

the unconscious,  $x = y$  and  $x \neq y$ .' The dream gives the unconscious representation as it is, in what we are obliged to call, when speaking of it, its fusion, its indistinction – which, for all that, do not result in sheer chaos. And this is not the result of operations coming afterward, blurring figures that were originally separate, clear and distinct; instead it results from the being of the psyche which is the genesis of representations, in which, perhaps in this case, 'my friend R.' is formed starting from and in relation to 'my uncle' – but in general, at any rate, all 'separate' representations that waking logic necessarily distinguishes are certainly formed starting from and in relation to a minute number of archaic representations which were the world for the psyche, which have been separated during the long work of the formation of the individual for the ends of awake existence and which in turn refer us back to the enigma of an original representing-representation. What causes a problem here is not this fusion and lack of distinction, even less is it the contradictions that are implied for waking logic – or better yet, for identity logic for all that is awake is far from identity. Instead the problem lies in this separation and its very possibility, the origin of the schema of discreteness and its partial hold on what is. Once we find ourselves within it, it is not so much the imaginary-representative magma of the unconscious that is the inexhaustible source of astonishment, but rather the schema of discreteness, the idea of identity, the relative effectiveness of the separation.

Representation – whether unconscious or conscious – is, in fact, unanalysable (without thereby being simple). Every decomposition into elements is here a provisional artifact, every positing of separating-unifying schemata an awkward attempt to recover a being with an indefinite number of dimensions by means of a few scraps that have been ripped out of it. Representation has no borders, and any separation that is introduced into it can never be held to be pertinent – or rather, it will always be certain to be non-pertinent in some essential aspect. What exists there refers back to what does not exist there, or to what calls for it; but it does not call for it under the auspices of a determined and formulable rule, as a theorem calls for its consequences, even if these are infinite, a number its successors, a cause its effects, even if these are innumerable. The abyss that separates the indefiniteness of representation from the highest order of mathematical infinity is still greater than that separating mathematical infinity from an ordinary number. It is an abyss of being, not a difference in cardinality. That which is not in a representation can still be there, and there is no limit to this, no *peras*.

This is also the reason why – or rather: this is only another way of saying that – the actual, essential 'relation' between representations, what is called association, is not a *relation*, properly speaking; it is neither a relating of terms external to one another, nor the logical disimplication of what would have meaning only by being taken together. So-called 'free' association, such as one attempts to induce it