



Xth Meeting of the International Forums  
With International Encounter of the School  
of Psychoanalysts of the Forums of the Lacanian Field [F-SPFIF]

BARCELONA 13/16 September 2018

## PRE-TEXT 3

Rithée Cevasco

June 2017

The expression “advent” of the real raises some questions. What distinction can we make between “advent” in the singular or in the plural. Event(s) and why not “manifestations of the real”? How not to evoke Lacan’s counterpoint, frequently made, between “the symptom as event of the body” and anxiety as “advent of the real”?

I refer to what Colette Soler has pointed out, since it is to her that we owe the introduction of the subject for our Rendezvous. She has made clear on several occasions that advent has the sense of something expected and rather desirable. The term can thus take on a positive value.

I am putting forward the following question: what advent of the real can we expect from a psychoanalysis? Lacan spoke of his expectation of a possible advent at the end of the analysis: that of a new signifier, an invention – removing all pretension from this term – a signifier that comes from each one, and is thus, singular.

We find the expression “advents of the real” in *Television* and in “La Troisième”. However Lacan uses it in other contexts as well. To cite but one: “the advent of the real subject” that he mentions in the course of his Seminar VI, *Le désir et son interprétation...* a subject with which we are confronted in experience as “having already happened” [*déjà advenu*] in the past, having the same origin as its production.

As for “of the real” [*du réel*], I hear the “*du*” as a partitive in French. The use of the neuter article “*lo*” in Spanish is welcome here, it seems to me, for it avoids speaking “of THE real”.

And that is for several reasons.

In the first place, it seems to me that we are referring to a “field of the real”, thus larger than the real circumscribed by analytic practice: the real of science, of art, of politics and even sometimes the real of the jouissance of the living being.

Thus the term “real” is bearer of a differential sense. It depends on the practices that circumscribe (a term that could be refined with Borromean writing) it. Whether it is a matter of elucidated practices or not, they are always grasped within a particular discourse. We approach the real as that which excludes all sense. Without any doubt! But could we speak of a real that could not be circumscribed by a practice/discourse? The real, in this or that field, through this or that practice, is circumscribed by the impossible (Freud perceived this when he spoke of the impossible practices of governing, educating and analysing). The real could thus be approached more precisely as that which constitutes the proper limit to all practices and all discourses. Bumping against these limits could induce a movement towards other discursive turning points, the real being revealed in the interstices of the “round” of one discourse to the other.

This is valid for science itself for it does not abandon its impossibles. The ideology of science alone – not the order of its reasons – in its alliance with the capitalist discourse is at the origin of the promotion of the idea that “everything is possible” in the market of the illusions of consumption.

In addition, Borromean writing allows us to circumscribe the real at stake in the field of psychoanalysis. We can define it on the basis of the One (that of number, obviously not that of the unification of two into one).

There is a double writing of the real in Lacan. The One of the real as a simple ring of string (the minimum expression of which is called a “trivial knot” in the language of knots) equivalent to that of the symbolic and of the imaginary, each trivial knot having its consistency, its hole and its ex-sistence. The ring of string is then the “most eminent representation of the One, in the sense that it encloses but a hole”,<sup>1</sup> Lacan says in *Encore*, at the very start of his adventure with Borromean knots.

He also affirms with insistence that “his knot” is real. This is no longer a matter of the trivial knot, but of the Borromean knot, formed with a minimum of three rings of string, and beyond that, the knot of the sinthome (with an “h”) in so far as that accomplishes a function of knotting.

So it concerns the structure of the real of the *parlêtre* (a real that Lacan tries to write outside any “erring” of the metaphor, and which, in so far as it is real, cannot be considered as a model that would be applied to ...).

Thus the real is one of the three *dit-mensions*<sup>2</sup> of the *parlêtre*, which, with the symbolic and the imaginary, are the generic elements of every speaking being. But the real of the knot is supported by the modality of knotting, by the sinthome (with an “h”): singular real, proper to each one, so one by one.

---

<sup>1</sup> Translator’s addition: *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XX, On Feminine Sexuality, The Limits of Love and Knowledge, Encore 1972-1973*, ed. J-A Miller, trans. B. Fink, New York and London, W.W. Norton & Company, p. 127.

<sup>2</sup> Translator’s note: “*Dit-mension*” introduces “*dit*” (“say”) – into the word “dimension”.

Without any doubt the clinic constructs typologies, for that is its function. But this is a clinic that must be forgotten with every new case, the orientation by the real aiming at the singular proper to each analysand.

So the real is conjugated with the One and with the “at least three...”, thereby removing the two which contradicts the axiom of exclusion (there is no sexual relation that can be written). Only the analytic discourse allows it to be unveiled, there where all the other discourses veil it.

What “advent of the real” could we expect from psychoanalysis that is not bound to this impossible real of the sexual relation? That is to say, under the form of the letter of the symptom or as a manifestation of affects and, primarily, the as privileged affect that anxiety constitutes.

We know that the impossible real specific to analysis is situated in the negativities of the structure of language: not meta-language, not the universe of discourse, not the Other of the Other on the plane of language. We could add: not truth which is but half-said, and also taking into consideration the “not-all” of the object *a*, which is necessarily partial. There are statements of “there is not” anterior to the formulation, in 1967, of the axiom that concerns the negativity of the real of sex: “No sexual relation that can be written” (“the great secret of psychoanalysis”, Lacan tells us). Jouissance and language are thus knotted in its formulas of negativity. Negativities that on the other hand find their positive responses in *sinthomatic* (with an “h”) variations which, in responding to them, function in a supplementary way [*suppléance*].

Based on the practice of psychoanalysis, “advents of the real” pose a question: are the variations of the *sinthomatic* (with an “h”) solution differentiated according to the modalities of sexual jouissance: phallic and not-all phallic – this jouissance other than phallic ... if it existed? The other jouissance is not to be confused with the jouissance of the Other... which does not exist and which is only manifested in the imaginary of fantasmatic significations, incarnated in the primordial figures of the Father and The Woman.

Can the choice of sex (liberated from the fantasmatic signification of jouissance) be awaited as an advent of the real of sexuated jouissance? If we speak of choice, there is an expectation of something new that would happen [*adviendrait*], different from the symptom of jouissance that has already happened [*advenu*] and is fixed from childhood in its double-sided “traumatic” dimension: the entry of sexual trauma and the trauma of language in coalescence.

The Freudian imperative, often commented upon, “*Wo ...war...werden*”<sup>3</sup> – I have put ellipses, on purpose, at the “locus” of what was already and what must come to be [*advenir*] – to echo something of the order of “advents of the real” aimed at by the politics of a psychoanalysis oriented to the real.

---

<sup>3</sup> The well-known Freudian expression is “*Wo es war, soll ich werden*”.

These advents emerge as the effect of a saying (neither deduced nor induced, but inferred based on the statements of the analysand in the course of the treatment).<sup>4</sup> This “saying” that remains forgotten behind what is said.

With regard to the sinthome (with an “h”) as function of Borromean knotting, could we expect a possible choice in the treatment? Colette Soler<sup>5</sup> makes this suggestion: if there is a choice, if we are not condemned to a destiny already traced by the forced choices of the formations of childhood symptoms of jouissance, this choice would be situated without doubt at the level of the sinthome (with an “h”). So that is what could be expected in an analysis.

This is what we question as a consequence, and in a manner that concerns us particularly with regard to the “advent” of the sinthome (with an “h”) of the analyst and his relation to the real. We can question ourselves on the whys of this choice, a classic subject studied under the forms of the “advent of the desire of the analyst”.

It is a saying of this order that can be inferred in the *dispositif* of the Pass and, consequently it would accompany a nomination of AS [Analyst of the School].

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>6</sup>

The formulas of sexuation invite us to make this step starting with this “something” that can circulate<sup>7</sup> between these four positions: of the necessary and of the possible which are in contradiction (foreclosed negation: yes or no) and of the contingent and the impossible which confront us with an undecidable (yes or no; yes and no; yes, but not all ... it is that, but not all ... nearer to what would be conflicting negation in French grammar).

I want to be precise in what I am saying: in this context it is not a matter of once again picking up the old debate about the specificity of feminine writing, for writings by women, together with their testimonies of the Pass, are not necessarily those from which can be expected a saying that is “not-all”. Nor is it about the “feminisation” of

---

<sup>4</sup> In *L'Étourdit*, Lacan situates the saying [*dire*] as the effect of a cut. With Borromean writing, he puts the accent on a saying that knots and names. However, later (Seminar 24, *L'Insu*) he again takes up the function of the cut on one or more toruses made from rounds of string through the operation of their possible reversal.

<sup>5</sup> In her book *Lacan, lecteur de Joyce* (Paris, PUF, 2015).

<sup>6</sup> It seems to me that our colleague Florencia Farias defended a doctoral thesis in which she approached this problem. Unfortunately I have not had the opportunity to read it. Certainly other colleagues in our community will have had access to it and this will be an important reference on this question.

<sup>7</sup> See Chapter XIV of Seminar ...*ou pire*, the class at St Anne on “The knowledge of the psychoanalyst” of June 1, 1972. Lacan mentions something of the order of a circulation (which evokes without doubt the “circle” of discourse) induced by the unstable logic that grounds the logical partition of sexual jouissance between jouissance that is all phallic or not-all phallic.

the analytic world or of the whole world, and still less – it goes without saying – of a supposed “feminisation” of the male analyst.

It is about the circulation between the left side and the right side of the formulas of sexuation that shatter any anchorage in the “*touthomanie*”<sup>8</sup> of the universal norm (a male norm, Lacan tells us) and of inferring the Saying of the “true hole” of the structure of the *parlêtre*.

Every Saying is existential and contingent, but the Saying of The One, the saying of the One-sinthome (with an “h”) can come in various forms according to other modalities of sayings. It is not about affirming that there would be a ONE-SAYING-OTHER, of this other jouissance that responds to a logic of the not-all, for we would certainly return to the closing of the discourse about sexuality that would lead once more to the “two” that is the complement of the relation that does not exist.

So the question could be formulated thus: what is the connection between the ONE-Saying of the sinthome (with an “h”) and the not-all?

I have simply wished to raise some possible stopping points among the multiple questions that we summon with the subject “advents of the real” for our next Rendezvous in Barcelona.

We do not expect the advent of the messiah from an analysis! On the other hand, can we not expect from it the advent of an ethic (it would also be emptied of all pretention) of a saying of the not-all to which it invites us? Advent that could have effects beyond our practice if we succeed (vain hope?) in producing an echo of our discourse in other “advents” of the real that are announced rather from the side of a totalitarianism of the all. More particularly, in the political field ... and that without dwelling on the capitalist discourse, promoter of certainly non-traditional forms of “*touthomanie*”, but not ceasing to extol a universe of the not- impossible, associated with the all-powerful ideology of science which does not take responsibility for the consequences of its treatment – indubitably efficacious – of the real.

June 2017

*Translated by Susan Schwartz*

---

<sup>8</sup> Translator’s note: “*touthomanie*” is an “invention” of the author’s: “*tout*” meaning “all” in the sense of “all phallic”; “h” for “*Homme*” meaning “Man” as in the left side of the formulas of sexuation; “*manie*” meaning “mania”. Thus: the all phallic mania of masculine jouissance.