



Xth Meeting of the International Forums  
With international Encounter of the School  
of Psychoanalysis of the Forums of the Lacanian Field [IF-SPFLF]

BARCELONA 13/16 September 2018

## PRE-TEXT 10

---

### The inferences of the “not-all” in the clinic and in the enunciation

**Carmen Lafuente, AE of the EPFCL**

*“You have satisfied me little-man. You realised, it is what was missing”<sup>1</sup>  
Jacques Lacan. *L’Étourdit**

For this work I have taken as a starting point the following paragraph of Ritheé Cevazco’s pretext about the “saying not-all”.

*“In considering the “advents of the real” in an analysis, could we not question ourselves also about the modalities, or modulations of the “not-all” in the traversing of the impossibilities of signification, of sense, of the sexual relation (according to *L’Étourdit*) and, very particularly, of what a saying of “not-all” infers with regard to this jouissance that is other than phallic jouissance.”<sup>2</sup>*

I propose to reflect in this pre-text on the possibility of a “saying not all”, and its consequences in the analytic clinic and at the end of an analysis.

### The sayings of the sexes

As we know in the unconscious there is only one sexual reality and consequently analytic practice imposes the *maldicción*<sup>3</sup> of sex. But if we

---

<sup>1</sup> Translators’s translation

<sup>2</sup> From original translation of pre-text by Susan Schwarz

<sup>3</sup> Lacan uses this term which has a phonetic double meaning in French between maldición (curse) and machodicción (male-diction)

follow Lacan in his formulas of sexuation we find at least two ways of relating to sex. How can we address this complex reality?

If on the one hand the unconscious knows nothing about the other sexual reality, that of the right hand of the formulas, this might lead us to think that the “not all” part is left out of an analysis. If phallic jouissance may only be accessed via the unconscious then the manifestations of jouissance Other, which are not inconsiderable, would not enter into an analysis.

But the unconscious does not only exist as knowledge, but also as the saying which is inferred from the statements of the subject. Colette Soler reminds us in her magnificent article about the sexed saying<sup>4</sup>, that Lacan says in *Encore*:

“...only in the saying can the differential incidence of its jouissance be found, as the saying is the incarnation of the difference of sex. It is introduced as a third between truth and the real. The signified of the saying is the *ex-istancia*, and the different incarnations of the sayings of the sexes are left to be specified and to question that which may exist of the saying on the side of the Other sexual reality.”

In that case, would it be possible to speak of a saying “not-all” in spite of the fact that Lacan repeatedly tells us that the “not-all” is beyond the signifier and that nothing can be said of it? We remember that in *Encore* he highlights the fact that women analysts say nothing of their jouissance and that this could be attributed to the structure itself.

Lacan does not mention that there could be a saying Other, but the question is to know how the Other in the inscription of language passes to the act of the saying. In *L'Étourdit*,<sup>5</sup> by way of the figure of the *surmoitié*, he mentions that for females, ways of their saying *ex-ist*. In women then, there is not only one way of the saying, there are at least two; given that we can account for that of the phallus and that of the barred A with which the woman has more of a relationship, by nature of the fact that she is Other because of her jouissance. We can find manifestations of this saying of the *surmoitié* in the clinic and in the enunciation.

---

<sup>4</sup> Hétérité 6, Revue de psychanalyse, *Les réalités sexuelles et l'inconscient*, 2007: "Le dire, sexué ou L'Autre réalité sexuelle"(The sexed saying or the Other sexual reality)

<sup>5</sup> Lacan, J.: *L'Étourdit*. Otros Escritos. Ed. Du Seuil

## **Inferences of the “not-all”**

In what follows, I will highlight some of the references which have seemed to me particularly prominent in helping us to elucidate the question of the inferences of the “not-all”.

To begin with, we can't leave out mentioning the ecstasy of the mystics which Lacan develops in *Encore*. I also remember references worked on by Colette Soler some years ago in relation to Ysé<sup>6</sup>, the protagonist of Paul Claudel's book, who Lacan evokes in Seminar VIII and relates to the “not all”. Colette Soler evokes an annihilating negativity which co-relates to an absolutization of love. The same text makes reference to the poor wife of Leon Bloy<sup>7</sup> which we also find in Seminar VIII .

## **The opposition**

Another proposition of this saying “not-all” is that developed by the same author in the article mentioned about *The sexed saying or the Other sexual reality*. It deals with the opposition. The saying of the “not-all” passes through the ways of “this isn't it” or “this isn't everything”:

*It is a non-recognition of the only way which is not always enunciated and which is sometimes confirmed in silence. More than a negation it is a formula which serves as entrenchment.*<sup>8</sup>

The author clarifies that this no is not that of hysteria or that which is outside of discourse in psychosis. It is the mediating *hétérité*, always neighbourly and sometimes even homely which inhabits the collective fantasies that are plagued with fairies and witches. It is entrenched otherness which is nevertheless attached to the phallic and to the object which Lacan designated with the term *confín*.

---

<sup>6</sup> Soler, C.: *Le pas tout*. La Cause Freudienne. 1991.

<sup>7</sup> Bloy, L. *La mujer pobre*. Alfama Ed.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. See 4 above. Translator's translation.

We mustn't forget that the saying is always saying no to the statements, suspending what the statement has of truthfulness, as it doesn't matter what there is of truth, as the truth of the real cannot be said.

### **The non-discordancial**

The emptiness of the Other gives a particular style to its relationship with the phallus which is sensitive in the enunciation of female subjects. Lacan illustrates this with a grammatical figure taken from Damourette and Pichon<sup>9</sup>. This is the so-called the *non-discordancial* and is different to the non-forcluded negation in French. This *non-discordancial* can be used in French and also in Catalan. An example would be the phrase: *Je crains qu'il ne vienne pas*. In the *Je crains qu'il ne vienne* there is a vacillation represented by the *no*; we don't know if the subject fears whether he comes or not. There is an ambiguity.

G Morel's work<sup>10</sup> was based on the way in which Lacan re-used the term *discordancial* to speak about the enunciation in feminine subjects and of a particular position of the subject which would be in permanent discordance, as signalled by the unfolding of *jouissance* in the feminine subject. Lacan exemplifies with the different works of Marivaux. In *The Transvestite Prince* the feminine discourse is found in the following kind of manifestation: *je ne sais*, which is a barely veiled confession and which can be in opposition to *Je ne sais pas* which is the rejection of hysterical knowledge. The veiled confession has a relationship to the half saying, with the *not-all*. In *The Transvestite Prince*, the heroine, Hortensia, is not in a hysterical position, but rather in a position which we might call feminine. She accepts what comes her way, she does not shrink from it, she accepts the *tyche*. There is however an oscillation, the part of the absence which which slides around in the discourse, due to the fact that she is structurally divided, she isn't everything for him and she says to him, perhaps without knowing: "*I wouldn't dare...I wouldn't agree...I wouldn't know*"

### **Indetermination**

---

9. Edouard PICHON & Jacques DAMOURETTE, *Des mots à la pensée. Essai de grammaire de la langue française*, éd. d'Artrey.

<sup>10</sup> Morel, G.: *Oedipe aujourd'hui. Séminaire théorique*. 1997

In Camila Vidal's pass testimony<sup>11</sup>, we find a symptom which allows us to circumscribe something of feminine jouissance. We read there: *I have always had problems remembering proper nouns, not only those of people, but also of streets, venues, book titles...a symptom which has put me in embarrassing situations...complicating my everyday life.*

*The result of all this was the sensation that I never felt aware of things and couldn't be specific, I always felt I was walking a tightrope.*

*From early on I rejected discovering an explanation for this forgetfulness as the enormity of the symptom led to a rejection of whatever kind of interpretation in the style of the Freudian Mr Signorelli, and so I spent years attributing to others this fading desire which was attributed to myself....*

*"It is as if I don't want to submit myself to something of the symbolic" I said one day to my analyst after having related an unpleasant incident which had happened to me with someone close...given that it is in fact so simple to meet in a particular café in a particular street, rather than go through all this roundabout hassle which leaves me in a state of indetermination and disagreement. Simplicity is for others whilst I am left in another place. This indetermined permanence, outside of phallic jouissance, this lack of a limit which surrounds proper nouns doesn't leave much space for the decided desire given that all strong desire is limited and concrete."*

### **The mother-daughter ravage and the surmoitié<sup>12</sup>**

Some questions which I would like to develop and which I take from my own analysis are the mother-daughter ravage and the *surmoitié* as manifestations of this Other part and the way they have been disassembled in my analysis. The ravage as it is mentioned by Lacan in the University of Yale conferences, is a devastating relationship between mother and daughter which consists of a state of reproach and disharmony between them. It is not a structure which is generalizable to all the relations of a mother with a daughter. It is not a structural element and, in treating it as a manifestation of Other jouissance, it is contingent. This mother-daughter ravage manifests in some women and it denotes a difficulty in assuming a feminine position, with manifestations in the body, and in their relationships.

In her book, *What Lacan Said about Women: A Psychoanalytic Study*, Colette Soler says:

---

<sup>11</sup> Vidal C.: Niebla. Pliegues 7. FFCL-España

<sup>12</sup> Lafuente C.: Espacio Escuela. La caída de la Surmoitié. Web del FPB- EPFCL

“Beyond this right-claiming dimension is there not a request made to the mother to reveal the ultimate secret? Not only of the feminine agalma, which is always phallic, but also of the jouissance which *ex-ists* but which is ignored by the Other and which therefore leads, as a consequence, to a woman’s appeal to the Other.”<sup>13</sup>

In the clinic there are examples of rigorously conducted cures in which the ravage makes its entrance. This testifies to a structural, clinical real which must be treated. In my own case, after my previous analysis, a transferential super-ego remainder was left which manifested itself as an inhibition in presenting myself for the pass, and in which I made the Other guilty. The mother daughter ravage appeared in this symptom in which the daughter blames her lack on the maternal Other, a symptom which on occasion manifests in the transference and which takes a ravaged form. An interpretation began to unravel this subjective complaint. “This is infantile” said the analyst, which allowed me to understand that I had perpetuated this daughter’s demand of the mother, who she made responsible for her lack, and the neurotic hope collapsed.

### **La surmoitié**

In L’Étourdit, Lacan speaks to us of the *surmoitié*, a neologism, hybrid between *surmoi* and *ma moitié* which is how soulmate or Adam’s rib is designated in French. With regard to her, he tells us that she doesn’t let herself be dominated by the super-ego as easily as the universal conscience. It isn’t the Freudian super-ego linked to the prohibition of phallic jouissance but on the contrary, it is a feminine voice which propels the jouissance.

It is very important to be aware of the logic of the *not-all* in analyses and in the conclusion of the cure as it is a way to treat the super-ego which is the push towards jouissance.

In my case, this dimension of the *surmoitié* took the form of equivocation. In my analysis I related my mother’s death and its tragic circumstances which generated an appalling sense of guilt in me. When she died I spent those days in my parent’s house although I wanted to go and sleep with my ex-boyfriend who she hadn’t approved of. The day of her demise, before I left home, she spoke to me from a distance and from behind a blind: “Carmen, make the bed”. I didn’t see her, she didn’t see me, but I heard her.

---

<sup>13</sup> Translator’s translation

The analyst stressed the AS<sup>14</sup>, which surprised me greatly, as I had always related the super ego to my father. My mother was adored, idealized. But now there appeared another aspect of the idealization, the devouring super-ego.

This new meaning which appeared, the ace, the best, leaves an opening to other possible meanings and produces the emergence of a new signifier outside of the chain, a master signifier, a signifier of jouissance. With respect to the interpretation “haz/AS” we have the double side of the ways of the saying. The “haz” which is a call to have, clearly phallic and the “AS” which may be considered as the transmission of something else, the being best in relation to the feminine. But it is articulated with guilt and could be interpreted in the following way: “If I enjoy, she dies”. It was necessary to dismantle this figure of the impulse towards jouissance, of the “Haz/as”, to reach the awareness that there is not an Other of the Other, to the incompleteness of the deadly separation.

At the end of the analysis, the sense of this “as” being depleted, it would be left as a letter identical to itself but beyond meaning, a littoral between the symbolic and the real, to which it set a limit.<sup>15</sup> It marks the fall of the *surmoitié* for the subject.

N Bousseyroux<sup>16</sup> points out that Lacan declines the forms of the saying of the *surmoitié* which are inconsistent, undemonstrable, unspeakable and refute the Other although they might also not bar the Other and so complete her. The super-ego's voice, as much as if it completes or if it refutes the Other is *de-consistent*. Even more so if we take into account the saying of women which follows the logical course of the “*not-all*” and inscribes itself beyond the Oedipus and hence beyond the Freudian super-ego.

### **What must be considered**

The paradox of the feminine unfolding of the jouissance makes that which is more visible, the relationship to the phallus, to be neither the only nor the most important consideration. The rock of castration is sifted by the relationship to this jouissance Other which in spite of being less visible

---

<sup>14</sup> Homophone in Spanish between *haz*(make) and *as*(ace)

<sup>15</sup> Thanks for this aportación go to Trinidad Sánchez de Biedma

<sup>16</sup> Bousseyroux, N. :Real de mujeres. Pliegues de la Biblioteca. FFCL-España

doesn't stop having effects. One mustn't look for its manifestations in the unconscious but rather in the saying, in a jouissance which infiltrates the enunciation and which may also have effects in the phallic dimension which is the determination of the subject.

The jouissance Other, supplementary to the phallic, is not a lottery. It provokes anxiety, it doesn't identify, it de-personalises.

The analyst cannot deny this Other sexual reality which cannot be repressed and is not always calmed by love which we know is difficult to find and conserve in our current society. We must become aware of this real of the feminine position which is sometimes confused with hysterical symptoms or psychosis leading to a false ending of the cure.

The analyst mustn't retreat in the face of this unyielding real which manifests, perhaps more for the *not-all* than for anyone else, and is frequently accompanied by anxiety and pain, but which must be considered and addressed in order to be able to accompany a subject to the end.

**Translated by Richard Barrett**