

SOLITUDE AND SOCIAL LINK

Sophie Rolland-Manas

These two terms can *a priori* be understood in an opposite and contradictory dimension. But in the field of psychoanalysis oriented by the real and by experience, it is rather a matter of an articulation, of a link between the two.

Psychoanalysis is a solitary practice where the analyst functions without being there as a subject. He is alone in his act which he experienced in his own treatment at the moment of passage to the analyst.

However, this practice is not entirely solitary since it does not happen without the analysand. It is established in a social link of two, which is the analytic discourse and which is woven over the course of this unique experience. Once the analysis terminates, marked by the satisfaction of the end, the analysand may choose to exit the discourse or maintain it, make use of it, by changing places.

Most often, analysands who have encountered their «absolute difference », that point of radical solitude, choose to occupy the function of analyst and also continue a social link in a community of analytic work, even beyond the School, in the city, shall we say. They are there with the task of supporting the psychoanalytic knowledge resulting from experience, as well as that drawn from elaborations by other analysts and some other non-analysts.

Already in « Function and Field of Speech and Language », Lacan says that the end of this intimate experience that is analysis is not so individual since it also takes on a sort of consistency in the social and leads the analysand to associate with others, and not just any others: «...the question of the termination of an analysis is that of the moment at which the subject's satisfaction is achievable in the satisfaction of all—that is, of all those it involves in a human undertaking».^[1]

But this is complicated by the question of psychoanalytic knowledge, for how do psychoanalysts maintain relationships among themselves? Those who know that « this knowledge is not portable, because no knowledge can be carried by a single person Hence the association of the psychoanalyst with those who share knowledge because they cannot exchange it. Psychoanalysts are scholars of a knowledge they cannot converse about ». ^[2] Also, it is probably from this « untenable position », ^[3] from this hole in knowledge, from this impossible, that links are possible.

Thus for each one, at the heart of the experience, a solitude to which specific social links with some others are articulated. This leads us to say that the psychoanalyst in his solitude is not **all** alone, nor **the only** one alone.

And the fact of being alone in his psychoanalytic act, even so he is not alone in being alone.

To make a link, we will end with a remark by Lacan from the Seminar *RSI*: « If I were the only one, for example, everything I say would have no impact. It is indeed because there is something I am trying to situate, in the form, in the species of the psychoanalytic discourse, namely that I am not alone in having this experience, that thanks to the fact that I am like everyone, I am *parlêtre*, that thanks to this fact I am led to formulate what can account for this analytic discourse, in a certain way, good! »^[4]

Is he not pointing here to the question of the psychoanalyst's responsibility to advance the analytic discourse so as to make psychoanalysis endure?

English translation by Devra Simiu

^[1] J. Lacan, 1953, « The Function and Field of Speech and Language », *Écrits*, (trans. Bruce Fink), New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 2006, p. 264.

^[2] J. Lacan, 1967, « De la psychanalyse dans ses rapports avec la réalité », *Autres écrits*, Paris, Seuil, 2001, p. 359.

^[3] *Ibid.*

^[4] J. Lacan, *Le Séminaire, RSI, XXII*, unpublished, lesson of April 15, 1975.