



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

BARCELONA 13/16 September 2018

PRE-TEXT 9

REGARDING THE REAL ADVENTED IN ANALYSIS

Elisabete Thamer

« *Deviens qui tu es, quand tu l'auras appris* »
Γένει' οἷος ἐσσι μαθών.
"Werde, welcher du bist, erfahren."
Pindare, *Pythiques*, II, vers 72

I return to a question posed by Rithée Cervazco and Colette Soler, in Pre-texts 3 and 7 respectively, which I would reformulate in the following way: Would there be an advent, or rather a re-advent, *in* and through *an* analysis of the real. If this is so, how would this happen in a speech practice. What are the consequences?

In the report of the seminar "...or worse", Lacan affirms that the analytic procedure, invented by Freud, is a process "through which the real touches the real"ⁱⁱ. In that case, if the analytic procedure is, according to Lacan, essentially that of free associationⁱⁱⁱ, we must admit, that this speech practice includes, in its own exercise, the possible advent of a certain real.

Lacan's affirmation can be clarified by the matheme of the analytic discourse which it articulated, and which includes two impossibilities. The first, that of the "real which touches", is written in the upper part of the matheme, between a and S, and describes the analytic process: the object cause of the speech of the analyzand which cannot however state its object or eliminate the division of the subject. The other, that of the "real touched" by the analysis is written in the lower part with the barrier which separates truth and production (S2//S1) The S1 is considered to be the first signifier, master signifier or *lettre jonie*, it will not be unified with the S2 which is considered to be the second, or to be knowledge. This shows us that the analytic discourse in itself is installed in the heart of the experience, the possible conditions through which a particular real advents in and through the analysis.

Is this essential for the end of the analysis?

In the seventies, Lacan redefined the symptom and the unconscious, relocating its hard core towards the real: “the symptom is the real”^{iv}. The interest of this change of direction is therefore clinical and it principally refers to the end of analysis and the pass. How could an analysis be successful in “touching the real” without a new advent of the real which is this time advented in the cure?

Obviously an analysis cannot re-edit or return to an advent of the previous real. Nor can it raise that which is *Urverdrängt* or liberate access to *the* letter of the coalescing symptom, which, by definition seems to me impossible. What it entails is that the analyzand can reach a place of apprehending, through the analysis, that the real is what is at the heart of his symptom, as it is in other formations of the unconscious. There is not a finished analysis in which the analyzand hasn't been able to experience (and prove) that the bedrock of his unconscious is real, including the decyphering of the refractory symptom.

This is not an easy task because the speaking being has had the propensity to make sense of everything which happens to him, to decipher his dreams -the ancient testimonies are full of this (see the satire / sa-Tyr of Alexander or the *Sacred Discourses* of Aelius Aristide^v). These are all examples which corroborate what Lacan affirmed in the same report, namely, that the unconscious has in the symbolic “its preformed material”^{vi}. The challenge of analysis is then, to respond in a different way to the demand for interpretation, to the demand for sense, that is to say to interpret in a different way, to finally cut this “semantophilic whirlwind”^{vii} which the subject is in love with.

According to Lacan's indications, which are confirmed by certain testimonies of the pass, the unconscious knowledge which belongs to the ICSR, that is to say that which is beyond sense, is an understanding which manifests itself. It manifests itself as being beyond sense in the limited time of its manifestation, like a reduced time-lag, as a flash^{viii}, because there is no possible attendance of this real. The fact that this knowledge *manifests itself* means that it escapes, for the first time, the interpretative, historicizing musings of the analysis.

This moment happens at the same time as a cut of sense and the supposed knowledge of the analyst. The fruit of the analytic discourse would be placed there because, in putting an end to transference expectations, this advent of the real promoted *by* the analysis paves the way towards the identification with the symptom or in other words that which is left to bear.

The unconscious has always been equally “real” from the beginning until the end of the analysis, the problem is that the speaking being makes sense of all his enjoyments. Hence the dimension, which cannot be programmed by the structure of the analytic discourse with regard to the end of analysis, because every subject has more or less propensity to enjoy the sense of the search for truth.

This return to the beyond of sense, which is without doubt ephemeral, marks a point of no return in the demand of the analyzand, the effects of which are on the side of the subject: an enjoyable surprise, an irrevocable deflation of the enjoyment of sense. This is what constitutes the final test, not the musings which can be extracted from it.

This re-advent of the real in analysis, given the fact that it clarifies the true nature of the what has gone before, *troumatique*^{ix}, overthrows the symptom typically correlated with it: without anxiety but rather with the enjoyable emotions which we call enthusiasm, satisfaction, joy... So many positive *effects* which, affecting the subject and his body, indicate

that the analysis has ended.^x The subject can finally leave to the real that which belongs to the real.

ⁱ Pindare, *Pythiques II*, vers 72 ; trad. allemande Friedrich Hölderlin, dans *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe*, v. 3, Berlin, Aufbau Verlag, 1995, p. 278.

ⁱⁱ Lacan, « ...ou pire J » [Compte rendu], dans *Scilicet 5*, Paris, Seuil, 1975, p. 6 ; *Autres écrits*, Paris, Seuil, 2001, p. 548.

ⁱⁱⁱ J. Lacan, « La psychanalyse dans ses rapports avec la réalité », dans *Scilicet 1*, Paris, Seuil, 1968, p. 51 ; dans *Autres écrits, op. cit.*, p. 351.

^{iv} J. Lacan, *Le Séminaire* « RSI », inédit, leçon du 19 novembre 1974.

^v Pour le rêve d'Alexandre, voir S. Freud, *L'interprétation du rêve*, trad. J. Altounian et al., PUF, « Quadrige », p. 134, note 2 ; Aelius Aristide, *Discours sacrés*, introd. et trad., A. J. Festugière, Paris, Macula, 1986.

^{vi} J. Lacan, J. Lacan, « ...ou pire » [Compte rendu], dans *Scilicet 5*, Paris, Seuil, 1975, p. 6 ; *Autres écrits*, Paris, Seuil, 2001, p. 548.

^{vii} J. Lacan, « L'étourdit », dans *Scilicet 4*, Paris, Seuil, 1973, p. 51 ; dans *Autres écrits, op. cit.*, p. 494

^{viii} Voir J. Lacan, « Intervention de Jacques Lacan. Séance du vendredi 2 novembre (après-midi) », dans *Lettres de l'École Freudienne*, 1975, n° 15, p. 69.

^{ix} Troumatique: neologismo entre *traumatique* (traumático) y *trou*, agugero

^x Pour le néologisme « effect », voir C. Soler, *Les Affects lacaniens*, Paris, Seuil, 2011, p. VIII.