level of the *sinthome* in the treatment, was what imposed itself on Lacan in Seminar 23. However, Freud's subtlety in coming up with this effect is in itself remarkable

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7. *L'Un tout seul*, 2011, lesson N° 11, 4 May 2011. Unpublished.

<sup>5</sup> Freud, S., *The Interpretation of Dreams*. SE Volume IV, Hogarth Press, London, 2001, p. 302.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, p. 303.

## PAPERS 5 / The Dream, a Body Trapped by the Letter

and exciting. It is a dream interpreted with his method, but theorized by himself in a Lacanian way, as a letter. It is also striking how, among “the course of a mass of dream fragments that I could scarcely remember,” the written word *erzefelish*, fulfilled the function of writing, that is, of support, as Lacan states when he says that “a writing is a fashioning that gives support to pondering.”<sup>7</sup>

The real as first datum, and the signifier as letter, what comes to strike at the root of the real, of the bodies,<sup>8</sup> is the wager of the pass, that this real is extracted from the analysis as a logical deduction. This border function with the *jouissance* of the body, out of meaning, is confirmed in a dream of the testimony of Marcus André Vieira: “Our plane falls to the sea, another plane comes to our aid, an Inca king would come to save us, the plane falls, and the great warrior shrinks and transforms into a toy (...) we discover that we had been at waist level in the water all along. Throughout the dream there was a festive atmosphere and most importantly: before we hit the water so as to not sink and then, with enough noise, just for pleasure, splash, splash, splash.”<sup>9</sup>

In this dream, significant elements of his life are contained, but it has value not so much for being a condensation of the past, “but rather for being a depuration of the letters of my history to such an extent, which had the effect of presenting in the purest way a constant raw material in all those historical events and which gave foundation to everything.”<sup>10</sup> It is a *jouissance* that appears out of the picture in life, but that in analysis, when there is nothing to tell, enters as that plus, what Lacan calls *jouissance* substance, ineliminable because “that is the life that does not fit in life” is what forces Lacan to wager on what

---

<sup>7</sup> Lacan, J., *The Sinthome: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXIII*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. A.R. Price, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2016, p 124.

<sup>8</sup> Miller, J.-A., “El Ultrapase,” *Freudiana* 66, Barcelona, 2012, p. 19. *L’Un tout seul*, 2011, lesson N°14, 25 May 2011, p. 166.

<sup>9</sup> Vieira, M. A. “La escritura del silencio (voz y letra en un análisis), Tres Haches, Buenos Aires, 2018, p, 59.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid*, p., 59.

## **PAPERS 5** / The Dream, a Body Trapped by the Letter

in the analysis works as writing.<sup>11</sup> The analysis made available in the dream an extra satisfaction, which was previously taken as dispersed agitation, “the paradoxical presence of this *jouissance* that materializes in a precise encounter between the air and the water that the hands bring to life when they splash on the surface (...) the allegory that the dream proposes is that of the extra satisfaction that the analysis brought (...) any child can know of that pleasure.”<sup>12</sup> This is what is written for Viera, splash, splash, splash!

*Translated by Lorena Hojman*

*Revised by Linda Clarke and Isabel Aguirre*

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p., 60.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p., 61.

# The Psychological (which is) Truly Real

Marta Serra FREDIANI - ELP

We can read the syntagm “The Interpretation of Dreams” as a response to the question, what does this dream mean?, where the deciphering of the narrative – as we know nothing about the real of the dream – would consist in taking the path opposite to the encryption work carried out to produce the dream.

The *parlêtres* have always been interested in finding the meaning of their dreams; they are passionate about meaning: they require the meaning of life and of lots of other things, for example, their dreams.

But that yearning for meaning is not the result of capriciousness but merely the consequence of a determining fact: the natural habitat of the *parlêtres* is language, and therefore – since meaning is possible only within that habitat – they have a certain aversion to the real, for what is outside meaning.

We could say that one lives between two realities, that of the world and that of words – which Freud called *material reality* and *psychic reality*, respectively – with the particularity that neither can catch the real that is at stake, as also that which we call the “world,” that which exists outside the symbolic, only appears in one’s life according to the laws of the signifier, which are not at all the laws of the real.

A phrase in Freud’s work “The Interpretation of Dreams” caught my attention: “The unconscious is the true psychological reality; in its innermost nature it is as much unknown to us as the reality of the external world, and it is as incompletely presented by the data of consciousness as is the external world by the communications of our

## PAPERS 5 / The Psychological (which is) Truly Real

sense organs.”<sup>1</sup> Awareness and perception are therefore useless for the real.

I would like to pay particular attention to the first part of the sentence, “the unconscious is the true psychological reality,” because it differentiates the dream – and all other formations of the unconscious – from the unconscious itself.

The formations of the unconscious are the result of a work of articulation between signifiers with which knowledge – unconscious knowledge – and meaning is produced, while the unconscious taken as the “true psychological reality” are isolated signifiers, therefore, out of meaning, which allows them to be thought of as “letters,” thus passing to the register of the real. Those letters are the signifiers that in a contingent way pierced the body, giving rise to a *parlêtre*; they are One by one, each is  $S_1$ , and at the same time they are a swarm<sup>2</sup> subject to the structure of the language of the unconscious.

Are those  $S_{1s}$  just as they are found in dreams? Freud insisted that the words appearing in dreams had indeed been uttered by someone, which could be attributed to his passion for truth. But somehow, that just brings us toward Lacan's proposal of *lalangue*. *Lalangue* is not an invention of its own, it is the language of the Other into which we are born and which we inhabit, called the mother tongue to, metaphorically, emphasize that it's the first one you receive. However, what is invented, what is the creation of each *parlêtre*, is the knowledge produced by starting from the articulation of those signifiers.

With Freud, analytical interpretation sought to bring to light the hidden meaning of the dream, unconscious knowledge. With Lacan, the analytical discourse is oriented towards the production by the analysand of the  $S_1$  that served to invent that singular knowledge.

---

<sup>1</sup> Freud, S., *The Interpretation of Dreams*, The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume V, Vintage, London, 2001, p. 613.

<sup>2</sup> Lacan, J., *Encore, On Feminine Sexuality, The Limits of Love and Knowledge, The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XX*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Bruce Fink, W.W. Norton, London/ New York, 1999, p. 143.

## PAPERS 5 / The Psychological (which is) Truly Real

Freud taught us that the only possible method for his goal was ‘free association’ of the dreamer, a paradoxical name given that if it served then and continues to serve today, it is precisely due to the fact that it has no freedom whatsoever, conditioned as it is, from beginning to end, by those very concrete signifiers belonging to *lalangue* of each one and only to them.

However, to address the limit of “dream interpretation,” rather one must rely on another possible reading of that expression, the one that results from responding to the question “what is it that, in saying, it wants?”<sup>3</sup> where the accent of the operation is displaced towards the *jouissance* that is produced in the very cyphering of the dream, which (taking into account that the only raw material at play are the signifiers), makes of the dream one more example that shows how language is an apparatus [device] at the service of *jouissance*.

If cyphering produces *jouissance*, deciphering is not far behind. So much so that even the nightmare – which removes the dreamer from the dream due to anguish – when it is deciphered, it too involves *jouissance*, enjoy-meant [jouis-sens].<sup>4</sup>

We therefore enjoy the meaning because, in the absence of the sexual relation that can be written, there is a making do with the signifiers, in order to find a certain “sexual meaning” more or less stable and fixed that helps us to orient ourselves in life, that which Lacan calls “senseless meaning.”<sup>5</sup> There we can locate the function of the phallus, the function of the fantasy and also that of the *sinthome*, each providing a certain limit to the meaning that by itself does not find a stopping point. I would not find it because the sense of the real is impossible to achieve, since it does not exist; there is only that senseless meaning that is invented “about” the real.

---

<sup>3</sup> Lacan, J., *From an Other to the other. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XVI*. Unpublished in English. Paidós, Buenos Aires, 2012, p. 183.

<sup>4</sup> Lacan, J., *Television*, ed. Joan Copjec, trans. Denis Hollier, Rosalind Krauss and Annette Michelson. W.W. Norton, New York/London, 1990, p. 10 [jouis-sens/jouissance].

<sup>5</sup> Lacan, J., *Les non-dupes errent, The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXI*, unpublished, lesson of 20 November 1973.

## **PAPERS 5** / The Psychological (which is) Truly Real

Therefore, in analysis, when the senses have been cleared and the nucleus of the real is glimpsed, dreams can appear that bring a *hystorised* writing of the *parlêtre* and they appear accompanied by a certainty that is not open to the continuation of free association.

*Translated by Linda Clarke*

*Revised by Neil Gorman and Isabel Aguirre*

# Dream and Writing

Silvia PINO - EOL

*(...) no one will be able to re-dream your dreams  
nor dream theirs with your own style of dreaming,  
or listen to your dreams.<sup>1</sup>*

In the Opening of the Clinical Section, clarifying the relationship between the unconscious and the dream, Lacan concludes: "Then it must be said that the unconscious is not Freud's, it is Lacan's. This does not prevent the field from being Freudian."<sup>2</sup>

## **The Freudian Field: Meaning and Deciphering**

The *Traumdeutung* places dreams as the royal road to access the unconscious. The subject divided by a meaning that escapes him and the dream included in the question of the cause. This inaugurates the field of the analytical experience that has the meaning in its nucleus.

Freud privileges dreaming as a psychic act over the content of the dream: "The mechanism of the dream-work and the unconscious dream-wish are exempt from any outside influence."<sup>3</sup> The accent is then placed on dream work and the indestructible desire, where dreaming has only one useful purpose, to be an activity that procures for the dreamer an immediate gain of pleasure and is in the service of preventing the disturbance of sleep.

---

<sup>1</sup> Fogwill, R., *La gran ventana de los sueños*. Ed. Alfaguara, Bs. As., 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Lacan, J., "Ouverture de la section clinique," *Ornicar? No. 9*, Paris, April 1977.

<sup>3</sup> Freud, S., "Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis, Lecture XV: Uncertainties and Criticisms," *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XV, Hogarth Press, London, 1971, p. 238.



Lacan highlights this Freudian dimension with his thesis: "It is what our dear Freud has of a Lacanian (...) in the dream one sees it, that the operation of the ciphering is made for *jouissance*."<sup>4</sup>

The Freudian psychic apparatus – dream machine – is a memory device that cannot stop repeating without remembering. It is a writing always pending rewriting. That which Lacan warns of as the tyranny of the memory, where the concept of repetition takes on all of its value and sustains the economic principle of homeostasis.

The limit of the interpretation of the dream comes to Freud as the "true secret" of his doctrine of dreams: the navel. The meaning as the lost object cannot be caught by the symbolic-imaginary nets and the limit of the interpretation is the limit to deciphering.

### **The Dream: Ciphering of *Jouissance***

Lacan takes up Freud's *non-recognized* {*Unerkannt*} as a hole and identifies it with the primary repression, the limit of analysis and related to the real. The navel of the dream, the point where the indestructible desire is revealed as inarticulable, becoming cause.

A movement that goes from the meaning to be deciphered to the *jouissance* of the deciphering, thus articulating the cause to *jouissance*. The illusion of the sense of meaning falls and in its place introduces the impossible to say.

In his teaching, Lacan considers the dream from three dimensions:

1. The dream testifies to the impossibility of a complete meaning.
2. Dreams are a message addressed to the Other as well as an invention of the dreamer.
3. In the dream we are not disturbed by the *jouissance* in its relationship with the body, and it reveals how disturbing the signifier can be.

---

<sup>4</sup> Lacan, J., *Les non-dupes errent: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXI (1973-1974)*, lesson of 20 November 1973, unpublished.

## PAPERS 5 / Dream and Writing

Effect of meaning, effect of hole and invention are intuitions in the classic Lacanian teaching that give the dream the dignity of *savage interpretation*.<sup>5</sup>

The desire of the dream is nothing more than the desire to make sense, there are words in it that are represented as best as possible. Lacan advises to reread the dreams analyzed in the *Traumdeutung* following this key: "Through the dream we only grasp the nonsensical meaning that the unconscious fabulates to put in words what it articulates. Therefore, what comes from it is already an interpretation (...)." <sup>6</sup>

As J.-A. Miller puts it, it is Lacan who demonstrates that the dream is in the field of writing and not of speech. The dream reveals what does not cease being written on the background of the non-sexual rapport. Writing that functions as a fictional infection, an infinite chicane. And the limit of interpretation is the limit of ciphering.

The dream bears witness to the fact that "the signifier is still on the go."<sup>7</sup>

### **The Dream: An Equivocation**

Lacan looks for a real that is not supposed to be, and it is interesting that he is once again relying on the *Traumdeutung*. In *L'insu...* the dream is reduced to an *equivocation*.

What does this twist mean for the use of the dream in the analytical experience? The day-residues and the infantile fixations are questioned to introduce something that goes further than the unconscious as an effect of the signifier. It is no longer about the dream as an effect of meaning.

---

<sup>5</sup> Lacan, J., *Reseña del Seminario de la ética*, en *Reseñas de enseñanza*. Ed. Manantial, Bs.As. 1988, p. 22.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, [Trans. Pany Dimitrakis].

<sup>7</sup> Lacan, J., *...or Worse, The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XIX*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. A. R. Price, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2018, p. 193.

## PAPERS 5 / Dream and Writing

The dream as an *equivocation* has lost the signifier's foolishness of always representing something else. It is a nonsense relative to a conscience.

Lacan establishes a distance between what is written and what is read in the dream, and this new writing takes on the value of an ethical decision to end.

The point that stops the infinite chicane of the signifier is not supported by the idea of a path, of displacement. It is a matter of finding support in another writing that is autonomous from the referent and the paradigm of this one is the neologism.

It is a question of the dream at the extreme of our practice, of the problem of the scope of the symbolic. How can we think of a writing that keeps a meaning that can be isolated?

There is an idea in Lacan of a space outside the field of knowledge that takes the form of *one feels it but does not know*, a *feeling*<sup>8</sup> that alludes to something real. And there, the perfect place for a desire as a need for invention, for drawing something out of nothing. Is this the new status of the desire of the dream?

For Lacan, if there is a real, it is hooked to the thought on the side of what exists, of the event, of the instant, of "*it is that*": "Self knows this. But it is enough that attention be focused on this for one to be outside it. No amity is there to support this unconscious."<sup>9</sup>

Lacan states, "what I enunciate in any case is that the invention of a signifier is something different from memory,"<sup>10</sup> it is in the dream as a construction that this point of disambiguation appears, which stops the displacement of meaning into the infinite.

---

<sup>8</sup> Lacan, J., *L'insu que sait de l'une-bévue s'aile à mourre: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXIV (1976-1977)*, lesson of 14 December 1976, unpublished [Trans. Pany Dimitrakis].

<sup>9</sup> Lacan, J., "Preface to the English Edition of Seminar XI," *The Lacanian Review* No. 6, New Lacanian School, Paris, Fall 2018, p. 23.

<sup>10</sup> Lacan, J., *L'insu que sait de l'une-bévue s'aile à mourre*, *op. cit.*, *Ornicar?* No. 17/18, lesson of 17 May 1977, p. 21 [Trans. Pany Dimitrakis].

## **PAPERS 5** / Dream and Writing

Dreaming as a saying, reduced in itself to an *equivocation*. Dreams do not give us a fixed formula that would reach a "*tis written*,"<sup>11</sup> although there are some that in the edge of the analytical experience write a letter as a singular support point, neological that can decide the ending of the analytical experience.

*Translated by Pany Dimitrakis*

*Revised by Ana De Filippi and Isabel Aguirre*

---

<sup>11</sup> Lacan, J., "*Lituraterre*," *Hurly-Burly* No. 9, NLS, Paris, 2013, p. 38.

# An Unspeakable Dream

Patricia TASSARA ZÁRATE - AS

Analysis had allowed me to feel better. There was no longer an overflowing anxiety, the bond with the School was strong, things were going well with my partner, and I had landed an interesting job. We can say that, in Freudian terms, things worked well at the level of love and work.

I hastily presented myself to the pass, thinking it would be the end. It was, but not an end with the pass, something I would understand years later.<sup>1</sup>

Between two meetings with the second *passeur*, who turned out to be a woman, I had a dream of anxiety with traumatic overtones. I dreamed that my son and I were in a car with some people. Suddenly, the car falls into the void. In the panic of the fall, I turn to my son, and seeing his terrified face, I wake up. As Lacan indicates, "a dream wakes you up just at the moment when it could release the truth."<sup>2</sup>

It was an unspeakable dream. I forgot it, I couldn't bear it, I couldn't transmit it or work on it in that pass. I approached it years later, when the anxiety of facing the feminine made me return to the analysis, until I finished it.

What woke me up? In the first place, a sleeping "mother" under an identification, sheltering the object. The scene manifested a repetition, as my own mother had died in a car accident in my adolescence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf., Fernández B., "Todos los testimonios enseñan," *Informe del cartel del Pase D9 de la ELP*, Escuela Lacaniana de Psicoanálisis, 2013-2015, pp. 3-7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., Lacan, J., *The Other Side of Psychoanalysis: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XVII*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Russell Grigg, W.W. Norton, New York/London, 2007, p. 57.

## PAPERS 5 / An Unspeakable Dream

Although in the dream, the subject in its maternal role was confronted with death, we can say that what awakened was not only the anxiety of the loss of the object, beloved son, but rather her own loss, what was being lost for her. Fall, death, maternal sacrifice, unspeakable horror at that moment. The dream showed an unspeakable real with its sign of anxiety, but above all, how that void was plugged. In the analytical work on the feminine - the last segment of analysis - I was able to return to the traversing of the fantasy, let go of the object, and consent to the non-existence of a guarantor Other, ceasing to defend myself from the real with the mortifying maternal identification. I was confronted with the woman inside me, with the most heterogeneous, incalculable and extime. Love went from being absolute to being contingent. The drive had broken away from a mortifying fixation.

Disidentification from the  $S_1$ , mother, separated me from seeking to respond to the sacrificial demand of the Other, finding myself with great corporal lightness, enthusiasm, and with laughter as the first body event.

In the unconscious, which Lacan defined as "a *savoir-faire* with *lalangue*,"<sup>3</sup> the dream is the signifying montage that is offered to be read. Dreams are made of *lalangue* residues. In this sense, a dream is an interpretation of the letter of the unconscious. But there is a limit to meaning, the navel. For Lacan, the dream awakens when it touches the impossible to write. The real leaves no trace, it has no face, it never ceases not to be written; it is silence, but it does not stop emerging, only that I no longer need the fantasmatic guardians in the face of the real.

*Translated by Polina Agapaki*

*Revised by Cyrus Saint Amand-Poliakoff and Isabel Aguirre*

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf., Lacan, J., *On Feminine Sexuality, The Limits of Love and Knowledge: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XX*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Bruce Fink, W.W. Norton, New York/London, 1998, p. 139.