

## NOTES ON NOTES OR PSYCHE IN SPACE

Victor Mazin

### **On the difference between notes and remarks**

In linguistics, there is such a concept as a synonym. This Greek word refers to a common (σύν) name (ὄνομα). Synonyms are words that have the same or very similar meaning but differ in spelling, pronunciation, or stylistic connotation, that is names are different, but meanings are close. For example, two words, a *remark* and a *note* are the synonyms.

However, I do not believe in synonyms in psychoanalysis. Every word has its own acoustic references, every word refers to a particular network of so-called free associations. In this sense remark and note are very different words.

The word *remark* includes *re-*, a mark of recurrence, and a *mark* itself which has meanings of sign, token, and assessment, estimation. In a psychoanalytic sense remark already comprises one of the fundamental notions – repetition. Any word including *mark* exists by and on repetition. The noun ‘note’ is not only a short piece of writing, a reminder not to forget, but also a comment on some text or a reference as footnote and endnote. Moreover, note is also a single musical tone. This note in itself is something not self-sufficient. A note is always already demanding another note. It is like a letter which presupposes another letter. Thus, musical notation has its own alphabet, and the letter A is the sixth note in the musical alphabet. It presupposes the other letters – B, C, D, E, F, G. And which note, which letter will follow A is a question of cybernetic probabilities.

On the issue of possible letter sequences, Lacan turns to the chains of the St. Petersburg mathematician Andrei Andreevich Markov Sr.. The meaning in language does not come from a single signifier but from a chain of signifiers, where each signifier is influenced by the previous ones in a probabilistic way. Psychoanalysis for Lacan is a probabilistic science working through chains of signifiers in free associations. And one more thing concerning synonyms. Lacan used to note that an analyst at a session has no her/his own language. She/he uses signifiers of an analysand. An analyst speaks in the language of her/his analysand. An analyst cannot use a synonym. For example, one of my analysands speaks in swear language (in Russian ‘*mat*’). Well, I have to repeat his curse words without trying to soften the language or to use euphemisms. In psychoanalysis what is to be said and how it is said are strictly connected. How defines what. The acoustic form and its references are of principal importance.

While I started to make some rough notes for this essay, I was trying to use the word ‘remark’, but I felt a resistance from the writing. Every time I tried to write the word remark, I wrote, instead, the word note. I yielded to a dictation of writing and began to put down the notes. Notes on notes.

### **Freud’s note on space and extended psyche explodes into a multitude of interpretations**

A note is something that a subject makes not for others but for herself. A note is something fragmented, short, something written in telegraphic style, and as well as a remark it requires further disclosure, unfolding, interpretation. A note is a recording of a thought that suddenly came to mind. In this sense it is very close to free associations.

A note is not intended to be published. At least not in the non-articulated form. The raw thoughts need to be processed. Freud did not want his private letters, drafts, notes taken during analysis (original records of the Rat Man case, which served as a base for the *Notes upon a Case of Obsessional Neurosis*), or texts he was disappointed with (*Project for Scientific Psychology*) to be available to the public. He used to destroy all the preliminary materials. Fortunately, some of these materials have survived and become available to the reader. One of the examples of such a ‘survived’ note would be a thought that Sigmund Freud wrote August 22, 1938: ‘Space may be the projection of the extension of the psychical apparatus. No other derivation is probable. Instead of Kant’s *a priori* determinants of our psychical apparatus. Psyche is extended; knows nothing about it.’ (Freud 1964 [1938] SE XXIII: 3000).

This handwritten note on a single piece of paper was found in Freud’s desk in his home at Maresfield Gardens and published posthumously. Freud has written just one of the thoughts that suddenly came to his mind, and it generated long lines of interpretations of different psychoanalysts and philosophers. Psychoanalysis is an analysis of the psyche. Thus, at stake here is the question of the psyche, or – if to use Freudian technical term – psychical apparatus. Jacques Derrida calls Freudian note an aphorism, which asserts that psyche is an extension and an attribute. This idea, as he writes, ‘that would probably make Descartes spin in his grave, extension is the essence, the substance or essential attribute, of the soul that answers to the proper name Psyche’ (Derrida 2005: 12). Freud turns over Descartes’ formula *cogito ergo sum*, so, it is not surprising that Descartes spins in his grave. In his book *On touching – Jean-Luc Nancy* Derrida reads how Jean-Luc Nancy reads this Freudian aphorism. For Nancy, this random note was no less than ‘Freud’s most fascinating and perhaps (I say this without exaggerating) most decisive statement’ (Nancy 2008: 21). Nancy repeats this phrase – ‘psyche is extended; knows nothing about it’ – in his text on psyche, once and again like a mantra, like a haunting melody, like a compulsive repetition of a sequence of notes. And also, this aphorism, for Nancy, is a point of departure of his analysis of psyche; ‘it’s as if Nancy, the better to launch himself forward, stopped short one day, paralysed by emotion, confronted with Freud’s sentence “*Psyche ist ausgedehnt, weiss nichts davon*”’ (Derrida 2005: 11). The Freudian enigmatic note is a deconstruction of the everlasting opposition of psyche and body: ‘in this one note by Freud, all of “psychoanalysis” really has its true program always yet to come – this nonknowledge, then, is Psyche’s *very body*, or rather, it is this body that Psyche herself is’ (Nancy 2008: 97).

Nancy emphasises that Freud was obsessed with the idea of constructing psychical apparatus, and the unconsciousness is the being-extended psyche. In *The Interpretation of Dreams* Freud first compares psychical apparatus with some optical devices, and he claims that psychical agencies are in spatial relations, but then he says that the relations between agencies in psychical apparatus are not necessarily spatial but temporal: ‘It would be sufficient if a fixed order were established by the fact that in a given psychical process the excitation passes through the systems in a particular temporal sequence’ (Freud 1953 [1900] SE IV: 537). Much later, Freud, in his ‘A Note upon the “Mystic Writing-Pad”’, would argue that the origin of time lies in the work of the consciousness-perception agency (Freud 1961 [1925] SE XIX). In the end it is possible to imagine that the extension of psychical apparatus has a spatio-temporal character. Psyche is a spatio-temporal differentiation, a place of *différance*, if to use a deconstructive term. Differentiation is an extension as the process of adding the external to the internal, which is in its turn also external. In any case the psyche knows nothing about its own internal-external spreading. Psyche is – according to Jean-Luc Nancy’s interpretation – ‘the name of the body,

as presupposed neither according to a substratum sunk into matter *nor* according to an already-given superstratum of self-knowledge' (Nancy 2008: 95).

In the famous text written for publication in 1923, *The Ego and the Id*, Freud claims that ego is first of all bodily (Freud 1961 [1923] SE XIX). This imaginary agency, if to use a Lacanian term, arranges the space. Ego is exteriorization of the bodily surface. It is a projection to the surface of the other serving as a mirror reflection in optical space. This process of imaginary identification is possible only if there is a space, a distance between me and another. The recognition of the bodily ego and emergence of spatialization are simultaneous and inextricably linked processes.

Me myself and others together delineate space, distributing places. Thus, it is not surprising that Nancy says that the ego not just has a place, but is a place. This place is always already in question in paranoia; and Daniel Paul Schreber declares that God does not understand that in order to exist one must have a place. Schreber's own ego has not become a place enough. Freud's note concerns Kantian *a priori*, and the psychoanalyst hints that the psychical apparatus represents space as a mental coordinate, as a projection of unconscious interiority, of which psyche knows nothing about. Freud's note is a continuation of his reflections in 'A Note Upon the "Mystic Writing-Pad"'. Space has its origin in our psyche as extensions of our body; and the psyche knows nothing about its extension, since the expansion process takes place beyond agency's consciousness-perception.

The psyche leaves mnemonic-traces, marks, remarks, notes in space. In psychoanalysis the psyche is to give its secrets in the flux of free associations. To start this process of associating it is enough to have a short note in mind or even one word. Following the primary process, free associations are designed to reveal the enigmas of the unconsciousness.

### **Free associations are found in literature**

In 1920 Freud wrote a short essay called 'A Note on the Prehistory of the Technique of Analysis'. In this note he first talks about Havelock Ellis who has found the origins of the technique of free associations in literature, namely in the poetry of Dr. J. J. Garth Wilkinson, who was mostly famous as a mystic following Emanuel Swedenborg. Ellis concludes that Freud's method is a method of an artist, and his theory 'should be judged not as a piece of scientific work but as an artistic production' (Freud 1955 [1920] SE XVIII: 263).

In his answer to Ellis Freud recollects Schiller who advises paying attention to thoughts that spontaneously come to mind, and then he says that neither Wilkinson nor Schiller influenced psychoanalytic technique. However, there was a writer who did influence Freud – Ludwig Börne. It is interesting that starting a conversation about this German writer who was a part of the Young Germany movement in the first half of the twentieth century, Freud begins to speak about himself in the third person: when Freud was fourteen, he was given a book by Börne as a gift, and after fifty years he still has this book, the only book he kept from his youth. Börne was the first author whose works he delved into. Freud suggests he forgot 'The Art of Becoming an Original Writer in Three Days', written by Börne in 1823; and in his forgetfulness this essay became one of the origins of the technique of free associations. Such is, as Freud says, cryptomnesia.

Börne's advice is to take some sheets of paper and for three days in succession write down everything in a row without any delays or hesitations. When the three days are over one will be amazed at what novel and startling thoughts have welled up in mind. That's how one might

become an original writer in three days. In his note on the prehistory of technique Freud does not give an answer to Havelock Ellis, if his method is scientific or artistic. He has just said that Ellis' attitude towards psychoanalysis as artistic creation is a new form of resistance. Who is Sigmund Freud, a serious scientist or an artist writing stories? There are at least three answers to this question: (1) he is in between art and science, in interregnum (*Zwischenreich*), and the name for this in-between place is psychoanalysis; (2) he is neither in one domain, nor in the other; (3) he is a scientist and an artist, as one of his objects of identification – Leonardo da Vinci.

Thinking about psychoanalytic technique we come to one more shining example in literature, in the Russian literature of the beginning of twentieth century. Freud highly valued the Russian writers Dostoevsky and Merezhkovsky, but most likely he had not heard of Vasily Rozanov, who was in many respects close to Merezhkovsky and who quite often identified himself as Dostoevsky's Underground Man. In his writing it was Rozanov who was closest to the technique of free association.

### **The Underground Man writes notes not for the publication**

If Freud distinguished between texts ready for publication and notes not intended for the reader's eyes, then Vasily Rozanov turned notes into literature. He has made literature out of his remarks, notes, aphorisms, reminiscences, intimate ideas, impromptu lines, and thoughts suddenly intruded his mind. His literature is, first of all, what is usually considered either preparatory materials or waste.

Rozanov was a contemporary of Freud. He was born 2<sup>nd</sup> May 1856, that is he is four days older than Freud. And his pen, as well as Freud's, is directed against the positivism of the era. To my regret Rozanov is not well-known in the West, and he is almost forgotten again in Russia. Why again? Because his books were not published in the Soviet Union, then, in the time of Perestroika he was returned to the readers, and now he is almost forgotten again. Rozanov is an extremely controversial writer, who was for and against the tsarist government, who was for and against the Russian Orthodox Church, who was an admirer of Judaism and a staunch anti-Semite, who accepted homosexuality and accused Gogol of latent homosexuality.

Rozanov asks himself if he writes for a reader, and his answer is no. He repeats once and again that he writes for himself only, not for readers, friends, writers. He calls himself a weird writer who does not write for publication. His books undermine the very idea of a book as something unified, united in terms of a style or a theme. Rozanov disseminates his different notes which he collects and publishes in a book under a common title.

Who needs his thoughts? He himself, and he writes in his *Solitaria* that he collects his thoughts as fallen leaves for himself. *Solitaria* [1912] is his first book that includes these fallen thoughts, then he will write two volumes (or *bundles* as he named them) of *The Fallen Leaves* [1913-1915], *Evanescent* [1914; 1915]. Here is his first note from the *Solitaria*:

The wind blows at midnight and carries away leaves... So also, life in fleeting time tears off from our soul exclamations, sighs, half-thoughts, half-feelings... Which, being fragments of sound, have the significance that they 'come' straight from the soul, without elaborations, without purpose, without premeditation – without anything external. Simply 'the soul is alive', that is, 'has lived', 'has breathed' ... I have always somehow liked these 'sudden exclamations'. Strictly speaking, they flow in one continuously, but one can't succeed (there is no paper at hand) in putting them down – and they die.

Afterwards one can't remember them for anything. Yet certain things I succeeded in jotting down on paper. The jottings went on piling up. And then I decided to gather together those fallen leaves'.

Rozanov 1979: 47

Of course, these sudden exclamations have an addressee. This is the author himself. But not only. He writes down his exclamations to the Other, to God, to Unconsciousness.

### **Psyche without a form**

The psyche of Vasily Rozanov, as he exclaims, has no form, as if it is a pure open space, extension with no limits. The reason for this formlessness is twofold. Firstly, he is a purely spiritual being. Secondly, he is not sufficiently born. In his own words: 'I have no sense of form... I am a "clod", a "loofah". But that is because I am all spirit, and all subject... I am the least "born man"' (Rozanov 1979: 67). This last trait, being 'the least born man', according to Freud, might be called universal. It is common for all humans, and Freud named this trait in his *Project for a Scientific Psychology* the organic helplessness, *organische Hilflosigkeit*. Lacan translated this term as *détresse*, which is distress, grief, disaster. Rozanov experiences all these affects. He calls his book *Solitaria* a writer's lament about writing. Writer with no form writes notes-laments.

In *Evanescent* [1914] Rozanov describes himself not simply as formless thing but as a fluid nomad with nothing constant, with nothing stable. Moreover, he is not tied to any place, any profession, or any city. He is not attached or bound, as if he were a fallen leaf blown by the wind. He asks himself if he is something or nothing, and, for Lacan, this question marks what is distinctive about human subject: 'Man is the character who is always asking if he exists' (Lacan 1988: 268). Rozanov addresses this question to his thoughts, to his fallen leaves. It is not so difficult to pick up and to collect fallen leaves, but it is not easy at all to catch a thought, so to say a raw thought.

### **To catch a raw thought**

Freud explains in *The Interpretation of Dreams* that the process of dreaming in the psychical apparatus presupposes that the connections between dream-thoughts are broken; and these thoughts through the dream-work and regression transform themselves into the images of perception: 'In regression the fabric of the dream-thoughts is resolved into raw material' (Freud 1953 [1900] SE IV: 543). Thus, raw material, *Rohmaterial*, is represented with the signs of perception, *Wahrnehmungszeichen*. Lacan speaks decisively, 'that we can immediately give to this *Wahrnehmungszeichen* their true name of signifiers' (Lacan 1981: 46).

There is a difference between the first thought, some sort of a raw thought, not enough articulated, and the thought which is articulated, and might be written. There is a famous line from a poem 'Silentium!' by Feodor Tyutchev: 'The thought once spoken is a lie'. There are as if two thoughts, deep inside one, and outside one, spoken itself all of a sudden and written; and they are different. Rozanov tries to catch inside thought, and he asks a question, where do the thoughts come from? His answer is: 'Our ideas come we know not whence and go we know not where' (Rozanov 1979: 50). Freud might call this unknown, this negativity of nowhere by name of the unconsciousness. If to use Freudian terms, we could say that Rozanov pursues a thought that belongs to the primary process, that is to a flux of unconscious thoughts: 'Something is flowing in the soul. Eternally, constantly. What? Why? Who knows? – least of all the writer' (Rozanov 1979: 57). For Vasily Rozanov, who catches his thoughts in the unknown flow, a printed thought is especially far from an unspoken thought of Tyutchev.

The main aspiration of the writer Rozanov is to seize a fleeting thought, to catch it at the moment of its emergence, to preserve it in its most intimate form. He would want to keep this raw thought in his writings. He tries to recreate the intonations of speech while collecting his fallen leaves. Rozanov sees a hindrance on his way in the process of printing. Time after time he curses Gutenberg. He does not like machinic technology of writings which makes all writers look similar:

It is as though that damned Gutenberg has licked all writers with his copper tongue, and all of them have lost their souls in print, they have lost their face, character. My 'I' is only in manuscript, as is the 'I' of every writer.

Rozanov 1979: 51

The process of printing gives birth to a technical psyche, which has a creative mechanism, but no inspiration. Inspiration descends upon the spirit, upon the soul, which works on the manuscript with hands. Creativity of the technical psyche is not enough for Rozanov.

Rozanov's novelty lies in his aim to legitimise the manuscript, which consists of notes, of fallen thought-leaves as a special literary form. His writings are different remarks comprising intimate thoughts, fragmented and unfinished maxims, aphorisms. His prose is somewhere in between philosophy, theology, literature and self-analysis. The most important for a psychoanalytic reader is that he writes down thoughts which all of a sudden come into his mind. The most important thing is to catch a thought which is always already ready to disappear. To catch it, to speak it out.

### **To catch a thought to speak it out**

Rozanov writes: 'Every movement of my soul is accompanied by *utterance*. And every utterance I want without fail to *write down*. It is an instinct' (Rozanov 1979: 83). In Russian Rozanov uses not a usual word like utterance (*vyskazyvanie*), but a neologism *vygovarivanie* which is very close to the word *wegerzählen* which Freud uses in *Studies on Hysteria*. It is not simply utterance but of speaking out, speaking away, an expulsion of thought from oneself, bringing it outward.

Freud encourages hysterics to freely associate and to speak out in order to get rid of unconsciously tormenting thoughts. Rozanov is not so much focused on getting rid of thoughts, but on discovering them. He follows a train of thoughts, and he knows that a sudden thought might intrude into it. In this case he quickly turns the lined sheet and writes on the back of it. A train is on one side, and a thought-carriage that suddenly crashes into it is recorded on the other side: 'Then, quickly removing the lined sheet, I wrote on the back of it that other idea' (Rozanov 1979: 46). That is how he weaves the fabric of his literature from captured thoughts. That is how the free association sequence of signifiers collapses when another train-chain crashes into it.

### **To catch a meaning to try to understand oneself**

In his writings Vasily Rozanov strives to understand different phenomena, different people, but above all himself. His writings are always confessions, everlasting self-analysis. He wants to understand himself. His first book is *On understanding* [1886]. All his life he was trying to understand the world but first of all himself.

To understand oneself is also to understand the land where one was born, even if not sufficiently born. One is born in the symbolic cradle. Rozanov tries to understand his cradle –

Russian culture, literature, politics, religion – and his place in it. Rozanov is a religious writer, and his writings in this sense are even more confessional than Rousseau's *Confessions* or Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams*. He emphasises that he writes sketches for himself. He asks himself once again if he writes for a reader and the answer is definitely not. He writes for himself.

To understand means to grasp a meaning. But how to do it if Rozanov's word meanings are unstable and fluid?! In every note, his words resonate not only with their immediate meaning, but are also overwhelmed by ever-new semantic echoes of other words. Thoughts are in contradiction with themselves. Freud and Lacan are very much familiar with this linguistic phenomenon of the human psyche and human thinking.

### **Notes, thought and thinking**

In the second section of his book *The Ego and the Id* Freud asks himself about those *internal* processes that are called thought-processes. He speaks about thinking in plural, so far as these processes are spatially distributed across different agencies of registration.

The principal clinical question Freud raises in this book is: Do internal processes of thinking reach the surface of consciousness or does consciousness reach the unconscious processes? The answer is neither nor. The principal agency in this process is preconscious, an agency where a thought is born, an agency where object-presentations connect with word-presentations. There are two processes of thinking in one: thinking in pictures and thinking in words. The first one Freud claims to be very incomplete.

The unconsciousness thinks. And there are, as it were, two different processes of thinking. One belongs to the primary process, and another one to the secondary one.

The unconsciousness thinks. It thinks by means of displacement and condensation, or, in Jacobson-Lacan terms, it thinks through metonymy and metaphor.

### **Signifiers flying in space**

Thoughts are fleeting, transient, evanescent, and the task of the writer is to catch them. Rozanov does it everywhere. In his books under a note he used to write in parenthesis where exactly in space this or that thought was captured, or when in time it was captured. For example:

... crossing the bridge,  
examining coins,  
in a train carriage,  
filling a pipe with tobacco,  
in bed at night,  
having breakfast,  
in the street,  
in a cab,  
at night,  
at the door while returning home,  
fallen asleep, went out to smoke on the stairs,  
drinking the evening tea, exterminating mosquitoes,  
October,  
playing checkers with children,  
on the postal receipt,

going to bed,  
recollecting childhood in the bed at night,  
watching teenagers dance,  
looking at the sky in the garden,  
winter 1912,  
leaning against the wall on Italian Street,  
on the way to clinics,  
crossing the square in front of the Ciniselle Circus in fear,  
on the back of the line sheet,  
horse-drawn tram...

Rozanov is ready to catch thoughts anytime and anywhere. But the perfect place for thought hunting is the horse tramway. He writes: 'Most thoughts come to me on the horse-drawn tram. The tram shakes, I shake, my brain shakes, and thoughts are shaken out of my brain'(Rozanov 2012: 433).

Lacan might have called this hunt the hunt for flying signifiers. In Lacanian terms we deal here with a flying signifier, a signifier that has detached from a signified. It is in free flight in search of some new signifiers, it searches for a landing site in a chain of signifiers, for a place in the sequence that suits it. Horse tramway runs, and Rozanov catches his signifiers.

### **Free associations in Rozanov's writings: not-all and accidental**

Vasily Rozanov is a great stylist. His style is to write notes on the margins of big history. The principle of his writing is the principle of random notes, as if he knew that in psychoanalysis accidental is the principle. In the preface to the third edition of *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, Freud writes that it is exactly the accidental that plays the main role in analysis, because it is the accidental that creates the human psyche.

For Rozanov the principle of rough and not logical succession of the notes is more important than a systematic or dogmatic text. Like Freud he refuses to create some sort of a complete system. Like Lacan, he follows the way of *not-all*. Rozanov writes:

I have introduced into literature the pettiest, the fleeting? The invisible movements of the soul, the webs of everyday life, for meaning is not in the Eternal; meaning is in Moments. "I have some kind of fetishism for trifles. Trifles are my 'gods'."

Rozanov 2012: 225

For Rozanov, the meaning of life lies in the smallest details and moments of time. His attitude towards mental experiences is close to the way Freud treats the material of the unconscious, for example dreams. A dream told in free associations is broken down into separate details, words; and every element, every word is equally important. Freud decomposes the dream score into individual notes. He takes into account that the unconscious is inextricably linked to sexuality, and free associations cannot occur without sexual overtones.

### **Notes on sex**

There is one more feature that brings Freud and Rozanov together: an accent on human sexuality. Rozanov is unique in this sense. No one else in Russian literature comes back to the question of sex time and again. There are no notes, no writings without sex.

Rozanov repeats several times that his writings are mixed not with water, not with blood, but with semen. Once he is riding in a cab and the following thought comes to his mind: '...such

fools, all my writings are mixed not with water or even with oil, - bit with human semen' (ibid. 351). His writings are literally the result of dissemination, of spreading the semen. Dissemination spreads the semen in writing, which has no fixed meaning. Such semen-writing, written with a phallus as an empty flying signifier, is open to a multitude of different interpretations.

Rozanov emphasizes that he has an undeniable phallicism, and that there is nothing demonic or devilish about it. It is more like an instrument of writing. It is not surprising in this context that phallus as a style of hand-writing dominating the brain:

From this composition of life how evident it becomes that our *genitalia* are more important than our brain. The brain is the captain; the steersman. But for 'navigation' what is important is evidently not the captain, a replaceable and hired person, but the eternal 'unmoorings' and 'moorings'

Rozanov 1979: 112.

Rozanov is against the scientific approach to the problems of sexuality. The scientific approach to gender issues is shrouded in pretence and lies. The situation is worse in medical examinations, reports, and statistics. In *Evanescent* (1914) he writes: 'Drag, drag out the doctors and lawyers by the hair. They are professionals in lies, deceit, and stupidity' (Evanescent 1914: 60). One can approach sexuality not through science, but through psychoanalysis and literature. They allow at least partially delineating the body and its touch. Sex, however, is never equal to itself. It doesn't coincide with itself:

'My' sex isn't one thing throughout; it's a discrete, random, eventful contact of the zones of 'my' body, as much as of others – my body becoming other, by touching itself there, by being touched there, becoming thereby *the same*, more absolute, more separated than ever, more identified as a taking place of touching (of extension)'

Nancy 2008: 37

Body, psyche, and sex prescribe to each other. *Jouissance* binds them together; though it is impossible to speak of one, of a unification, more likely of splits and cleavages. One way or another, Rozanov catches the thought as it approaches the body and writes it down:

I am choked with thought. And how pleasant it is to me to live in that choked state. That is why my life, despite its thorns and tears, is after all a joy.

Rozanov 1979: 89

Sexuality, for him, is not what is in contradiction with religion. It is on the contrary for Rozanov: 'The connection of sex with God – greater than the connection of the mind with God, greater even than the connection of conscience with God – is gathered from this that all asexualists reveal themselves also as a-theists' (Rozanov 1979 103).

Sexuality connects not only with God, but with other humans, too. Sexuality, according to Rozanov, is what is open, not complete:

Everything in a person is defined and complete, except for the genitals. Which, compared to the rest, seem like some kind of ellipsis or obscurity... which encounters and is connected to the obscurity or ellipsis of another organism. And then – both are clear. Isn't it this incompleteness that gives them their repulsive appearance?

In 1911 Rozanov wrote a book called *The Moonlight People*. This treatise is devoted to the study of sexuality and its denial in Christianity. Rozanov sharply distinguishes between the Old Testament with its polygamy of the patriarchs ('the religion of sacred procreation') and the New Testament with its apology for the middle sex (*Urnings*). While the Old Testament calls for fruitfulness and multiplication, the New Testament seems to say, 'Blessed are those who do not multiply', living 'like angels'. Rozanov puts forward the hypothesis that Jehovah, who created the world, needed a second female hypostasis; and humans are intrinsically of different sexes. Rozanov was interested in the question of the possibility of intercourse without sin, reproach and shame. He was in search of a right note to write on sexuality. This was not an easy task for Freud either. When discussing sex, Freud sometimes switched from his native German to French or Latin.

### **Something to be evolved**

It is rather often that Freud writes as if not a text itself but an introduction to a text. Any of his texts is a note open to continuation, to free association. For example, his *Zur Einführung des Narzißmus*. According to the title it is not an article *on* narcissism, but an introduction *to* it. More than that he writes not an introduction but something – like a note – for the future introduction. The preposition 'zu' in German indicates direction. Freud points in the direction of further expansion of his notes. He does write not so much about something as for something, to something. He writes *Zur Vorgeschichte der analytischen Technik*; *Zur Geschichte der psychoanalytischen Bewegung*; *Zur sexuellen Aufklärung der Kinder*; *Zur Ätiologie der Hysterie*; *Zur Dynamik der Übertragung*; *Zur Einleitung der Behandlung...*

### **Einfall on the ways of the train thoughts**

In *Studies on Hysteria* Freud speaks not so much about *freie Assoziationen* as about *Einfall*, or even *der freien Einfälle*. He uses this term *Einfall* (incidence) all the time when discussing his technique in cases (*Fälle*) of Emmy von N., Miss Lucy R., Katharina, and Fräulein Elisabeth von R. The notion of free associations in Freudian discourse will be established later, after he will stop using pressure techniques. This technique consisted in placing his palm on the patient's forehead, then removing it and asking her to say whatever comes to mind (*Einfall*).

*Einfall* means a sudden intrusion in the mind of a thought or a word. There are no free associations, but there is an intrusion. Associations are not free. They follow its pathways. Of course, they follow them, but a derailment disaster, *Unfall*, is possible.

We are talking about laying down thought pathways, facilitations, breaching (*Bahnung*). Freud's neurological work ('The Project of Scientific Psychology') can also be applied to mental associative pathways. The German term *Bahnung* refers to railways, railway tracks. One follows the rails, the tracks. It is not free movement in any direction. One follows existing chains of signifiers. He follows them even if on the way he produces puns, *calembours*, neologisms, and he shows in his teaching how metaphor and metonymy work.

Constructing psyche, psychical apparatus, Freud first had a neurological idea of facilitation, and then, in the last chapter of *The Interpretation of Dreams* he speaks about thoughts' facilitations. And twenty-five years after he will write on the same subject of psyche, writing and facilitation 'A Note upon the "Mystic Writing-Pad"'. Derrida in his essay *Freud and the Scene of Writing* emphasizes that Freud takes the first step towards this "Note" in "The Interpretation of Dreams", where the metaphor of writing captures the problem of the psychical

apparatus not only in terms of its structure, but also in terms of its matter (Derrida 1978). This matter would be the letters, the agency of letters in unconsciousness. The conclusion Derrida comes to when reading Freud is this: psychical apparatus is a machine of writing. Rozanov would agree with this aphorism. He would be extremely interested to listen to Freud on the inherent, unbreakable connection between psyche and writing.

### **To find a note**

To write is not only to write a text. To write a text is in a way to write music. To write one needs to find the right note. The text could be read as a musical partiture. Vasily Rozanov says that always to hear music is his distinctive feature:

The secret of authorship consists in the constant and involuntary music in the soul. If it is not there, a man can only “make a writer of himself”. But he is not a writer.

Rozanov 1979: 57

For Rozanov, the human psyche is not a being, but music. There is no ontology but a musicology of the psyche. This is a reason, perhaps, that not every thought might be captured, but only a musical one. This is what Vasily Rozanov says.

### **Lacan makes notes**

To start to say something one has to take a place in a discourse. What is the place of Lacan, the place from which he delivers his speech? According to him, his place in discourse is the baroque. His discourse is permeated with allegories, ambiguities, metaphors, witticisms, and aphorisms. Lacan has even called himself the Gongora of psychoanalysis.

In seminars he takes the place of the baroque and at the same time the place of analysands called upon to speak out unconsciousness. Before a seminar Lacan makes notes, then during the seminar he improvises on the topic of preliminary notes. The regime of free associations and baroque rhetoric form Lacan’s style in his seminars. *How* defines *what*. Psychoanalytic listening is aimed not only and no so much at what is said, but how it is said.

### **To listen undertones**

Rozanov knows how difficult it is to listen to others. Of course, he is not speaking about Freudian floating attention as a complementary technique to free associations, but let us note that his thoughts are very close to psychoanalysis. In *Fallen Leaves* he says that there is a special gift of listening to a human soul, and he continues:

Not everyone knows how to listen to a person. Some listen to words, understand their connection, and respond coherently. But they fail to detect the ‘undertones’, *the shadows of sound* ‘beneath the voice’ – and in them, and in them alone, the soul speaks.

Rozanov 2012: 115

### **References**

Breuer, J. and Freud, S. (1955) [1893-1895]. *Studies on Hysteria. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* Vol II (ed and trans) J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Derrida J. (2005). *On touching – Jean-Luc Nancy* (trans) C. Irizarry. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Derrida, J. (1978). Freud and the Scene of Writing *Writing and Difference* (trans) A. Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freud, S. (1953) [1900]. *The Interpretation of Dreams. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* Vol IV (ed & trans) J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Freud, S. (1905). Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* Vol VII: 123-246 (ed and trans) J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Freud, S. (1955) [1920] A Note on the Prehistory of The Technique of Analysis *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* Vol XVIII:263-5 (ed & trans) J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Freud, S. (1961) [1923]. The Ego and the Id *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* Vol XIX: 1-308 (ed & trans) J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Freud, S. (1961) [1925]. A Note Upon the 'Mystic Writing-Pad' *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* Vol XIX: 225-32 (ed & trans) J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Freud, S. (1964) [1938]. Findings, Ideas, Problems *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* Vol XXIII: 299-300 (ed & trans) J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Lacan, J. (1988). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book II. The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis 1954-1955* (ed) J.-A. Miller, (trans) S. Tomaselli. Cambridge: CUP.

Lacan, J. (1981). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XI. The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis* (ed) J.-A. Miller, (trans) A. Sheridan. New York/ London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Nancy J.-L. (2008). *Corpus* (trans) R, A. Rand. New York: Fordham University Press.

Rozanov, V. V. (1996) [1886] *On understanding*. Rostov-na-Donu: Tanais.

Rozanov, V. V. [1912]. *Uedinennoe*. [*Solitaria* (trans) S. S. Koteliansky. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979].

Rozanov V. V. (2012) [1913, 1916]. *Opavshie listja*. Sobranie sochinenii v 8 tomakh. Tom IV (ed.) N. Nikolyukin, A. Polyakov, S. Fedjakin. Moscow: Knizhnyi Klub Knigovek. [*Fallen Leaves* (trans) S. S. Koteliansky. London: The Mandrake Press, 1929].

Rozanov, V. V. (2012) [1914]. *Evanescent*. Sobranie sochinenii v 8 tomakh. Tom V. (ed.) N. Nikolyukin, A. Polyakov, S. Fedjakin. Moscow: Knizhnyi Klub Knigovek.