VII Encontro Internacional da IF-EPFCL VII Encuentro Internacional de la IF-EPFCL VII Rendez-vous International de l'IF-EPFCL VII *Rendez-vous* Internazional dll'IF-EPFCL VII International Meeting of the IF-SPFLF

O que responde o psicanalista? Ética e clínica ¿Qué responde el psicoanalista? Ética y clínica Qué répond le psychanalyste? Ethique et clinique Che cosa responde lo psicoanalista? Etica e clinica What does the psychoanalyst respond? Ethics and clinics



# VIIth Meeting of the IF-SPFLF WHAT DOES THE PSYCHOANALYST RESPOND? ETHICS AND CLINICS

July 2012, 6th – 9th

## www.rio2012if-epfcl.org.br | rio2012ifepfcl@gmail.com

**PRELIMINAR 4:** 

#### WHAT IS TO ANSWER?

### **Gabriel Lombardi**

Before reflecting upon *what* the analyst responds, about the object or the statement of his response, I propose to consider what is *to answer*. The word could not be better chosen. We see converge in it since the very immemorial times of the Indo-European languages, the saying as an act, the guarantee that is offered when pronouncing it, the freedom to give or to accept that guarantee, the responsibility that in the end pertains to the being only for the fact of saying.

Thus in the Odyssey, Homer's literary journey, at the time of beginning a dangerous enterprise for him and for his people, the hero makes a liquid offering destined to Zeus or to Poseidon; *spéndō* is the libation and the invocation to the desires – the gods of power and of the sea. Like this in Aulus-Gellius, when the father commits to give his daughter in matrimony, he says "*spondeo*", and the same says the suitor. This exchanged guarantee gives birth to the sense of *respondere*, well established already in Latin language.

Rio de Janeiro, 06 – 09 | 07 | 2012 www.rio2012if-epfcl.org.br e-mail: rio2012ifepfcl@gmail.com



Emile Benveniste, acute inquisitor of the Indo-European institutions' vocabulary, explains that *and-swaru* in Germanic, *swaran* in Gothic, and *answer* in English are equivalent to *swear*, founding saying of responsibility, be it contractual or absolute, be it written or merely said – made of saying.

*Responsum* is also the saying of the god's interpreters, particularly the haruspex, that before the risky act give the security in return for the offering. The oracle is the true answer because in it the signs of randomness replace the knowledge that there is not at the moment of choosing, when saying *yes* or *no* to the calling of desire must adjust to a real without rule.

The religious aroma that gets to us with the *responso* for the dead and the Christian libation does not inhibit us to use, like Joyce, the resonances of this multi-linguistic beam for our desire and for our specific journey. What is the answering of the analyst, in these times in which the heroes, the faithful and the naughty have been substituted by psychotics, neurotics, perverts? What is to respond in the *oraculum* opened by the Freudian method, that place where the urgency and the plead are no longer answered by God or a prophet, but by the mere desire of a haruspex that bases its interpretation in the signifying guts of the being opened by the symptom?

The fundamental rule allows the analyst to embody the essential structure of a true answer, given now to the subject *\$* of the symptom, that divided way of the being, that delaying the existence resisting the decision where the real is found. If, as recently pointed out by Antonio Quinet, the analyst is invested of a mask, of a semblant, of an enigmatic saying, also of silence and of unexpected cuts, it is because the analytic answer is made in the place where to what urges, of knowing, only desire answers.



The analyst's response to what presses does not close a question, it guarantees that a process of personal search, of fishing in the unconscious river, could be carried out. Paying with his person, the analyst propitiates the unfolding of the word in a subject gagged by repression, unresolved before the threshold, inhibited in the action. Consequently, our conception of psychoanalysis replaces the sequence

QUESTION OF THE ANALYZAND → ANALYST'S ANSWER,

for this other one:

#### ANALYST'S ANSWER → CONSEQUENCES

Those consequences may be merely associative (interpretation of the interpretation), transferential (the paradoxical, divided act of the analyzand \$), and also answers of the being in analysis, individual ones, events that extract the saying from the forgetfulness to which knowledge relegates it. And among these the last answer can come, the analyzand's final satisfaction to what urges, the one that *satis* acts, when saying *enough!* to the analytic process. Then analysis happens between that inaugural *spondeo* of the analyst, and that *spondeo* of the analyzand's subjective destitution.

If what urges has found its singular hour already, if analysis and luck (*l'heur*) conceded him the destine of desire, how to recognize it? Therapeutic, didactic and properly analytic effects, liberating ones, cannot be measured from the Freudian device, since the analyst is anchored in the efficacy of his oracular position, desiring without knowing, foreteller that has already produced the sequel of a decision in that who came for an answer. The analyst has been the *satisdator*, the one who guarantees, the one who became the guarantor of making that satisfaction happen sometime, paying with his intimate judgment for not being able to predict time, nor the way, or the finality. From there his uncertainty, if he is an AME, when designating a passeur.



In our School we answer this question with the device of the pass, shifting the problem to the function of the passeur. Instead of his acknowledgement, we hope that his unconscious sensitivity or reactivity will operate to the passant's decision, choice that in him is usually surrounded by a new signature, a personal meteorology, declassified reasons, interpreting affects –enigmatic affects, citation affects. We do not expect knowledge, but echoes of an elective answer that as such is radically foreign to knowledge, saying of the being to the being in the straight domain of the didactic of psychoanalysis, whose success is not guaranteed beforehand, the *satisdator* lacks here.

We also hope that through it some answers will be transmitted to us, hystoric ones used to say Lacan. How did the effects of the signifier (\$ and *a*) get separated, those effects usually impede the subjective destitution required at the being's vestibule?

All the efforts to glimpse what is at stake in the first pass, that often finds its opportunity in the temporal gap of the end of the analysis, could result deceiving if we do not admit that answer that now pertains the analized to give *sponte*<sup>1</sup> in that spontaneity that is at the base of the Lacanian real, the real without law, in that lag between *cairós* and *chrónos* that does not even depend on the auto-legislation of a conscious or unconscious will,.

Consequently, along with didactic and therapeutic results we can situate in our ethical horizon other merely analytic ones, which for example open sublimatory ways, that orient what urges by a less autistic unconscious, less lost in terms of the desire of the Other – desire in which the interesting bases itself upon, the Lacanian inter*esse*.

<sup>1</sup> Sponte, absolute ablative of the noun spons, spontis, "spontaneously". According to Varrón proceeds from the same etymological beam that spondeo. Heidegger follows it, Ernout and Meillet don't deny it, nor do they consider it certain. In my argumentation this coincidence is opportune.



In the ethical horizon of our practice there is the parousia of a being that is satisfied in another way than in the symptom – where drive and desire are contradictory, leaving the matter unsolved-. The preontological unconscious, imposed interdiction to a being sentenced to indetermination and to inopportune repetition, in the analysis passes to an ethical statue, an ought to be, an imperative that may be resolved, may fnd its determination in act when finishing the analysis. The notion of answer in itself implies the causality by freedom.

Thanks to which, the real unconscious, the analyzed unconscious, does not reduce us to the idiotic jouissance of *lalangue*, but in turn destines jouissance to desire, makes a *Triebschicksal*<sup>2</sup> for long delayed. The real unconscious is oracular unconscious, reader of desire that responds in a sort of spontaneity that yet is not merely *freedom from*, negative freedom, but *freedom to*, remaining open to...

The desire, that we made ours, of shedding some light onto that obscure decision of the being that consists in assuming the position of the analyst, should not lead us to stamp with devices, methods and reasons on what that assumption has of satisfactory answer, which does not verify the psychoanalytic guarantee with lies, already made phrases or sagging mathems, but with the assumption, in the Freudian way, of that augury that since always intervenes in the exercise of the freedom to participate in the city or in the battle.

> Buenos Aires, January 2012. Translation: Gabriela Zorzutti

<sup>2</sup> Lacan gives an interesting version of the Freudian Triebschicksale in his class of March 18th of 1980.