



PREAMBLE VI- DECIPHERING THROUGH INTERPRETATION

"That is why I say: that in what the analysand says as well as in what the analyst says there is nothing but writing" J. Lacan Sem XXV, *The moment to conclude*, 1977

Psychoanalysis was born when Freud, under the influence of Charcot¹, abandoned his scientific activities, for an approach to hysteria that revealed its nature as language and as sexual enjoyment, already anticipated by other authors before Freud.

If a symptom can be produced in a patient through the hypnotist's sayings, and terminated by those same sayings, it is inevitable to conclude that there are symptoms as an effect of speech in humans. What interests Freud is not so much to produce, or rather, it should be said, to impose "new symptoms" as the hypnotist does, but rather to clarify the sayings that have already been operating for a considerable time in the patient's symptoms, as an effect of his entry into the bath of language in the Other.

This implies that there is something that is (in)scribed in his psyche beyond his ego and that is beyond his control. That is to say, there is something unconscious that is active and that causes different formations: such as, for example, symptoms in the sense of illnesses, slips of the tongue, dreams... but not only this; in fact, even the very ego with which the subject is satisfied, has a symptom structure. For Freud there is therefore an unconscious "primordial historisation", which must be possible to rewrite.

But an unconscious it is not directly decipherable, like the Rosetta Stone. And as we have said, Freud does not want to "over-write" according to the values of the hypnotist as many psychologists and some therapists want to do even in our days. What he wants is that the subject's functioning is re-established in synchrony with the patient's unconscious aspirations, desires, drives, and loves.

¹ In 1886 the translation of *New Lessons on the Diseases of the Nervous System* by J. M. Charcot was published.

For this, he has only one means: the words of his patients. The hysteric teaches him to listen to his own words and thus all the complexities of the relationship between oral and written and vice versa open up and can be grasped from his first analytic cases, as early as 1895 as shown in "The dream of Irma's injection".² A question that runs through the entire history of psychoanalysis and also other fields of knowledge: linguistics and other cultural areas, even in the Anglo-Saxon world. Read Walter Ong and his "Orality and writing. The technologies of the word"³ and its influence on communication theories.

Using the word and only the word, the analyst does not directly decipher the unconscious as Champollion did with the Rosetta Stone, however even the latter did not come to terms with it until he understood that there were signs that did not represent things but sounds. In the same way, for Freud⁴ it was necessary to differentiate the *Sachwostellung*, a representation of a thing (of a visual nature) according to him, uniquely existing in the unconscious and according to Lacan converted into a-thing by the letter on the side of the real, and the *Wortvorstellung* (of an acoustic nature) of the preconscious-conscious system. Then the question of the oral-written articulation is revealed simultaneous to the articulation of the mode of operation of the conscious word on the "unconscious a-thing".

Freud lays down two rules in psychoanalytic practice: the free association of the analysand, and the free-floating attention of the analyst. Both disregard the "communicative illusion" of words. This means ceasing to treat the signifier as a sign, and considering polysemy and even polyphony, disregarding communicative exactitude, listening to the signifier and its production of meaning as well as the search for truth that is always fleeting. But this leads the analysis to become interminable because it is difficult to escape the effects of suggestion and the rearrangements of the features, so as not to reach the real. Freud arrives at a limit, to the rock of castration and the death drive that feeds the repetition of evil.

It will be Lacan who will formulate how necessary it is to aim beyond these appearances, beyond the wall they erect in front of reality. Aware that science brings about transformations in that beyond with the use of those "little letters", according to his expression in Seminar VII on Ethics⁵.

He deduces that the analytic interpretation must also point to that beyond of the *amur*⁶ through the letter, in the place of the conjunction of jouissance with the real. But not without the signifying interpretation, rather through it. Misunderstanding will play a fundamental role here, in which the letter is essential, even if it is as silent as an 'h'.

² Freud S., (1899), The dream of Irma's injection in *The interpretation of dreams*, SE IV, 107-121

³ Ong Walter J., *Orality and literacy. The technologies of the word*, Routledge 1982.

⁴ Freud S., (1934-38), *Moses and monotheism*. SE XXIII.

⁵ Lacan J., (1959-60), (1992) *The Seminar Book VII, The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*, 18 May.

⁶ N. of tr., *amur* is a neologism of Lacan, in French language *amur* resonates with *amour*, love, and at the same time *mur* returns to wall.

Otherwise, how could the "*pas de sens*" act as a receiver? As in that joke of the Basques who read on the wall: "*aceros inoxidable*" (stainless steels) and felt called by the imperative: "*Haceros inoxidable*" (Make yourselves stainless!), thus mistaking the rigidity of iron for the fervour of action. One perceives that "Psychoanalysis will not be without the written" in the expression of C. Soler.⁷

Thus, the free-floating attention of the analyst must serve to allow him to "read in the listening" and thus cross the field of interpretation of the signifier to intervene in the permanent encryption-deciphering of the unconscious, the tireless interpreter.

Josep Monseny Bonifasi

Scientific committee: Rosa Escapa, Francisco José Santos Garrido, Isabela Grande, Zehra Eryörük, Orsa Kamperou (secrétaire), Paola Malquori, Colette Soler, Natacha Vellut.

www.champlacanien.net et www.forumlacan.it/iv-convegno-europeo-if-epfcl/

⁷ Soler C., (2012)., *La psychanalyse n'est pas sans l'écrit*, Revue Champ Lacanien, n.10.