

On *ortho-doxa*

Rithée Cerasco

The question of knowledge is closely linked to the question of what can be taught and transmitted. The dialogue of Plato, “*Menon on Virtue*”, prompts us to reflect on a truth that cannot be taught¹. The *lexis* Ortho-Doxa (True Opinion) is therefore not to be confused with any *doxa*. This dialogue is the subject of Lacan’s comments on several occasions². I will confine myself here to “L’*étourdit*”³, where Lacan announces a “progress” because this OD “has for us nothing more than an ab-sence⁴ of meaning”, “emptying” of any meaning that points to the ab-sense of the ab-sex.

Lacan’s preoccupation is aimed at “*what can be taught about the real*”, he bets (again) to formulate a *mathema* of what cannot be taught – no doubt a paradox – concerning “*the impossibility of saying true of the real [which is motivated by a mathema [...] in which the relation of the act of speaking [le dire] to the said [le dit] is situated*”.

However, the act of speaking forgotten behind the what is said finds rather a topological support, starting from a surface on which to trace the course of the wall of the impossible – of sex, sence and meaning.

The OD is located on the a-spherical surface of the cross-cap as a point (point-off-line) of *fixtion*, (*fñction*/*fixation*) – any point but necessary- whose fall is produced by a cut between the act of speaking and the said. That this point of *fixtion* is named by an equivocation, refers to the act of interpretation as a cut. But there is cut and cut⁵. Only the cut of double turn, cut of the act of speaking, causes the fall of the “a” (the round of the cross-cap), as the object cause of desire and the verification of the subject as divided (Moebius a-spherical band). “*The point, then, is the opinion that can be said to be true of what the act of speaking that goes round it verifies it indeed, but only of what the act of speaking is what modifies it to introduce the δόξα as real*”.

The transformation is therefore a passage from the said (single turn cut) to the act of speaking (double turn cut), a passage from the *fixtion* -symbolic/imaginary- to something of the order of the real.

Could we situate these points of *fixtion* in history and in psychoanalytical doctrine and doing as it should be done the tour of them? For example, with regard to our myths as a point of fixation, of OD? In the first place the Freudian myths, no doubt: Oedipus and his reverse of *Totem and Taboo* (which are so dear to the hearts of psychoanalysts “well thinking” of the meaning and of ideology of the family). But also the myths of Lacan: that of the *lamelle*, that of Evie as the place of origin of « *lalangue* ». It is not a question of questioning them in the field of the true/false, but of going through them, tracing this double turn that allows us to empty them of all meaning, in order to... why not? eventually make use of them.

The approach of these OD points – it seems to me – could induce us to be more cautious at the time of our fervent clamour against any orthodoxy.

Shortly after “L’*étourdit*”, Lacan approaches his “nodal method”. The question persists: how to touch a real from a practice of the word? The orientation of the cure aims at the “*sinthome*” – the door of access, then, even if only to a fragment of the real of the singular knot of each “speaking being” [*parlêtre*]. A knot necessarily heretical in its singularity, but often an orthodox knot, rather cushy [*pépère*] (conforming and comfortable) and orthodox... and sometimes very heretical⁶.

This does not happen without the operation of deconstruction/transcending of the fantasy [*fantasme*] cutting around the point of the OD, a precondition for the satisfaction of the end [of analysis] by identification with the *sinthome*, involving the devaluation of symptomatic *jouissance* and its repetition.

In the long run, will it be possible to locate these points of *fixtion* which would also be braided in the nodal elaborations?

Could we not speak in analytical knowledge of moments of “passing” concerning OD points? An example of this is the journey from the Freudian unconscious to the “ours” – as Lacan expresses it – as long as we write in the prolongation of his (Lacan’s) *sinthome*, which leads him to this extreme position of

approaching a real outside of all meaning, but far from any conception of a “real in itself” where the Kantian *noumeno*⁷ leads us (*nous mène*).

Revised by Anna Wojakowska-Skiba and Jan Tkaczow

¹ For Socrates there is no *epistémè* of virtue. It cannot be taught because it escapes the expected coherence of all knowledge.

² See in particular: J. Lacan: ‘The Ego in Freud’s theory and in the psychoanalytical technique, where Lacan already evoked the oblivion present in all knowledge: oblivion linked - at this moment of his teaching - to the creative function of truth.

³ ‘L’étourdit’, *Autres écrits*, Paris, Seuil, Paris, 2001.

⁴ N. T: In French, there is a play on words here based on a homonymy: instead of absence meaning lack, Lacan uses a neologism *absens* to point out the lack of meaning.

⁵ Distinction between a cut of only one run and a cut of double run. For the topological development see: J. Chapuis with R. Cevasco, *Guide topologique de “l’Étourdit”. Un abus imaginaire et son au-delà*, Éditions Nouvelles du Champ lacanien, Paris, 2019.

⁶ Suffice it here to evoke the heretic Joyce. See: Colette Soler, *Lacan, Lecteur de Joyce*, Paris, PUF, 2015 and 2019.

⁷ In french (*nous mène*) leads us homophonically to the Kantian “noumeno”.