

Irony: A Contribution of Schizophrenia to
the Analytic Clinic

by Jacques-Alain Miller
Trans. by Ellie Ragland

I have set myself the problem, in all its generality, of establishing a differential clinic of psychoses. And I thought it would clarify the problem if I began by opposing to it a universal clinic of delirium.¹ To lay the foundation for a differential clinic of the psychoses, I propose nothing less than that we consider the idea of a universal clinic of the delirium.

*

What I call a universal clinic of the delirium is based on this premise: All our discourses are only defenses against the real. But in order to construct this clinical perspective, one would have to attain the infernal irony of the schizophrenic, an irony out of which he makes a weapon Lacan described as piercing straight to the heart of any social relation. But a universal clinic of the delirium cannot speak for itself; that is to say, it cannot cease not writing itself.² Except from the point of view of the schizophrenic.

9

How are we going to define the schizophrenic here? For the moment, I propose to define this subject, following Lacan's lead, as the one who specifies himself by not being caught up in any discourse, in any social link.³ I shall add that this is the only subject who does not defend himself from the real by means of the symbolic, which we all do if we are not schizophrenic. He does not defend himself from the real by language because, for him, the symbolic is real.

The point at issue, then, is the schizophrenic's irony, and not his humor. And although irony and humor both make us laugh, they are distinguishable one from the other by structure.

Humor is the comic slope of the superego. Freud said this.⁴ The neurotic certainly does not lack humor. The pervert is completely capable of having it. Equally so the philosopher of universal maxims,⁵ and the surrealist as well.⁶ Humor inscribes itself within the perspective of the Other. Above all, a humorous saying makes itself heard in the place of the Other where it overtakes the subject in the misery of his impotence. Think about the well-known Jewish humor cultivated in the ghetto, this supremely social place precisely *because* it is created by the segregation within which the terrible God of

10

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob encloses his children.

Irony, on the contrary, does not come from the Other, but from the subject. And it is directed against the Other. So what does irony say? It says that the Other does not exist, that the social link in its very foundation is a fraud, that there is no discourse which is not a false pretense, a semblance – the title of one of Lacan's seminars.⁷ The true masochist sometimes manages to attain irony when he demonstrates that the Other whose slave he seems to be is only the puppet of his will, *his*, the masochist's. Doubtless, it is on this path that irony is suitable to the psychoanalyst, no less than to the revolutionary. Lenin, like Socrates, displays irony, even if he disguises it by means of the invective, and even if this irony grows pale when its cause comes into question.⁸ Irony is the comic form taken by the knowledge that the Other does not know; that is to say, that as the Other of knowledge, it is nothing. While humor is practiced from the point of view of the subject supposed-to-know, irony is only practiced at the point where the fall of the subject supposed-to-know has already been consummated.

In this way, according to Lacan, psychoanalysis, along the path prescribed by Freud, restores irony to neurosis. And it would, in fact, be wonderful if we could cure neurosis by irony.

11

We would not need to sustain it, so to speak, by psychoanalysis. But we are not cured of psychoanalysis yet, despite Lacan's irony and, doubtless, despite what his wish was.⁹

*

While waiting to be cured of psychoanalysis, then, I shall formulate the wish that our clinic is ironic.

The choice is a forced choice: Either our clinic will be ironic, that is to say, based on the non-existence of the Other as a defense against the real – or our clinic will be a flat repetition of the psychiatric clinic, for it often makes fun of the crazy person, this poor madman who is outside the common relationship to language. But the one who makes fun of the psychotic's means merely remains stuck within a construction of his own clinic, based on already established discourses. What I am saying is also a critique that does not spare the psychoanalytic clinic of the psychoses when that clinic restricts itself to assessing psychosis on the basis of the established psychoanalytic discourse – that means, referring it to the Oedipal norm. I would not point you in this direction if Lacan had not gone into the psychoanalytic clinic of the psychoses, beyond the Oedipal norm. Lacan waits for us to follow him. I say this humorously, of course.

12

In what I call the universal clinic of delirium, the schizophrenic occupies a place one could call a place of internal exclusion. In fact, if the schizophrenic is this subject for whom all the symbolic is real, his subjective position can, indeed, help us understand that the symbolic is only a semblance for other subjects. The rotation of the four discourses that Lacan distinguished and formalized is, indeed, made to show that there is no discourse which is not a semblance.¹⁰ And this rotation is itself only conceivable on the basis of the existence of a subject outside discourse.

I call the schizophrenic the subject capable of not avoiding the real. He is the speaking being¹¹ for whom the symbolic does not serve as a way to avoid the real, because for him the symbolic is itself real. If there is no discourse which is not a semblance, there is, however, a delirium which pertains to the real, and it is that of the schizophrenic. Based on this, the universality of the delirium can be constructed.

Let us note that the thesis of a universality of the delirium is a Freudian thesis. For Freud, everything is only a dream. That is what Lacan says Freud says. But if everything is only a dream, then everybody is crazy; that is to say, delirious.¹²

13

I propose to put this thesis on the front of a differential clinic of psychoses: Everyone is crazy. Only then does it become interesting to make distinctions. Everyone is crazy, that is to say, delirious. Not only does this truth appear in the differential clinic of humanity, it appears in that of animals as well. Because animals are not crazy, except for the donkey, the one who carries the Holy-Sacrament, attributing the merit of such a responsibility to his own personal credit. Thus, the donkey constructs a delirium of presumption.¹³ Animals can, however, commit suicide in the small measure that domestication has made the cause of desire exist for them in the Other.

Let us simplify matters. The delirium is universal, based on the simple fact that people speak and that there is language for them. That is the “abc” from where we start, from scratch: Language, as such, has the effect of annihilation.

In dialectical terms, we will say: the word is the murder of the thing. This is a proposition from Lacan’s first teaching.¹⁴ Already that says everything because it requires that the symbolic separate itself from the real. In the schizophrenic perspective, the word is not the murder of the thing, it *is* the thing.

It is in this sense that, if the psychotic does not believe in the Other, he is, however, sure of the Thing. If you know

14

how to hear “*la Chose*” in this, the Freudian *das Ding* as punctuated by Lacan in his *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*,¹⁵ “the word is the murder of the thing” means this: *Jouissance* is forbidden to the one who speaks as such, or again, that the Other, as the place of the signifier, is the terrace swept clean of its *jouissance*. For the paranoid, the word has not adequately murdered the Thing, since he must occasionally strike the Thing – the *kakon*¹⁶ in the Other – in an act of aggression that, as we have seen in the Aimée case, can serve him throughout his whole life as a metaphor, as a supplement.¹⁷ The melancholic subject turns to the mortifying effect of language against himself in the act of suicide in which he accomplishes his destiny of *kakon*.

“The word is the murder of the Thing” means that the word is death. The “death drive,” thus designated by Freud, is inherent in the speaking being. Without a doubt this melancholic short-circuit unfurls itself again with the neurotic, whose desire is perhaps less decided. Let us note that the letter distinguishes itself from the word. Does the agency of the letter kill the Thing? Rather, is the letter the Thing?¹⁸

What I have said in dialectical terms can also be said in diacritical terms by passing from Hegel to Saussure.¹⁹ There is

15

no biunivocal correlation of the word and the thing: The word does not represent the thing. One word is connected to another word. This structuralist axiom is no less pathetic than the dialectical maxim. It implies a passion. The single fact, concerning language, of putting the function of the coupling of signifiers in place of the function of representation – as structuralism does²⁰ — creates some perfectly pathetic effects of delirium. To say that the signifier has no relation to the thing, but to another signifier – one repeats it like Antiphon, always harping on the same thing, that is – implies that the signifier has a function of unrealisation. The signifier unrealizes the world.²¹

It is only when the relation of one signifier to another signifier is interrupted, when there is a broken chain, an interrupted sentence, that the symbol rejoins the real. But it does not rejoin it under the form of representation. Rather, the signifier rejoins the real in a manner which leaves no room for doubt: Take, for example, the interrupted sentences of President Schreber.²² In Schreber’s interrupted sentences, the signifier does not represent the real world in the least. It makes an irruption there. That is to say, a part of the symbolic becomes real. It is precisely in this that “schizophrenia,” as redefined,

16

can be said to be the measure of psychosis.

But if I recommend this ironic perspective on language, it is only because, by taking things from a reverse perspective, we see where it leads. It leads, for example, to the so-called theory of descriptions that owes its name to Bertrand Russell.²³

Russell began this theory of descriptions in 1905, at the same time Freud wrote his “Three Essays on Theory of Sexuality.” It is not excessive to say that all contemporary Anglo-Saxon philosophy comes out of Russell’s theory. This philosophy has developed in our time under the somewhat ridiculous name of formal ontology. At the same time, it is a matter of our having inherited the medieval theory of suppositions,²⁴ a theory which Lacan himself echoed in his subject supposed-to-know.²⁵

This theory of descriptions is concerned with the supposed reference of discourse, or, to call it by the name Frege gave it, *Bedeutung* (meaning).²⁶ And what is Russell’s concern? Bertrand Russell, and the others, are bothered by the fact that one can speak about something that does not exist *as if* it existed. It is the same question raised by Plato in the *Sophist*: That speaking about non-being makes it exist in some fashion.²⁷ The theory of descriptions would like to reduce truth to

17

exactitude. Its adherents would prefer that one say only what is, that discourse describe the real, then. The theory of descriptions would like to track down the discourse which says what is not. The principle (*princeps*) example proposed by Bertrand Russell is: “The king of France is bald.”²⁸ In 1905, and for an Englishman – who is not a French royalist – there is no king of France. “The king of France is bald” is a delirium. Evidently there are many connotations around this the “king of France is bald.” It is an echo of the French-English quarrel. And it does not miss evoking “the king is naked.”²⁹

What escapes Bertrand Russell is not that one can speak of what is not, but that *what is*, owing to the simple fact that one speaks of it, *becomes a fiction*. Were the king of France to exist under the guise of a character who wore the crown, that would not make him any the less a fiction. What is created by a signifier is at the same time made a semblance. That does not exist *because* one talks of it. Then we have to be quiet, would have to keep silent, as Wittgenstein says – if you want something to exist, keep quiet about it (“*Was man nicht sagen kann, muss man schweigen.*”)³⁰ And that is what the psychoanalyst does in his or her practice. The theory of descriptions is useless, not only because the king of France does not exist, not

because the word gives existence to what does not exist, but precisely because language creates the inexistence of what one is talking about. Lacan's axiom, that truth has the structure of fiction, admits that the word has the effect of fiction.³¹ The secret of the universal clinic of the delirium is that the reference is always empty. If there is truth, it is not because of the adequacy of the word to the thing. Rather, it is internal to the act of saying something; that is to say, to the connection of one word to another. In this sense, the signifier, insofar as it is connected to another signifier, allows the reference to be empty. And it is this which constitutes the symbolic as an order, the symbolic as Lacan named it. This is the same movement we observe in Freud when he passes from the factual seduction to fantasmatic seduction, from the fact of fantasy,³² from the search for exactitude to the scansion of truth, from the unconscious as a referential knowledge, to the unconscious as a textual knowledge. But how do we incarnate the empty reference? Nothing is simpler, if one remembers that the whole Freudian clinic turns around an object which does not exist, that is, the mother's penis. The reference to the king of France who is

bald is a reference to the mother's penis. It is a fact that Freud started his research with a study of dreams, that he offered the interpretation of dreams as the royal road of psychoanalysis, and that he took the dream as a signifying articulation without reference. It is in that sense that Freud considered the dream as a species of delirium. And that is also why Lacan arranges his whole clinic in terms of an "there is not" whether he writes it with (-o), or by stating that there is no natural relation of the sexes one to the other ("*Il n'y a pas de rapport sexuel.*") "Let us begin by separating all the facts," says Jean-Jacques Rousseau, putting it superbly.³³ This is how analysis begins. As long as one is not in analysis, the conversations are only preliminary conversations. "Associate freely, tell the truth, go ahead, frankly, don't omit anything" means quite simply: "Join one signifier to another signifier without being concerned about the reference, about formal ontology." Lacan reintroduced terms which ought to have been proscribed, terms of representation and of reference, but they do not convey the same meaning in his usage. There is representation only insofar as the signifier represents a null reference. This empty reference is written as castration (-o), or as what develops out of castration: the subject, \$\$. Lacan's subject is an effect of a non-

existent entity, the one which motivates and haunts the theory of descriptions. Up to there, we are still in the Freudian space. The idea of a negative reference, starting with the structure of language, conveys the pivotal importance of Freudian castration. But what is particular to Lacan, properly speaking, is the introduction of a reference of a new type which is born by the very act of linking signifiers. It is not a reference that would already be there, and that one could represent, or about which one could say "there is not." This reference of a new type, born out of the linking of one signifier to another, is what Lacan called "the object *a*." How, by what conditions, does the articulation or connecting of signifiers produce a reference? One day a reference is born from the linkage... In some sense, there is a double reference. The first is negative, absence, (-o), \$\$. But there is another which is positive, and it is *a*. This explains why, in the economy of Freud's discourse, the fantasy can reach the place of the *fact*. This allows that the object *a*, if it is a being, is a being of fiction that depends on the linking of signifiers. That is, the object *a* is a semblance.³⁴ If this semblance is a being, it is a being that depends on the signifying

chain, and precisely, on its consistency. That is why Lacan calls object *a* a *logical* consistency. The object *a* takes on consistency in proportion to the negativization induced by the successive signifiers. Therefore, it is also a remainder, in the sense that something *remains to be said*. But it is not the same after a chain of signifiers has developed as it was beforehand. If the *a* depends on the connection of signifiers, the only formal ontology is that of the object *a*. But why would I say "ontology"? Because the object *a*, as it is conceptualized in psychoanalysis, seems very much like a being. And it is this one point, especially; that it is crucial not to confuse with the real. *The object a as such is a semblance of being*. And the very term of consistency clearly conveys its affinities with the imaginary order. Without a doubt, when the object *a* finds its place in the fantasy, the fantasy holds the place of the real for the subject. That does not mean inasmuch as that the object *a* is real. That Lacan uses the term axiom³⁵ concerning the fantasy indicates quite clearly that he places it in a logical system. And it confirms as well that the object depends on the joining, the articulation, that is, of signifiers. That is why the object *a*, as a semblance, has its place

between the symbolic and the real. It is a logical consistency which "pretends" to be, and which is only what one encounters in going from the symbolic to the real. The object *a* is a symbolic elaboration of the real which holds the place of the real in the fantasy, but is only a veil of it. Its proper function is to complement the negative reference of the subject. As a logical consistency, it is fitting that the object *a* incarnate what the subject is lacking. Because the subjective lack-in-being calls for the semblance of being, it is appropriate that the object *a*, as a logical consistency, give its place to forbidden *jouissance*, that is, to the lost object.

*

This is what permits us to give a new meaning to what we call psychosis. That is where Lacan leads us. Psychosis is the clinical structure wherein the object is not lost, wherein the subject has it at his disposal. It is in this sense that Lacan could say that the crazy person is a free person.³⁶ At the same time, in psychosis, the Other is not separated from *jouissance*. The fantasy proper to the paranoiac implies that an identification of *jouissance* within the Other. In sum, we can assert the difference between paranoia and schizophrenia in as much as the schizophrenic has no alternative

23

Other than language – and at the same time lay forth claim to the difference between the Other in paranoia and in neurosis. There is the Other in paranoia, and this Other is real; that is to say that, effectively, the Other of paranoia exists, and is even fond of the object *a*. The theory of the paternal metaphor and of its failure in psychosis has been discussed many times before. But to take it from another point of view, one would have to conclude that when the paternal metaphor fails in psychosis, the desire of the Other, of the mother, has not been symbolized. And for this very reason, it is in the real.³⁷ In the case of paranoia, the desire of the Other and the Other itself, as well as the chain of signifiers, are in the real. The Other's desire has become a will to *jouissance* without limit.³⁸ This is the path for understanding the fundamental connection between psychosis and anxiety, as well as the connection between psychosis and the erotomania aroused in the Other. There is also the Other in neurosis, except that there, the best proof that it is *not* real is that one must make it exist by, for example, loving it. This is verified in the first steps of the analytic experience: The transference means that what is at stake for a neurotic is making the Other exist in order to hand

24

over to it the burden of the logical consistency of the object *a*. That is what Lacan called the subject-supposed-to-know: Making the Other exist in order to restore to it the object *a*, made of this object-cause-of-desire. The restoration of the object to the Other, at the same time, renders this object lost, and installs in the heart of neurosis, the demand – whether this be to demand of the Other the object that it conceals, or to ask oneself via the Other for a settlement of the debt that is owed one. The Other of neurosis asks, at least, that the subject justify itself. That also touches the pervert when he brings the unjustifiability of his *jouissance* to analysis. It is there that one situates what, in other categories than ours, one calls a *borderline*.

To ask the Other for the object it conceals, to make oneself ask for the payment of the debt, that is to say, in all the cases, to situate the logical consistency in the field of the Other, is the foundation of any discourse, the very principle of the social link.

*

The Other does not exist as real. To say that the Other is the place of truth is to say that the Other is a place of fiction. To say that the Other is a place of knowledge is to say that it

25

has the status of supposition. Neurosis is to make it exist at the price, for the subject, of consenting to erase oneself before the object. There the notion that desire is a defense takes on its meaning, a defense against the real of *jouissance*. Let us go further to say that neurosis is a clinical structure where the defense is called desire, while perversion is the clinical structure where the defense is called flat repudiation (*démenti*). Lacan proposed, as a definition of the psychoanalytic clinic, “the real as the impossible to bear.”³⁹ One has distinguished, for psychosis, the mechanism of foreclosure. Why not give the same pathogenic status to the Freudian *Bejahung*, the affirmation or the assent? Then one could grasp that in neurosis, the defense takes the form of giving meaning (the significatization of) to *jouissance*. That is radical in phobia, where the signifier serves as a rampart against the empty reference, the lack of the mother's penis. One could then perceive that in perversion, the defense takes the form of a fetishization of *jouissance*. The Other separates the pervert too, not less than the neurotic, from *jouissance*. The neurotic admits it, while the pervert denies it.

The term of “*démenti*” takes its weight from its opposition to the admission of the neurotic. Doubtless, the pervert,

26

like the neurotic, makes the Other exist. He pretends to be the object *a* of the Other in order to produce anxiety there – in that he succeeds at the point where the neurotic fails. The hysteric would like to make a lack-in-being the cause of the desire of the Other, that is to say, to give to her lack-in-being the value of the truth of desire, but the lack remains on her side, while the pervert makes it see-saw in the Other. And suddenly, for the pervert, the demand no longer has the function of object in his fantasy, but indeed, of the imperative, the order, the command... Let us note again that what one calls mania in the psychiatric clinic, is the case in which the object *a* does not function, that is to say, a case of inconsistent logic, which goes together with the perceived non-existence of the Other – since it is a question of a maxim which does not set itself up as truth. And why not put in opposition to it, as a formula of depression, the *a*-logical consistency of the object, an object which is no longer, then, the cause of the desire of the Other? The lack-in-being of the subject is no longer there except as a being-in-too-much (*être-en-trop*). As to the melancholic, his sudden suicide, if it does not constitute a call to the Other, not even to his lack, translates the brusque conversion of the subjective lack-in-

27

being into *a*. But, it is dying of a physical death, which is only a support of the second death.⁴⁰

Why did Lacan evoke mania and depression in regard to the pass, at the point where the Other discovers itself as non-existent? To indicate perhaps that to the one who goes up to that point, the Freudian cause is necessary as a protection against madness (*un garde-fou*).⁴¹

The last clinic of Lacan⁴² indicates that in no case, is the symbolic father a satisfactory solution to the impossible to bear. The symbolic father is the father of the crazy person. With Lacan there is no question of the ideal father, the one who would want our good. Lacan did nothing to remain among us as an ideal father.

*

It occurred to me, while inaugurating the first psychiatric service baptized by Jacques Lacan, to give a small, elementary *vade-mecum* to the practitioners.⁴³ Here I shall add an additional opinion: “Before the crazy person, before the delirious one, do not forget that you too, or that you were, as analysand, and that you too, you spoke of what does not exist.”

28

A first version of this text has been established by Juan Carlos Indard, whom we thank. This French version, as well as the commentary of the bibliographical notes, have been established by Agnès Aflalo. The English version as well as the endnotes have been established by Ellie Ragland.

Notes:

1. Opening lecture of the Ve International Rencontre of the Freudian Field, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1988.
2. The four modalities noted by Lacan in Seminar XX are *ce qui ne cesse pas de s'écrire* (what does not stop writing itself), the necessary; *ce qui cesse de ne pas s'écrire* (what stops not writing itself), the contingent; *ce qui ne cesse pas de ne pas s'écrire* (what does not stop not writing itself), the impossible; *ce qui cesse de s'écrire* (what stops writing itself), the possible. Cf. Chapters 8 and 9 in The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XX:Encore, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. with notes Bruce Fink, New York, Norton, 1998.
3. Jacques Lacan, "L'Etourdit," Scilicet 4, Paris, Seuil, 1972, p. 31.
4. Sigmund Freud, "L'humour," Le Mot d'esprit et Ses Rapports avec L'inconscient, Paris, Gallimard, 1930; Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious (1905) in Standard Edition, Vol. 8.
5. Kant develops the universal maxim (the categorical imperative) in Fundamentals of the Metaphysics of Morals (first two sections). Then, based on this postulate, he founds existence on the moral law in his Critique of the Practical Reason. Lacan often returns to the categorical imperative in his teaching and he proposes a new reading of it, based on Freud in his écrit "Kant avec Sade," Ecrits, Paris, Seuil, 1966, pp. 765-790.
6. André Breton, Anthologie de l'humour noir, Paris, Pauvert, 1966.
7. Jacques Lacan, Le Séminaire, Livre XVIII: D'un Discours qui ne serait pas du Semblant (1970-1971), unedited.

29

8. Concerning Lenin, one can consult One Step Forward, Two Steps Back (1904), Collected Works, Vol. 19. As for the irony of Socrates, it is always present, particularly in the first dialogues of Plato.
9. Miller's comments at this point are humorous, even somewhat ironic, appropriate to the audience of the analysts he was addressing. Miller's reference to Lacan's wish (*voeu*) becomes clearer in relation to his Course of 1990-1991, Le Banquet. In the course of May 29, 1991, Miller describes Lacan's wish or desire as an enigma in psychoanalysis. Nonetheless, one cannot doubt that Lacan desired to restore to Freud's work "the first sense of psychoanalysis" and, thus, Lacan paid homage to the first sense of psychoanalysis by elucidating Freud's first discovery – that of the unconscious – taken as the effect of truth in the field of language. Freud's second discovery, the field of *jouissance*, was one always veiled behind concepts such as "psychic economy," and so on. Thus, Lacan names *jouissance* that Freud discovered in Beyond The Pleasure Principle Lacan's field. Throughout his return to Freud, one cannot doubt that Lacan wished to reveal the "underside" – the *envers*, the *doublure* – of Freud's discourse, Miller says.
Citing Lacan (Cf. "The Freudian Thing, or the Meaning of the Return to Freud in Psychoanalysis" in Ecrits: A Selection, Trans. Alan Sheridan, New York, Norton, 1977, Miller evokes his: "*Moi la vérité je parle*" and "*Le style c'est l'objet petit a*," translating the former as: "Think about the unnameable thing which, if one were able to pronounce these words, would go to the heart [*l'être*] of language, in order to hear them as they must be pronounced, in horror... Lacan's desire is, doubtless, deflation and occasionally derision – and that is why satire and parody are finally his principal mode, taken, that is, in a logical construction – Lacan's desire is, nonetheless, magnetized by the will to make himself the equal of the unnameable thing, the one pronounced in horror, to lend his voice to intolerable words," (course of May 29, 1991).
10. Jacques Lacan, Le Séminaire, Livre XVII: L'envers de la Psychanalyse (1969-1970), Paris, Seuil, 1991.
11. *Ser hablante* in Spanish does not completely make the usage of *parlêtre* in French (author's note).
12. Sigmund Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams, Abrégé de Psychanalyse, Paris, P.U.F., 1949, Chapitre IX; Standard Edition, Vol. 5.
13. That is how the donkey is metaphorized in a story by Lafontaine.
14. Jacques Lacan, "Function and Field of the Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis," (1953), Ecrits: A Selection, trans. Alan Sheridan, New York, Norton, 1977; The Seminar, Book I: Freud's Papers on Technique, (1953-1954), ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. with notes John Forrester, New York, Norton, 1988.

30

15. Jacques Lacan, The Seminar, Book VII, The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Dennis Porter, New York, Norton, 1992.
16. Lacan takes up again this idea of P. Guiraud from his thesis in the "Propos sur la causalité psychique," Ecrits, Paris, Seuil, 1966, p. 175.
17. Jacques Lacan, De la Psychose Paranoïaque dans ses Rapports avec la Personnalité (1932), Paris, Seuil, 1975.
18. Jacques Lacan, "The Agency of the Letter in the Unconscious or Reason since Freud" (1977), Ecrits, op. cit., pp. 493-528.

19. The dialectic of Hegel or the Hegelian logic is first developed in The Science of Logic, the so-called Greater Logic. It is taken up again in the Encyclopedia, the so-called Lesser Logic.

20. One can cite here among others: Claude Levi-Strauss, Elementary Structures of Kinship (1947), Paris, *Mouton*, 1967, and Roman Jakobson, Essays on General Linguistics, Paris, *Minuit*, 1963.

21. Lacan retains *irréalisation* from the “*Introduction théorique aux Fonctions de la Psychanalyse en Criminologie*,” in regards to crime. He will take up this function of the *irréalisation* of the signifier in regard to the phallus in his *écrit* “The Signification of the Phallus,” Écrits: A Selection (1977), p. 289. [Note that Sheridan translates *irréalisation* as derealization.] One will be able to follow the construction of it with “The Agency of the Letter in the Unconscious or Reason since Freud,” and “*Le Métaphore du Sujet*.” Cf. Écrits.

22. D.P. Schreber, The Memoirs of My Nervous Illness, trans. Ida Macalpine and Richard A. Hunter, London, Dawson, 1955, notably, chapter 15. The interrupted sentences are taken up by Lacan again in his two *écrits*: “On a Question preliminary to any possible Treatment of Psychosis,” and “Subversion of the Subject and Dialectic of Desire in the Freudian Unconscious.” Cf. Écrits: A Selection, pp. 179-225, and pp. 292-324.

23. B. Russell, “On denoting,” 1905, collected in Logic and Knowledge, London, 1956.

24. See, for example, Duns Scottus and the medieval theory of suppositions.

31

25. The subject supposed to know appears for the first time in Le Séminaire, Le transfert. It becomes a concept in “La proposition. . . sur le psychanalyste de l’Ecole” in 1967, Scilicet I.

23. Bertrand Russell, “On Denoting,” 1905, collected in Logic and Knowledge, London, 1956.

24. See, for example, Duns Scotus and his theory of suppositions.

25. The subject supposed-to-know appears for the first time in Le Séminaire, Livre VIII, Le Transfert. It becomes a concept in “La proposition . . . sur le Psychoanalyste de L’Ecole” in 1967, Scilicet, 1.

26. G. Frege, “*Sinn und Bedeutung*,” (1892), Seuil, Paris.

27. Plato, The Sophist, trans. with notes William S. Cobb, Savage, Md., Rowan & Littlefield, 1990.

28. *Op.cit.*

29. See Hans Christian Andersen’s tale “The Emperor’s New Clothes” in The Complete Andersen: 168 Tales, trans. Jean Hersholt, New York, Heritage Press, 1949.

30. Ludwig Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, Paris, *Gallimard*, Proposition 7.

31. One can consult Le Séminaire XVIII, D’un discours qui ne serait pas du Semblant, (1970-1971), unedited; and the *écrit* which is contemporary of that, “*Radiophonie*.” And in 1973, “*Télévision*,” Trans. Denis Hollier, Rosalind Kraus, and Annette Michelson, October, No. 40, Spring 1987.

32. Sigmund Freud, Letter to Fliess of September 21, 1897, The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887-1904, trans. Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1985, pp. 264-266: “I no longer believe in my *neurotica* [theory of neurosis].”

33. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, “Discourse on the Origin of Inequality,” Basic Political Writings, trans. Donald A. Cress, Indianapolis, Hackett, 1987.

34. Cf. in the course of the year 1991-1992 that the author consecrated to “*De Nature des Semblants*,” unedited.

35. Jacques Lacan, Review of the Séminaire, La Logique du Fantasm, Ornicar?, No. 29, Paris, *Navarin*, 1984, p. 16.e

36. Jacques-Alain Miller, “*Sur la Leçon des Psychoses*,” Actes de L’Ecole de la Cause Freudienne, XIII, Paris, 1987.

37. Note “in the real” here means that it becomes a delusional neo-reality. Cf. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book III, Psychoses, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Russell Grigg, New York, Norton, 1993.

38. Note “will to a *jouissance* without limit” makes a reference to what Ni

32

etzsche called a “will to power;” that is, the psychotic certainty that no force controls or binds his or her will. Cf. Friedrich Nietzsche, The Will to Power, trans. Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, New York, Random House, 1968.

39. Jacques Lacan, “*Ouverture de la Section Clinique*,” Ornicar?, no. 9, April 1977.

40. The second death is the object of a long development in Seminar VII, The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, op.cit.
41. Jacques Lacan, "*Proposition du 9 Octobre sur la psychanalyste de L'Ecole*," op.cit., p. 14.
42. The schizophrenic does not have the signifier of the lack, but nothing prohibits us from trying to help him obtain it in the real. That is the lesson that I draw from the Robert case of Robert and Rosine Lefort.
43. Jacques-Alain Miller, "*Allocution*," *De près montré, Revue de Clinique Psychanalytique*, Paris, *Editions Borromée*, June 1988.