

Chapter 8

X Marks the Spot that Will Have Been

Jane Rendell

Exiting the platform at Kennington Tube, after a particularly arduous day, I drag myself up the steps and along the curved corridor to the lifts. A woman flicks her hair just past my cheek and glances up at the curved mirror up in the corner to check her reflection. I start to follow suite ... tilting my head upwards towards the image of her distorted face and the view back down the corridor disappearing behind her shoulder, but my gaze flickers over and is caught by a rather odd diagram, one I have not noticed before. This is a brand new, carefully framed and very well produced image. It is a simple black and white drawing of a circular labyrinth (or is it a maze?) divided into quadrants. Down at the bottom, next to the entrance (or is it the exit?) I see a small red cross. X marks the spot.

[Insert Figure 8.1 here – portrait]

Figure 8.1 Mark Wallinger, *Labyrinth*, 2013 (Kennington Station). Commissioned by Art on the Underground / LUL, 2013. The work © the artist, courtesy of Hauser & Wirth. Photograph © Thierry Bal.

One of the earliest diagrams drawn by Sigmund Freud to show the unseen workings of the mind is ‘Psychological Schema of the Word Concept’,¹ originally published in 1891 as part of his research on aphasia. It shows the conscious and unconscious as two complexes – ‘word-’ and ‘object-associations’. The diagram shows the division between the conscious and unconscious in terms of the two main branches of a tree, whereas in a later drawing, ‘Schematic Diagram of Sexuality’ (1894),² a line is used, sometimes dashed, to differentiate between two territories, one, un-named, located inside the boundary, and another labelled ‘the external

world' situated outside. In a subsequent diagram, 'The Architecture of Hysteria' (1897)',³ Freud drew the relationship between inner and outer worlds from another point of view – rather than a drawing showing space two dimensionally like a section or plan – the various zones in this drawing appear to recede into the distance like a perspective.

For Freud, hysteria is associated with the return of a memory; the content of a recurring hysterical attack is the return of a psychological state, which the patient has experienced earlier.⁴ Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis summarise how in *The Studies on Hysteria* (1893–5) Freud explores the way in which mnemonic or memory-traces are stored in an archival fashion according to several methods of classification, including chronology, position in chains of association and accessibility to consciousness.⁵ This archival system allows a single event to be stored in various places: connected with perception, memory and connected with the presentation of ideas or *Vorstellung*.⁶ In 'The Project' (1895) Freud differentiated between perceptual cells and mnemonic cells,⁷ perceptual images (*Wahrnehmungsbild*) and mnemonic images (*Erinnerungsbild*).⁸ Following Joseph Breuer, Freud reasoned that it was not possible for the same system to operate in terms of perception, as the 'mirror of a reflecting telescope', *and* in terms of memory, as a 'photographic plate', and instead he suggested that separate systems of registration existed.⁹ Freud explained his thinking on this to Wilhelm Fliess in his letter of 6 December 1896 using a 'schematic picture' accompanied by the following written explanation:

As you know, I am working on the assumption that our psychic mechanism has come into being by a process of stratification: the material present in the form of memory-traces being subjected from time to time to a *re-arrangement* in accordance with fresh circumstances – to a *re-transcription*. Thus what is essentially new about my theory is the thesis that memory is present not once but several times over, that it is laid down in various kinds of indications. I postulated a similar kind of re-arrangement some time ago (*Aphasia*) for the paths leading from the periphery [of the body to the cortex].

I cannot say how many of these registrations there are: at least three, probably more.¹⁰

In an essay accompanying a wonderful exhibition of Freud's drawings, curator Lynn Gamwell has argued that Freud's use of diagrams to map the space of the psyche needs to be connected to the development of science in a German context informed by the work of Kant and German Idealism where, rather than the rule of direct observation which was the norm in France, scientists in Germany were able to use 'theoretical models such as diagrams of unseen realms to guide their investigation'. She suggests that Freud 'moved back and forth between pictures based on observation and on theory in his pursuit of the elusive psyche'.¹¹ Writing in response alongside this set of Freud's drawings, Mark Solms' understanding is that the shift in Freud's drawings from 'representational pictures to abstract diagrams' parallels the change in his 'transition' from neuropsychology to metapsychology. Solms locates this transitional phase in that period of time when Freud had to abandon traditional methods of neuroscience based on clinical observation since many of the phenomena he was encountering, such as repression, could not be traced to visible causes, and in those drawings Freud prepared for Wilhelm Fliess including 'Schematic Diagram of Sexuality' (17 January 1895?).¹²

In 'The Interpretation of Dreams' (1900), Freud took a different visual turn, this time presenting the passage of communication between the exterior world and interior psyche through series of schematic diagrams comprising vertical bands, similar to an architect's cross-section through a substance. The final version shows perception (Pcpt.) at one end and the preconscious (Pcs.) at the other, with movement occurring from Pcpt. to Pcs. across a series of mnemonic or memory traces followed by a dotted arc swinging under the vertical band representing the unconscious.¹³ Later on in the written text, Freud supplemented his topographical account of the nervous system and the psyche, where the conscious, preconscious and unconscious were located in different places, with a dynamic one, where he argues a particular 'agency' is able to influence the structure.¹⁴ Using the metaphor of a telescope, Freud likens the operation of the psychical system to the way in which beams of light are refracted to

form an image when they enter a new medium.¹⁵ The use of spatial metaphors to explain the arrangement of psychical structures and processes also appears in Freud's 'Introductory Lectures' of 1917. Here he uses architecture to position the role of censorship on the threshold between two rooms – conscious and unconscious – guarded by a watchman.¹⁶

Let us therefore compare the system of the unconscious to a large entrance hall, in which the mental impulses jostle one another like separate individuals. Adjoining this entrance hall there is a second, narrower, room – a kind of drawing-room – in which consciousness, too, resides. But on the threshold between these two rooms a watchman performs his function: he examines the different mental impulses, acts as a censor, and will not admit them into the drawing-room if they displease him.¹⁷

Freud develops his understanding of the roles played by both the topographic and dynamic models of the psyche in his 1915 paper 'The Unconscious'.¹⁸ At the start of Part IV, 'Topography and Dynamics of Repression', he employs the term repression or *Verdrängung*, to describe 'a process affecting ideas on the border between the systems Ucs. and Pcs. (Cs.)'.¹⁹ In 'The Ego and the Id' (1923) Freud goes on to articulate activities on this boundary in terms of the ego – a 'frontier-creature' who 'tries to mediate between the world and the id'.²⁰ 'The Ego and the Id' contains a diagram, which repositions the systems or mental processes of the conscious, preconscious and unconscious, known as Freud's first topography, consolidated in 'The Interpretation of Dreams', with respect to what has become known as his second topography, a structural theory where the psyche is divided into the three new entities of ego, superego and id.²¹ Freud places the ego below the preconscious and above the id circumscribed in a blob-like shape.²² Ten years later, in 1933, in 'The Dissection of the Psychical Personality', Freud drew together these two triadic structures: 'the three qualities of the characteristic of consciousness [sic]' – the conscious, preconscious and unconscious, and 'the three provinces of the mental apparatus' – ego, superego and id; into one socio-spatial analogy using a geographical and cultural metaphor:

I am imagining a country with a landscape of varying configuration – hill-country, plains, and chains of lakes –, and with a mixed population: it is inhabited by Germans, Magyars and Slovaks, who carry on different activities.²³

Literary critic Virginia Blum and geographer Anna Secor have argued that in his 1915 essay, ‘The Unconscious’, Freud posits that the unconscious and preconscious are not ‘regions, territories or locations, whether anatomical or structure, but different relationships to the possibility of language’.²⁴ In Blum and Secor’s view Freud’s turn to structure in the second topography comes as a result of impasses presented by the Euclidean geometry of the topographical model itself,²⁵ as one ‘inadequate to the task of mapping the psyche’.²⁶ They suggest that while Freud, in his early neurobiological writings and drawings, searched for the unconscious as an actual space that could be mapped, later, from ‘The Interpretation of Dreams’ onwards, he turned to the use of metaphors to indicate hypothetical places rather than real and locatable ones. Blum and Secor assert that for Freud, the spatiality of the psyche is ‘caught between the topographical (having to do with regions and locations) and the metaphorical. Yet, the psychic processes Freud describes are in many cases arguably topological’.²⁷

Some days later, along with an invitation asking if I would like to write an essay for a book on Mark Wallinger’s artwork Labyrinth for Transport for London, I receive a fascinating document that includes a set of intriguing drawings showing different kinds of labyrinth and maze. I join the dots ... the labyrinth I saw in the Underground at Kennington is part of an art commission. Of course, no other text positioned down there could have been so carefully framed, yet so speculative, except for an artwork. The lack of any visible explanatory context lets the mind wander. Mine has only just been relocated to this spot, with the help of a clue, which has repositioned me on the inside, at the centre of this labyrinth, a place where I have come to know things, including myself. Yet others stay on the outside, offered no revelation of the mystery, for them the labyrinth retains its status as an enigmatic figure. These are some of the spots that X marks.

In my mind, a strange reversal takes place in Freud’s drawings over time, from the early schemas which represent in an abstract fashion his search for a biological location to the

unconscious, to the later figures where the various terrains of the psyche are drawn to resemble biological organs, such as the eye. Yet whether intending to represent the biology of the brain or to create more abstract diagrams of its mental processes, Freud's drawings attempt to make visible relations between interior psychic space and the exterior material world; in so doing they bear a striking resemblance to visual representations of labyrinths and mazes which also seek to link spiritual processes to physical geographies and have inspired Mark Wallinger's project for London Underground. Coming across Wallinger's *Labyrinth* in London's underworld makes it possible to imagine parallels between the spatial and bodily experience of traveling through these subterranean passages and the inner and often hidden workings of the mind.²⁸

In everyday speech, both the labyrinth and the maze denote a complex and potentially confusing arrangement of pathways, yet structurally, philosophically, and mathematically, they can be distinguished. Structurally, a labyrinth is one path that winds its way from the start to the finish, two places that often coincide, whereas a maze has forks, dead ends and sometimes cycles. Philosophically, the labyrinth is a meditative and often spiritual path laid out with the intent of setting one free, while the maze presents a puzzle and a challenge, a structure designed to trap and to trick. Mathematically, while the same set of curves can be used to define a labyrinth or maze topology, labyrinths are the curves themselves and mazes are the spaces between. The eighteenth century mathematician Leonhard Euler (1707–83) was one of the first to analyze mazes mathematically, and in doing so he made the first significant contributions to the branch of mathematics now known as topology.

In 1735 Euler put forward a puzzle now famous in the history of mathematics called 'The Seven Bridges of Königsberg' whose negative resolution has been argued to set the foundations of graph theory and prefigure the idea of topology. The city of Königsberg in Prussia (now Kaliningrad, Russia) was situated on both sides of the River Pregel, and included two large islands, which were connected to each other and the mainland by seven bridges. A

problem was set which was to find a walk through the city that would cross each bridge once and only once. Euler proved that the problem had no solution, but he was able to show that only the connective information was relevant; the pictorial representation of the graph could be distorted in any way without changing its properties, thus setting out a basic principle of topology that some spatial problems depend on the relations between objects – their continuities and cuts – not their exact shapes.

Blum and Secor describe how the field of topology focusses on the qualitative properties of space (as opposed to the geometric), and that:

topologically speaking, a space is not defined by the distances between points that characterize it when it is in a fixed state but rather by the characteristics that it maintains in the process of distortion and transformation (bending, stretching, squeezing, but not breaking).²⁹

For Blum and Secor topology deals with surfaces and sets of properties that retain their relationships under processes of transformation. Not only are topological figures often impossible to draw or construct, but highly theoretical topologists ‘not only avoid anything like pictures of these things, they mistrust them’, viewing them as mathematically meaningless.³⁰ Blum and Secor discuss how French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan used topological operations to deal with psychic processes such as transference, condensation, displacement, and mourning put forward by Freud;³¹ they draw attention to how Lacan’s ‘topology of the subject ... allows the neurotic to situate people, events, and places that are apparently separated in time and space *in the same place*’.³²

Blum and Secor explore how topology makes an early appearance in Lacan’s teaching in the context of his address to the Rome Congress of Romance Language Psychoanalysts in 1953, and how his schemas (L, R and I), developed in his seminars between 1954 and 1957, provide a different kind of map from those of Freud’s topographies.³³ They focus on how, in his Seminar IV (1956–7), Lacan made a very particular point concerning the schemas, that: ‘It

is not a matter of localizations, but of the relations between places'.³⁴ They go on to suggest that:

If many geographers have become convinced that the grid is not the whole story of space, Lacan can help us to understand how space works in non-Euclidean ways. We argue that it is because the subject is a topological figure that space as we live it is more-than-topographical. ...³⁵

According to Darian Leader, the thinking of the 1940s introduced a movement from the inductive study of objects to the refining of models, giving access to an understanding of 'structures considered as sets of relations between objects'.³⁶ In addition to the interest in algebra current, there was also a fascination in those structures of order, which deal with choices, hierarchies, classifications, topology and its concern with neighbourhood, proximity and barrier; such tools were emerging in anthropology and cybernetics. Leader considers Lacan's early schemas not as models; he notes that later, 'as Lacan moved from algebraic ideas to topologies and knot theory, he would come to see the diagram as something closer to the real, not as a representation of a structure but as the structure itself, understood in the sense of a set of relations of invariance',³⁷ a point of view close to Blum and Secor's description of Lacan's topology as 'at once psychic and material'.³⁸ Leader wonders then why 'diagrams should matter to psychoanalysis', and responds with the thought that, 'Where words fail something else is appealed to', noting how in his early work Lacan 'identifies this with certain privileged images'.³⁹

It is possible to suggest that Harry Beck's innovative London Underground Tube Map might be one such privileged image. The map is used to assist navigation, and it is certainly topological, setting out clear relations between key points, despite the fact that their positions on his map bear little resemblance to their geographical coordinates. Many Londoners, as Wallinger describes, have this 'diagram' imprinted on their psyche, and strangely it is this abstract and imaginary representation of London which best describes the city spatially,

providing a first visual clue for many visitors as to ‘where things are’, and remaining as a trace in the mind of residents long after they have realised the map’s lack of physical accuracy.

From 1951, as psychoanalyst Bernard Burgoyne outlines, Lacan worked with the mathematician Georges-Théodule Guilbaud to examine forms of thinking and questions of structure.⁴⁰ Drawing on Elisabeth Roudinesco’s biography of Lacan, theorists Ellie Ragland and Dragan Milovanovic give an account of how Lacan and Guilbaud ‘in private indulged together in their shared passion, forever tying knots in bits of string’. They note how in his later work Lacan continued to be influenced by a number of mathematicians: Pierre Soury, Jean-Michel Vappereau and Valérie Marchande, who mentioned to him the heraldic display of the Milanese dynasty the Borromeos, which included the motif of three overlapping and linked rings.⁴¹ During the 1950s and 1960s, Lacan developed several topological figures to illustrate the functioning of the human psyche, including the torus, the Möbius strip, the Klein bottle and the cross-cap; but from 1972, he turned to the theory of knots, a particular branch of mathematics, and in the last years of his seminar – 1975 and 1976 – he was specifically interested in the Borromean knot with respect to the symptom or ‘*le sinthome*’.

Lacan’s interest in the symptom was tied to his fascination with writing and its relation to the real; he says: ‘That the writing of little letters, that the writing of little mathematical letters, is what supports the real’.⁴² Lacan focusses in particular on the use of language in James Joyce’s work and in this seminar he refers both to Joyce’s *Finnegan’s Wake* (1939) and to *Ulysses* (1922) as key points of discussion. There are certainly strong similarities between the figure of the Borromean knot and its three intertwined rings and the figure of overlapping circles placed at the centre of *Finnegan’s Wake*. But it is perhaps *Ulysses* which is more important for Lacan, for he starts the seminar by arguing that Joyce wrote the book in ‘l’élargues’, in other words in a style where ‘the English tongue no longer exists’, where signifier does not relate directly to signified, where words play off each other, creating different possibilities for meaning that are fluid and polyvalent, such that Lacan describes the work in

terms of ‘elation’ or more specifically – in psychiatry – ‘mania’.⁴³ In his musings around Joyce’s *Ulysses*, at one point Lacan puts it most succinctly:

Ulysses bears witness to the way in which Joyce remains rooted in his father even as he disowns him; and it is this indeed that is, that is his symptom. ... I said he was the symptom. His whole oeuvre is one long symptom.⁴⁴

Ragland and Milovanovic explore how, in Lacan’s work, the symptom is important topologically because it ‘holds the subject together’; it is constituted through a basic unit of structure – the Borromean triadic associative unit of the Imaginary (identificatory), the Symbolic (language and social conventions) and the Real (effects whose cause is repressed excitation or trauma) – that ‘functions topologically insofar as it is knotted by a fourth order: the order of the knot that belongs to each of the other three but also holds them together’.⁴⁵

For Lacan, topology is not a metaphor; it is the precise way we may understand the construction and appearance of the subject. Topology provides an intuitive understanding of transformations. It encourages intuitive leaps and alternative conceptualisations. Often, multi-dimensional spaces, outside of our normal three space dimensions are employed.⁴⁶

I remember that I have been to this part of the Underground before, to this spot precisely, in a life that is past ... Last year I moved house and Kennington Underground station is now part of my morning ritual – leave home, unlock bike, cycle to Kennington, lock bike, go through barriers, run down spiral staircase, stand at far end of platform ready to exit near the steps at Euston – and again, in reverse, much slower, at the end of the day. But in 1992 as an architectural assistant just out of university, one of my first jobs was to survey the stations of the Northern Line from Kennington south to Morden. I was given a set of drawings issued by London Underground, and told to check that all the dimensions were correct. Arriving underground at Kennington one morning, I discovered a gap between what was drawn on the plans and the spaces I was experiencing. Dark lines, neat but fuzzy on the soft paper of the blue print, indicated the existence of a series of rooms and tunnels, some located parallel to the platforms, others hidden behind locked doors. When I started to investigate a group of men in white suits emerged from a circular shaft not marked on the map to block my entrance. Later I discovered by chance from a friend doing market research for a company X who wished to remain anonymous, that studies were being conducted to investigate the possibilities of burying nuclear waste under London, in the abandoned tunnels of the Northern line. ... A buried history

seen from another place today? A configuration that holds the relation between past, present, and future in terms of what will have been? Perhaps X marks the relation between spots in time as well as space?

X

Considered from another spot, a key aspect of Freud's shift from the first to the second topography can be understood to involve his conceptualisation of repression as 'a process affecting ideas on the border between the systems Ucs. and Pcs. (Cs.)'.⁴⁷ In psychoanalysis repression is linked to repetition and Freud's account of the compulsion to repeat is located in 'Beyond the Pleasure Principle' where he argues that while the pleasure principle's aim is to reduce agitation and return to an inorganic state, the compulsion to repeat works against this.⁴⁸ In their commentary on Freud's work, Laplanche and Pontalis posit that the 'defining property of the symptom' can be located in the manner in which it reproduces 'in a more or less disguised way' elements of past conflict, and the ways that 'the repressed seeks to 'return' in the present, whether in the form of dreams, symptoms or acting-out'.⁴⁹

The temporal structure of deferred action, *nachträglichkeit* in the German original, *après coup* in the French translation, provides one way of understanding the distinction between conscious and unconscious, how one is separated from, but returns in the other. Laplanche has chosen the neologism 'afterwardsness' as his preferred English translation as he finds that this term is better able to embrace the double temporal direction – the 'to and fro' or back and forth – of retrogressive and progressive actions, as well as the processes of detranslation and retranslation he holds are central to the concept of *nachträglichkeit*.⁵⁰ According to Laplanche and Pontalis, it was Lacan who drew attention to this important concept of Freud's.⁵¹ In 'The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis' (1953) Lacan picks out the word *nachträglich* in Freud and discusses it in terms of turning points where the 'subject restructures himself'.⁵² Lacan suggests that the meaning of symptoms comes, not from the past, as we might expect, but from the future, placing emphasis on the

future anterior as the tense of what *will have been*,⁵³ the tense, with which as Lorens Holm writes, ‘Lacan characterises the self-reflection of subjectivity’.⁵⁴

It is perhaps in imagining the critical potential of the *will have been* in terms of city design and urban experience, as Holm does when considering Le Corbusier’s early snapshots as un-yet-fulfilled objects of desire,⁵⁵ that we find the most suggestive spot in which to consider architecture’s unconscious. A topographical approach offers a way of understanding the psyche spatially, if not materially, then certainly metaphorically. Such an approach allows us to think of the psyche in terms of spatial structures and processes, including repression and displacement, and at the same time, to consider architecture in psychoanalytic terms. A topological perspective goes a little further in providing an understanding of space, that, as Blum and Secor have described, is ‘at once psychic and material’,⁵⁶ and which positions ‘people, events, and places that are apparently separated in time and space *in the same place*’.⁵⁷ This bringing together of past, present and future spaces and times in one place is certainly something conjured through the psychic workings of memory and creative design processes which imagine the future through speculation, projection and proposition, but an encounter with the unexpected which re-connects relations and experiences understood as already-separated also has something of the psychoanalytic process about it: to come at a familiar place from an unanticipated direction that renders it strange, to misrecognise and then to let yourself be reconfigured by what you had forgotten and wear again its well-worn forgotten intricacies.

If architecture does have an unconscious, then maybe we get closest to what this might be, through those urban experiences, which restructure us through spatio-temporal processes, like *nachträglich* and what *will have been*. André Green in discussing what he describes as the ‘bidirectionality of language’, its movements backwards and forwards,⁵⁸ between the processes of anticipation and retrospection, might call this ‘*associative irradiation*’.⁵⁹ And as John Hendrix and Holm write in the introduction to this book: it is in retrospective anticipation that signification occurs, ‘at the ‘anchoring point’ (*point de capiton*), which is the point at which the

subject inserts itself into language as absence'. X marks a spot, where for Lacan signifier and signified come together, if only to produce the illusion that together their meaning is fixed, an impression, which in its temporal dimension, only makes sense afterwards. Is this X in my mind? In the labyrinth? In the ink of the image under my finger? In the ground, right here, over there? Is this X that X? When will that X be this X?

The future anterior is at work in this very essay. Originally written as an invited response to Mark Wallinger's Labyrinth, for a publication by Art on the Underground, just as the book was to go to press – all images commissioned, every grammatical error ironed out – I received an unexpected email. My essay had been dropped. The references to Freud and Lacan were unwelcome in not reflecting the artist's own influences. But no mention was made of my suggestion regarding the possibilities of storing nuclear waste under London and any role the then London Underground may have played in such plans. I was outraged, then upset, and finally somewhat baffled. I put the essay to one side, and when exiting the tube at Kennington walked up the 179 spiral steps to street level to avoid the red X in its spot. When a few months later I received an unexpected invitation to join a book on architecture and psychoanalysis and I sent Lorens and John an earlier version of this essay, along with a note on its provenance and current state of displacement, they offered to rescue 'X marks the spot', 'from the oblivion of a paranoid state'! So this writing exists somewhere in the relation between places and books, its X still carrying an imprint of what might have been.

¹ For a reproduction of the original image see Sigmund Freud, 'Zur Auffassung der Aphasien' (1891, Vienna), translated as Sigmund Freud, *On Aphasia: A Critical Study*, trans. E. Stengel (New York: International Universities Press, 1953), p. 77, fig. 8. An extract from the 1891 text including the drawing relabelled is reprinted as 'Appendix C: Word and Things', in Sigmund Freud, 'The Unconscious' (1915), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIV (1914–1916): On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement, Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works*, trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1957), pp. 159–215, p. 214.

² Sigmund Freud, 'Draft G. Melancholia' (1894), in *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887–1904*, trans. and ed. Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985), pp. 98–105, p. 100.

³ Sigmund Freud, 'Draft M. The Architecture of Hysteria, 25 May 1897' (1897), in *The Complete Letters*, pp. 246–8, p. 245.

⁴ Sigmund Freud, ‘On the Theory of Hysterical Attacks’, and ‘Sketches for the ‘Preliminary Communication’ of 1893’, in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume I (1886–1899): Pre-Psycho-Analytic Publications and Unpublished Drafts*, trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1966), pp. 145–54, p. 152.

⁵ Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis, *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (London: Karnac and The Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1973), p. 247.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁷ Sigmund Freud, ‘Project for a Scientific Psychology’ (1895), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume I (1886–1899)*, pp. 281–391, p. 299. This was first published in German in 1950, and then in English four years later. See editor’s notes p. 283.

⁸ ‘A qualification is called for here in the case of ‘W’ and ‘Er’. It will be found that these sometimes stand respectively for ‘Wahmehmungs**b**ild’ (‘perceptual image’) and ‘Erinnerungs**b**ild’ (‘mnemic image’) instead of for ‘Wahrnehmung’ and ‘Erinnerung’. The only way of deciding for certain on the correct expanded version depends on the fact that the longer terms are of neuter gender whereas the shorter ones are feminine. There is usually an article or an adjective to make the decision possible; but this is one of those cases in which the reader must depend on the editor’s judgement ...’. See editor’s note in Sigmund Freud, ‘Project for a Scientific Psychology’, p. 288. The word *Wahrnehmung* is translated into English as perception and *Erinnerung* as memory.

⁹ Joseph Breuer, ‘Theoretical Studies on Hysteria’ (1893), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume II (1893–1895): Studies on Hysteria*, trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1955), pp. 183–251, p. 188, note.

¹⁰ Sigmund Freud, ‘Letter 52’ (dated Vienna, 6 December 1896), in *Extracts From The Fliess Papers: The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume I (1886–1899)*, pp. 233–9, pp. 233–4.

¹¹ Lynn Gamwell, ‘The Role of Scientific Drawings in 19th- and Early 20th-Century Research’, in Lynn Gamwell and Mark Solms, *From Neurology to Psychoanalysis: Sigmund Freud’s Neurological Drawings and Diagrams of the Mind* (New York: Binghamton University Art Museum and State University of New York Press, 2006), pp. 4–11, pp. 7, 9, and 11.

¹² Mark Solms, ‘Sigmund Freud’s Drawings’, in Lynn Gamwell and Mark Solms, *From Neurology to Psychoanalysis*, pp. 12–18, p. 16. Solms dates this drawing as 17 December 1894.

¹³ See figures 1–3 in Sigmund Freud, ‘The Interpretation of Dreams’ (1900), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume V (1900–1901): The Interpretation of Dreams (Second Part) and On Dreams*, trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1953), pp. 339–628, pp. 537, 538 and 541.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 610.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 611.

¹⁶ Sigmund Freud, 'Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis' (1917), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVI (1916–1917): Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis (Part III)*, trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1963), pp. 241–463, 'Lecture IX: Resistance and Repression', pp. 286–302, p. 295. Diana Fuss and subsequently Charles Rice have picked up on Freud's use of this domestic architectural metaphor to describe the relationship between the ego, superego and id, with Rice making the interesting point that it 'doubles the domestic situation experienced by Freud's clientele'. See Diana Fuss, *The Sense of an Interior: Four Rooms and the Writers that Shaped Them* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 6, and Charles Rice, *The Emergence of the Interior: Architecture, Modernity, Domesticity* (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 39–40.

¹⁷ Sigmund Freud, 'Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis', p. 295.

¹⁸ Sigmund Freud, 'The Unconscious', pp. 159–215, pp. 173–6.

¹⁹ Sigmund Freud, 'The Unconscious', p. 180. See also Sigmund Freud, 'Repression' (1915), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIV (1914–1916)*, pp. 141–58.

²⁰ Sigmund Freud, 'The Ego and the Id' (1923), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIX (1923–1925): The Ego and the Id and Other Works*, trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1961), pp. 1–308, p. 56.

²¹ Ibid., p. 24.

²² Ibid.

²³ Sigmund Freud, 'The Dissection of the Psychical Personality' (1933), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XXII (1932–1936): New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis and Other Works*, trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1964), pp. 57–80, p. 72.

²⁴ Virginia Blum and Anna Secor, 'Psycho-topologies: Closing the Circuit between Psychic and Material Space', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29(6) (2011), pp. 1030–47, p. 1033.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 1031.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 1034.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ See Steve Pile, 'The Un(known) City ... or, an Urban Geography of what Lies Buried below the Surface', in Iain Borden, Jane Rendell, Joe Kerr and Alicia Pivaro (eds), *The Unknown City: Contesting Architecture and Social*

Space (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2001), pp. 263–79, for a much earlier psychoanalytic reflection on what lies under London.

²⁹ Virginia Blum and Anna Secor, ‘Psycho-topologies’, p. 1034.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1034–5.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 1030.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 1035.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1038.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1045.

³⁶ Darian Leader, ‘The Schema L’, in Bernard Burgoyne, *Drawing the Soul: Schemas and Models in Psychoanalysis* (London: Rebus Press, 2000), pp. 151–166, p. 155.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

³⁸ Virginia Blum and Anna Secor, ‘Psycho-topologies’, p. 1030.

³⁹ Darian Leader, ‘The Schema L’, p. 153.

⁴⁰ Bernard Burgoyne, ‘Introduction’, in Bernard Burgoyne, *Drawing the Soul: Schemas and Models in Psychoanalysis*, pp. 9–22, pp. 21–2, note 9.

⁴¹ Ellie Ragland and Dragan Milovanovic, ‘Introduction’, in Ellie Ragland and Dragan Milovanovic (eds), *Lacan: Topologically Speaking* (New York: Other Press, 2004), pp. xiii–xl, p. xxi.

⁴² Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, XXIII* (13.01.76), IV, 9. See <http://www.lacaninireland.com/web/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Book-23-Joyce-and-the-Sinthome-Part-1.pdf> [accessed June 2014].

⁴³ Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, XXIII* (18.11.75), IV, 2. See <http://www.lacaninireland.com/web/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Book-23-Joyce-and-the-Sinthome-Part-1.pdf> [accessed June 2014].

⁴⁴ Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, XXIII* (13.01.76), IV, 12. See <http://www.lacaninireland.com/web/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Book-23-Joyce-and-the-Sinthome-Part-1.pdf> [accessed June 2014].

⁴⁵ Ellie Ragland and Dragan Milovanovic, ‘Introduction’, pp. xiv–xv.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. xx.

⁴⁷ Sigmund Freud, ‘The Unconscious’, p. 180.

⁴⁸ Sigmund Freud, ‘Beyond the Pleasure Principle’ (1920), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVIII (1920–1922): Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works*, trans. from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1955), pp. 1–64, p. 8.

⁴⁹ Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis, *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*, p. 78.

⁵⁰ See Jean Laplanche, 'Notes on Afterwardsness' (1992), in John Fletcher (ed.), *Essays on Otherness* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 260–65, p. 265. These notes are based on a conversation between Jean Laplanche and John Fletcher that took place in 1991.

⁵¹ Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis, *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*, p. 111.

⁵² Jacques Lacan, 'The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis' (Paper delivered at the Rome Congress held at the Institute of Psychology at the University of Rome on 26 and 27 September, 1953), in Jacques Lacan, *Écrits: A Selection*, trans. Bruce Fink (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002), pp. 197–268, p. 257.

⁵³ Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book 1: Freud's Papers on Technique, 1953–54*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. John Forrester (New York: W.W. Norton, 1988), p. 158.

⁵⁴ Lorens Holm, *Brunelleschi, Lacan, Le Corbusier: Architecture, space and the construction of subjectivity* (London: Routledge, 2010), p. 58.

⁵⁵ Lorens Holm, *Brunelleschi, Lacan, Le Corbusier*, p. 70.

⁵⁶ Virginia Blum and Anna Secor, 'Psycho-topologies', p. 1030.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ André Green, *Illusions and Disillusions of Psychoanalytic Work*, trans. Andrew Weller (London: Karnac, 2011), p. 18.

⁵⁹ André Green, 'Freud's Concept of Temporality: Differences with Current Ideas', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 89(5) (2008), pp. 1029–39, p. 1038.