

Bruce Fink, *The Lacanian Subject: Between Language and Jouissance*
published by Princeton University Press in 1995

Errata

- p. 1, regarding epigraph: “Je est un autre” (“I is an other”) is from Rimbaud’s letter to Georges Izambard dated May 13, 1871; see Arthur Rimbaud, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1954), 268.
- p. 12, paragraph 1: Cf. Freud’s comment that “The lesion in hysterical paralyzes must be completely independent of the anatomy of the nervous system, since *in its paralyzes and other manifestations hysteria behaves as though anatomy did not exist or as though it had no knowledge of it.*”
“And in fact a good number of the characteristics of hysterical paralyzes justify this assertion. Hysteria is ignorant of the distribution of the nerves, and that is why it does not stimulate periphero-spinal or projection paralyzes. It has no knowledge of the optic chiasma, and consequently it does not produce hemi-anopsia. It takes the organs in the ordinary, popular sense of the names they bear: the leg is the leg as far up as its insertion into the hip, the arm is the upper limb as it is visible under the clothing” (*SE I*, p. 169).
See also his comment, “It may be said that hysteria is as ignorant of the science of the structure of the nervous system as we ourselves before we have learnt it” (*SE I*, p. 49).
- p. 14, add epigraph: When I say “the use of language,” I don’t mean that we use it, that we employ it—rather, we are its employees. Language uses us and it enjoys thereby.
—Lacan, Seminar XVII, p. 74 (French version)
- p. 36, middle of page: change “the school of ego psychology” to “ego psychology”
- p. 75, line 5: change “for” to “to”
- p. 84, line 4: change “his” to “Lacan’s”
- p. 90, add epigraph: *Le désir [est] toujours désir d’autre chose.*
—Lacan, Seminar V (November 6, 1957)
- p. 93, line 8: change “concept object” to “concept of object”
- p. 102, line 2: change “is desirable” to “is desired and hence desirable”
- p. 119, first paragraph: Regarding the materiality of language, see Lacan’s comments on the kilos of language around us (piles of books and papers) in *Seminar VIII*, p. 38 (same page number in both French editions).

- p. 133, second to last para.: Cf. Lacan's comment, "Hysterical discourse is scientific discourse itself" (*Seminar XIX*, December 2, 1971).
- p. 159, Figure A1.3: As pointed out by Tim Caspar Boehme, who translated *The Lacanian Subject* into German, 00 should be in the place of 11 and vice versa in the 1-3 Network (cf. corrected version on p. 48 of *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2006)).
- p. 164, line 16: change "conncects" to "connects"
- p. 177, and throughout Notes section: Certain publication years are incorrect: my *Clinical Introduction* was published in 1997, *Reading Seminars I & II* was published in 1996, my translation of *Seminar XX* was published in 1998, and the complete edition of *Écrits* was published in 2006 in collaboration with Héloïse Fink and Russell Grigg.
- p. 198, note 4: Lacan refers to the first function of language as imperative in *Seminar XX*, page 32 in the English edition.
- p. 199, line 1: change page 7 to page 6
- p. 214, index entry "Flash, subject as": add page 42

General Note about Appendix 1:

When I was preparing *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2006), Dany Nobus pointed out to me that Tables Ω and O work somewhat differently than I had thought when I wrote *The Lacanian Subject*; see the "Translator's Endnotes" to *Écrits* 2006, p. 772. The seven letters in Greek letter line 1 are not intended to fall neatly into slots 1 through 7 (or even just slots 1 through 4), continuously, as I proposed in Appendix 1; hence there should be no sample number line in Table A1.6, and the slot numbers there are incorrect. Rather, the arrows in Tables Ω and O (which are not included in Appendix 1; see *Écrits* 1966, p. 50, and *Écrits* 2006, p. 37) present all 16 possible combinations of the four letters paired up two by two.

Table A1.9: Lacan's Table Ω

Slot Numbers:							
1	4						Greek letter lines:
α	δ	δ	γ	β	β	α	1
	δ			β			2
	α	γ		γ	α		3

Consider, for example, Table Ω . The short arrows running left to right between each two successive letters in Table Ω give six pairs of letters ($\alpha\delta$, $\delta\delta$, $\delta\gamma$, $\gamma\beta$, $\beta\beta$, and $\beta\alpha$); the first letter of

each pair should be thought of as occupying slot 1 and the second letter of each pair as occupying slot 4. The two long arrows in Table Ω , the first between α and γ and the second between γ and α , add two more pairs, making for a total of eight (the other eight possible combinations of the four Greek letters are pointed to by the eight arrows in Table O).

Greek letter line 2 in each table shows which letter is excluded from both slots 2 and 3 in each of the four pairs found in the line directly above it (e.g., δ is excluded from slots 2 and 3 in $\alpha\delta$, $\delta\delta$, $\delta\gamma$, and $\alpha\gamma$), while the Greek letter line 3 in each table shows which letter is excluded from slot 2 and which from slot 3 in each of the four pairs found above it in the Greek letter line 1 (e.g., α is excluded from slot 2 and γ is excluded from slot 3 in $\alpha\delta$, $\delta\delta$, $\delta\gamma$, and $\alpha\gamma$).

As one can see, the three different Greek letter lines refer to different sets of slots, making their interpretation rather difficult! Lacan's only explanation of them includes the term *quadrer*, which I have found only in Cotgrave's 1611 *Dictionarie of French and English*, where it is defined as "to square, suit, be fit, agree, or stand well with" (similar, in some ways, to the contemporary *cadrer*). Nevertheless, these do not seem to correspond to the likely meaning intended by Lacan, which is that of *framing or placing in quadrants*. These quadrants apparently correspond (through some spatial metaphor or quadripartite representation) to the different slot numbers discussed above.