

JOUISSANCE



DESIRE ...



SYMPTOM



ANXIETY



OTHER JOUISSANCE



© mox sflg

Specialist Course for UGent Doctoral School 2017-2018  
Mental Health Care, Psychoanalysis and Philosophy III

**AN INTRODUCTION TO LACAN'S SEMINAR ON ANXIETY (1962)  
AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR TODAY'S CLINIC AND CULTURE**  
Dr. Lieven Jonckheere

## **INTRODUCTION**

**27 August 2018**

meedoen

- Alle versies Sém X
- vertaling Ecrits
- eigen doctoraat 3 delen
- prent Mordillo
- iNWiT

by way of introduction, two questions

- Why SemX on anxiety?
- Why me on SemX on anxiety?

## WHY ME ON ANXIETY?

because I am a kind of specialist/expert on anxiety?

there is no such thing as a psychoanalytic specialist/expert

- specialist/expert is taboo in PA milieu  
as a psychoanalyst you cannot be a specialist/ expert
  - in a particular 'identity' (women/children/victims/transgenders/whatever)
  - in a particular 'disorder' (psychosis/borderline/anxiety/trauma/art/whatever)being a psychoanalyst and being a specialist/expert are incompatible  
a psychoanalyst is a generalist in the true sens of the word
- we will have the opportunity to discuss this point – starting from SemX on anxiety  
for the moment, in this introduction, I will limit myself to launching some provocative statements

the specialist/expert is a university/academic qualification/invention/nomination

the specialist/expert is not a psychoanalytic thing

It is a university/academic qualification

and yes, I am a university specialist on anxiety

exactly 30 years ago, in 1988 (applause!) – I made a doctoral thesis on anxiety

- at Ghent university, under the direction of the late Julien Quackelbeen  
who 2 years ago sadly passed away (24/09/16)
- title
  - title: “anxiety as the real in the psychoanalytic discourse”
  - subtitle: “questions prior to the praxis”  
– which of course was a pedantic allusion to Lacan’s “on a question prior/preliminary to any possible treatment of psychosis”
- it had 3 parts
  - the 3 parts being
    - anxiety of the freudian analyst
    - anxiety of the freudian analysant
    - anxiety in the talks prior/preliminary to any possible Freudian psychoanalysis  
868 pages in total  
all very very pedantic – but in the best university sense
  - indeed, in 6 years time, as an assistant of Julien Quackelbeen at the university – best time in my life, after my military service –
    - I had the opportunity to read everything Freud and Lacan had written and said on anxiety, and to check their main sources/references  
which reminds me of a remark Lacan once made concerning his own doctoral thesis, a remark that at that time had left me helpless with laughter, because I immediately identified with it  
one of the readers of his doctoral thesis had remarked to him: “if you have read all this, I really pity you” – whereupon Lacan, longtime afterwards, laconically reflected “as a matter of fact I had read all that, all that ...” – funny?  
So first of all I had slogged through Freud, Lacan and their sources, on anxiety
  - and then I had tried to detect some logic, some structure in it
    - which of course is rather artificial  
I will not go into the details now – if you happen to have read my doctoral thesis (i pity you!), you can always question me about it
    - but I think the basic structure of this doctoral thesis still stands  
and that’s the 3 parts:

- But I think the basic structure of this doctoral thesis still stands and that's the 3 parts:
  - first of all you got to have an idea of the anxiety of the analyst and its cause – which, at that time, was my 'clinical' way to approach something of the desire of the analyst as it appears at the end of his own analysis **part I**
  - And, if you have an idea of the anxiety of the analyst and its causes, you can start studying the anxiety of the analysant and its causes **part II**
    - this means that the anxiety of the subject in the analytic cure – the fact that you get anxious during analysis, but also in between analytic sessions – is first and foremost caused by the anxiety of your analyst
    - this is the reason why Lacan, in SemVIII on transference, a few years prior SemX, said that *la féconde Versagung de l'analyste*, the fertile frustration coming from the analyst is to refuse the analysant his own anxiety as an analyst you should never give an anxiety-signal to your analysants – even if this is what is expected from you, as Big Other, in the transference this is Lacan in SemVIII
  - Once you control, if I may say so, the 'communication' of your anxiety as an analyst to your analysants (Lacan uses this word, communication, only in the case of anxiety), you are in a position to start receiving patients, you can start preliminary talks **part III**
    - at that time, 30 years ago, I thought of my doctoral thesis on anxiety as a necessary/mandatory theoretical sideline to my own analysis in any case, I made this doctoral thesis on anxiety on a parallel with my first analysis – as a double preparation of my practice as a psychoanalyst ...
    - ... my practice as a psychoanalyst that I effectively started after finishing
      - my doctoral thesis
      - and my first analysis
- interested, in my doctoral thesis?  
then you find a digital version on google doc
  - unfortunately only in Dutch
  - accessible??

I told you all this about my doctoral thesis on anxiety, in order to prove that I really am – or at least, I once have been a university specialist/expert on anxiety

No, without joking

After 30 years I still have the impression that I always can fall back on this doctoral thesis, on anxiety, because it was my first orientation not only in the theory of anxiety, but in psychoanalytic theory in general

Whatever subject I have been studying ever since, since 30 years – check my website, whatever subject, I have always in one way or another fallen back on this study of anxiety

Anxiety is everywhere, anxiety is at the heart of everything human

There's no subject, no speechbeing (*parlêtre*) without anxiety

there's no symptom or inhibition without anxiety

So, to start with, everyone of you should at least become an expert in anxiety

Which is what you will start with here



## central place of sem X on anxiety – for me, in my personal trajectory

let's get to SemX on anxiety now

### SemX as my singular starting point for reading Lacan

for me, making a doctoral thesis on anxiety, simply meant that I had to read Lacan starting from SemX as a matter of fact SemX is not only the first Lacan seminar I have studied, it is also the seminar that I read and study over and over again

Sem X has become my starting point for orienting myself in Lacan's teaching as such, for making my way in the farthest corners of his teaching

It must be said that SemX is not the usual starting point for reading Lacan, for orienting oneself in his teaching

### SemXI en SemXXIII as the usual starting points for reading Lacan

you may be informed that the usual starting point for reading Lacan is double:

- SemXI four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis
- SemXX Encore

this double starting point has been fixed by JAM, in consultation with Lacan himself

- Sem XI (1964) was the first Seminar text to be established, edited and published by JAM during Lacan's lifetime – in 1973
- The text of Sem XX (1972-1973) was established, edited and published by JAM immediately after also during Lacan's lifetime – in 1975

these double quilting point, of SemXI en SemXX, being fixed, JAM started publishing Lacan's seminars in chronological order: I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII,

I will not go into JAM's publishing policy now

Only one small remark: in the English translation, the really excellent English translation by Adrian Price, the expression texte par JAM or 'text established by JAM' has been changed into 'edited by JAM' – which is something completely different

I refer to an interview with JAM, in 1985, by François Ansermet, about his 'establishment' of the text of Lacan's Seminars

There JAM says: "Lacan never did consider the transcriptions of his Seminar as the original text. Consequently my establishment of the text of the Seminar had to be a redaction" – an arrangement, you could say



## WHY SEMX ON ANXIETY?

### THE PLACE OF SEMX ON ANXIETY IN LACAN'S TEACHING AND ITS DIFFUSION

### THE PLACE OF SEMX ON ANXIETY IN THE 3 PERIODS IN LACAN'S TEACHING

#### JAM's publishing policy has created 3 periods in Lacan's teaching

It's more important for us, here, to notice, that by this publishing policy JAM (no doubt in consultation with Lacan) once and for all has created three periods in Lacan's teaching

- The first Lacan = Lacan of Seminar I-VIII  
this is also the Lacan that you will find in the second part of the Ecrits
  - Ecrits were published before any of the Seminars was published  
Ecrits were published in 1966, by Jean-Wahl (philosopher)
  - Ecrits contain Lacan's written texts upto 1965,  
with introductions, notes and rewritten passages by Lacan himself, dating from 1966
  - Ecrits fall apart into two periods
    - Lacan's antecedents = kind of proto-Lacan  
first part of the Ecrits  
this proto-Lacan offers already 3 crucial elements that are crucial for his later theory on anxiety – 3 elements that also proved difficult to integrate in his later teaching
      - first and foremost there's his well known reading of Freud's notion of narcissism
        - via ethology and the developmental phase of the mirror stage
        - which enabled him to explain the agression that is inherent in our imaginary relation to our own body, our equals – and space
      - Next there's his exploration, via a particular form of logic, of our relation with time – with its accompanying feelings of urgency and certainty – in fact, this is Lacan's first theory of anxiety – as soon as 1945
        - the tension in our relation to time translates itself as anxiety  
just like the tension in our relation to space translates itself as aggression
        - we will have the opportunity to come back upon upon this first anxiety-theory
      - and last but not least this proto-Lacan also had tried to develop a kind of Hegelian alternative for Freud's almost inexistant theory of transference
        - in fact, you could say that his first conceptualisation of the transference at once is Lacan's first approach of Freud's anxiety and consequently also of the anxiety of the Freudian analyst  
– as soon as 1951, exactly 10 years before Sem X on anxiety
        - we will have the opportunity to come back upon upon what could be considered Lacan's second anxiety-theory
    - first period of Lacan's teaching  
second part of the Ecrits
      - with that title "le sujet enfin en question" – "the subject who is finally in question" which means that from that moment on the subject is defined as determined by the signifier
      - the texts are mostly rewritings of the oral teaching Lacan had started up in 1953
      - the starting point is the famous "Fonction et champ de la parole et du langage en PA" or "The function and field of speech and language in PA"

- The Second Lacan = SemXI, four fundamental concepts (1964)
  - published in 1973 by JAM  
in consultation with Lacan, who at that time was still alive
  - this has become the official starting point of the second Lacan, the intermediate Lacan
  - this is the period where Lacan, for the first time, tries to get beyond the signifier  
the subject is no longer caused by the signifier alone, but also, and more fundamentally, by a lost part of his own body, by some lost object
    - the second Lacan identifies a series of such causal objects
      - first of all Lacan adopts Freud's objects
        - Freud himself already had adopted the traditional oral object of the breast
        - in addition to the breast Freud also had discovered a new object, an object that can be called the 'modern' or 'industrial' object par excellence: the anal object of the feces  
Freud himself thought of his discovery of the anal object as a fundamental contribution of psychoanalysis: in his letters to Fliess he even called psychoanalysis *meine Dreckologie*, my shitology
      - in the second period of his teaching Lacan basically adds 2 new objects  
you could say that both Lacanian objects are 'postmodern' objects – after WWII
        - the gaze – which in some respect is also a rather traditional object, if we take into account art history
        - the voice – which is maybe the postmodern object par excellence, being an object produced by science
      - so, according to Freud en Lacan, we have 4 objects – is that all?  
couldn't we say that nowadays a new kind of object is starting to appear?  
An object that more and more imposes itself as a part of our body  
– and that's the hypermodern object of the gadget in the age of internet!
        - the object of which it is prophesied, at the walls of the university that "the next big thing will be a lot of small things"
        - the object that we touch on screens
        - the objects that communicate between each other, thanks to 'the internet of things'
        - the object that ...  
we could discuss this question
    - but for the moment let's stick to the 4 objects of the second Lacan
      - these are the objects that cause the subject
        - via the drive ('pulsion' better translation?)
        - and via the fantasy
      - consequently these are also the objects that should pop up the end of an analytic cure
        - when fantasy, as the object relation of the subject, is traversed (*traversée*)
        - ... and the subject no longer has a relation with the object, as an object of desire, but is identified with it, as the object of the pulsion

- The Third Lacan = SemXX (1972-1973)
  - published in 1973 by JAM  
in consultation with Lacan, who at that time was still alive and kicking
  - this has become the official starting point for the so-called third or last Lacan
  - you could say that Lacan, in the third period, tries to go beyond Freud's notion of the drive  
he does so by conceptualising the notion of jouissance  
which until then had indeed remained a rather obscure notion
    - first of all Lacan's conceptualisation of the jouissance boils down to a distinction between two types of jouissance
      - phallic jouissance
        - jouissance as far as it is framed or limited by castration
        - jouissance that is related to all kinds of lost objects  
this is the male type of jouissance – that is not absent in woman either
      - Other jouissance
        - Jouissance that it not framed/limited by castration
        - jouissance that is not related to lost objects, to lost parts of one's own body  
but a jouissance in the body itself  
this is the jouissance of woman, the jouissance in her body a woman cannot get rid off  
via the man-made channel of phallic jouissance
    - secondly this conceptualisation of jouissance also reverses the relation between signifier and jouissance
      - before SemXX Lacan had identified all kinds of limits on the jouissance
        - first of all the signifier was considered a of limit on jouissance  
to speak is contrary to jouissance
          - as a
          - for that lost jouissance, we gain a small amount of jouissance every time the  
signifier makes sense
          - this is what happens in formations of the unconscious (dreams jokes,  
parapraxes)
            - with the *Mehrlust* or surplus-jouissance they produce
            - (in as far as the subject can identify with the *Dritte Person* or Third  
Person – which is Freud's anticipation of Lacan's Other)
        - basically the same applies to the fantasy
          - the fantasy also limits the jouissance
          - but secondly, as a kind of compensation for that lost enjoyment, it also  
guarantees a kind of substitutive enjoyment, in relation to a substitutive object
      - from SemXX on the signifier is no longer a limit on the jouissance
        - the signifier cannot cover the whole of jouissance  
there's no signifier for the jouissance of woman in the sexual relation, there's no  
sexual relation
        - as a consequence the whole language, all of our speaking, becomes an apparatus  
of jouissance – we speak because we bodily enjoy it – even when we do not  
produce meaningful jokes in the meantime

## **two types of serious Lacan readers**

these are the three periods in Lacan's teaching

but mind you! if you are or want to become a serious Lacanian

- you should not be a serial Lacan reader!  
do not start with the first Lacan, reading first the Ecrits
- you have to start with some later Lacan, be it SemXI or SemXX

now there are two different types of serious Lacan readers

- the serious Lacan reader who starts with SemXI
- the serious Lacan reader who starts with SemXX

serious Lacan readers at the university usually start with SemXI

as you may know this starting point is promoted by my professor Paul Verhaeghe

– whom you all know – and for whom I continue to have the greatest respect

university probably starts with SemXI because from some points of view this is rather clear-cut seminar

- SemXI is clear-cut from the conceptual point of view
  - it forges 4 concepts out of Freud's embryonic and chaotic notions of the unconscious, repetition, transference and drive
  - indeed one cannot maintain that the unconscious, the repetition, the transference and the drive were already concepts in Freud's writings
  - it is only Lacan who has tried to make concepts out of these basically, by giving each of them 2 complimentary definitions
    - a first where the Signifier is central
    - a second where the object is central
  - take for instance transference – which indeed is not a all a concept in Freud's writings in Sem XI Lacan defines transference in 2 ways:
    - the Signifier side of transference:
      - this is the subject supposed to know
      - the supposition that the knowledge, my unconscious as knowledge about myself, is in the Other, making the Other a subject
    - the object side of transference or its relation to the drive:
      - transference is the performance (*mise en acte*) of the sexual reality of the unconscious
- SemXI is also clear-cut from the logical point of view
  - it reduces the constitution of the subject to 2 logical operations: first alienation and the separation
  - this distinction is often misunderstood because of its ever lurking psychological interpretation
  - alienation
    - this is not the subject who loses contact with himself, with his feelings and the real world
    - but the irremediable division of the subject between two signifiers
      - the fact that there is no signifier that can finally identify the subject, the subject being the gap between every two signifiers
  - separation
    - this is not the separation of the Other, of the Mother
    - but the filling up of the gap of the subject – with an object, a part of his own body that he once would lost and now has got back
      - the subject hides its emptiness under some object
      - the subject, says Lacan with a wordplay, adorns itself with the object a (*se parer*)

serious readers of Lacan outside university usually start with SemXX

people who let themselves in their reading of Lacan guide by JAM's *orientation lacanienne* or lacanian orientation, usually start or should start with SemXX

as a matter of fact JAM promotes the idea that the most interesting way of reading Lacan is reading him backwards, starting with the latest Lacan

- in this way one should be able to make sense of all of those loose threads in Lacan's earlier teaching
- which often enough means that, in this way, one is also able to see more clearly the relevance, for the contemporary clinic and culture, of these loose ends

## the problem with me as a Lacan reader

now what is the problem with me, as a Lacan reader?

- first of all I must confess that already from the start on I have been unfaithful to both ways of reading Lacan
  - to the university way of reading Lacan, to Paul Verhaeghe's way
  - to the Lacanian orientation, to JAM's way of reading LacanI always had this double starting point, I have always been reading Lacan starting from the second and the third Lacan at the same time
- and second I have always occupied a slightly marginal compared with both these types of serious Lacan reading
  - for the second period I did not start with SemXI, 4 fundamental concepts, but with SemX, on anxiety
  - and for the third period I did not start with SemXX, on female jouissance, but with SemXXIII, on Joyce and the sinthom

Why do I love SemX and SemXXIII so much more than this university-friendly SemXI en SemXX?

- I guess that my love for SemX en XXIII has to do with Lacan's compelling freedom in both in SemX Lacan attacks the problem of anxiety from all possible sides Freud, the postfreudians and psychiatry, but also philosophy, art and literature, ethology and biology, topology and optics, all kinds of religions and psychology, and so on
- my love for SemX en XXIII also has to do with the fact that both are Lacan's most clinical seminars SemX showcases the broadest, the richest clinic possible
  - the first seminars are also very clinical – but there Lacan limits himself to rereading Freud's Big Five: Schreber, Hans, Dora, Wolfman, Ratman, the young homosexual woman
  - SemX on the contrary
    - is centered around Freud's clinical triad Inhibition Symptom and Anxiety – with Lacan ...
      - ... adding psychiatric and postfreudian clinical categories like acting out, passage à l'acte
      - ... but also inventing new clinical categories like embarrassment, impediment=*empêchement*, turmoil=*émoi*, and so on
    - which allows him to compare neuroses, psychoses and perversions in a whole new wayRead or study, and you will see: it is the most clinical seminar  
of course, it is difficult if you talk about anxiety, not to become clinical

so far for the context of SemX

its place in Lacan's teaching and in the promotion, the diffusion of his teaching



## THE ELEMENTARY STRUCTURE OF SEMINAR X

Let's now take the thing in our hand – and let it fall open

if you take a look at the content table, you will see that SemX falls apart in 4 parts  
= 1 part for each of the next days of this doctoral school

### the hidden hinge

but upon closer inspection it appears that these 4 parts are organized around a central hinge  
a hidden spring hinge that we come across upon right in the middle of SemX

- the F version fills 390 pages, the hinge pops up on p204
- the E translation fills 338 pages, with the hinge popping up on p175

this hinge is formed by a phrase, isolated by JAM, in his presentation of SemX,  
at the time of its publication, in 2004

- *l'angoisse est terme intermédiaire entre la jouissance et le désir, c'est franchir l'angoisse, fondé(e) sur le temps de l'angoisse que le désir se constitue*
- “anxiety is an intermediary term between jouissance and desire  
desire being constituted and founded upon the anxiety phase, once anxiety has been got through”  
assuming your desire is a matter of *franchir l'angoisse*, of getting through anxiety  
you cannot desire without having to get through anxiety

### two remarks

- first a conceptual remark about anxiety  
the anxiety Lacan mentions here is Freud's castration anxiety  
we will come back to his – because SemX is precisely Lacan's attempt to go beyond castration anxiety
- second a remark about the English translation of *franchir*
  - I think Adrian Price did an excellent job with this translation
  - Nevertheless I have the feeling that, 'get through anxiety' is not the best possible translation of *franchir l'angoisse*
    - franchir = step over a threshold
    - so I would rather translate that desire means that you first you have to step over anxiety
      - each time you desire you have to step over anxiety
      - desire is not a matter of having got through anxiety once and for all  
for me there's this connotation, in 'get through anxiety' – but I do not know

## the function of the hapax in JAM's reading of Lacan

however that may be according to JAM, the key word in this keypassage of SemX is the French *franchir*

isolating such keywords and giving them an unexpected importance is really one of the main tricks, if I may say so, of JAM's reading of Lacan, of his *orientation lacanienne*

- in the mass of Lacan's spoken words or written texts, especially when Lacan struggles to come to the point, JAM always succeeds in picking out a word that does not really fit into the context, more often than not this a word that Lacan did not use anywhere else – so you could call this word a hapax  
nevertheless, according to JAM, this word carries the burden, if I may say so, of what Lacan at that difficult moment is trying to convey, but what he cannot really convey yet, simply because it would necessitate a whole set of new concepts, and maybe even a radical change in his own theory so instead of introducing a set of new concepts or announcing a u-turn in his theory, Lacan out of the blue uses a singular word, a singular expression  
this is indeed what JAM's lacanian orientation to a certain extent is about
  - detecting these moments of hesitation, of possible tipping over in Lacan's discourse
  - and asking "what if we would take this word, this expression seriously and develop it into a new concept?"
- examples?
  - The paradigm of such a potentially game-changing hapax is the *traversée* – the traversing of the fantasy, at the end of an analysis
    - Lacan uses this expression only once, and very casually, at the end of SemXI, 246: "how can a subject, having traversed the radical fantasy, live the drive=pulsion?"
    - Afterwards JAM would build all the schools of the Freudian field around this idea
  - And now in SemX
    - JAM isolates this once-only expression *franchir l'angoisse* – stepping over anxiety
    - and invites us to build Lacan's anxiety theory around it

**anxiety cannot be cured  
do not try to get rid of your anxiety!**

by the way, it is interesting to note that Lacan uses both of these singular expressions in the same way

- having traversed the fantasy ...
- having stepped over anxiety ...

so maybe we could risk a parallel formulation

- having traversed your fantasy, what happens?  
You live the drive! (my translation of *vivre la pulsion*, at the end of SemXI)
- having stepped over your anxiety, what happens?  
You do not shrink back from your desire! (my translation of *céder sur son désir*, at the end of SemVII),

I think that it also should be clear that neither of these subjective movements is a definitive step forward in a more active, and even a kind of ethical translation, we could say:

- each time you live the drive, each time you wanna feel that you're alive, you have to traverse your fantasy first
- each time you do not shrink back from you desire, you go for your desire, you have to step over your anxiety first

so the only therapeutical lesson that you draw from this central idea of SemX is

- that one cannot be cured of this anxiety – because “no anxiety no desire!”
- that the only real cure for anxiety is desire
- that the utmost that you can learn, if I may say so, in a psychoanalysis is how to step over anxiety”, lightly, nimbly, swiftly – over and over again

**Mordillo**

all this theory, this hinge-idea if SemX,of stepping over anxiety, I found it back in the series of drawings of Mordillo that I used for the poster  
– very funny – why? **Ask the public!!**

## how is SemX structured around this hidden hinge

now how is SemX structured around this hidden hinge, revealed by JAM, of the ethical obligation for the subject to step over his anxiety in order to go for his own desire

as seen from the hinge we can distinguish 3 parts in Sem X

- the central part, where the hinge is buried  
this part is called “anxiety between jouissance and desire” by JAM
  - there you will find the ultimate table of division of the subject F1901203 – E161/173/174 with its 3 times
    - jouissance – or the mythical subject of jouissance
    - anxiety – more precisely Freud’s castration anxiety
    - desire

the only way, from the first time of fullness of autistic jouissance, from your own body, to the third time of the lack of which desire consists, is anxiety  
anxiety is the hinge between jouissance and desire

- but maybe there’s also another way, another hinge linking jouissance and desire  
indeed, Lacan seems to suggest that love could be an alternative way from jouissance to desire – with the aphorism *Seul l’amour permet à la jouissance de condescendre au désir* (F209) - “only love allows jouissance to condescend to desire” (E179)  
in due time we will come back to this gap between jouissance and desire – and the different ways man and woman ‘cope’ with it

- prior to the central part of SemX, on this side of the hinge, Lacan has to do some preliminary work
  - first he constructs the freudian “structure of anxiety”  
– wich will result in the identification of an object of anxiety
    - practically this structural view on anxiety boils down to a return to Freud:  
what can Freud teach us concerning anxiety?
    - conceptually this structural view implies that anxiety is viewed from the perspective of the dominance of the Symbolic over the Imaginary
      - as regards the symbolic Lacan tries to map the relation of anxiety to the unconscious  
– which is the relation of anxiety to castration
        - for that reason he picks up the thread of Freud’s “Inhibition, Symptom and Anxiety” (1926) – no doubt the main reference of SemX
        - but he also falls back on his own “Subversion of the subject and dialectic of desire in the Freudian unconscious” (1960 – written shortly before SemX) – a crucial reference for the first part of SemX
          - although this text is presented as the summary of his return to Freud ...
          - ... it culminates in a notion absent in Freud, and which contains the nucleus of a theory of anxiety that goes beyond Freud’s castration anxiety – namely the desire of the Other,
            - anxiety is no longer castration anxiety
            - but anxiety is anxiety for “the sensation of the desire of the Other”  
– who maybe wants my loss
  - having mapped the S structure of anxiety, as castration anxiety, Lacan goes on to identify the imaginary frame in which an object of anxiety can pop up  
this is the link of anxiety with the mirror image  
– but it is also the link of anxiety with the fantasy
    - although Lacan seems to return to Freud’s notions of narcissism and fantasy ...
    - ...the result is once again that he develops the kernel of a theory of anxiety that seems to goe beyond Freud’s castration anxiety
      - anxiety is not anxiety for the lack, the lack of castration
      - but anxiety is anxiety in front of “the lack of the lack”, anxiety for the fullness of some weird object, appearing in the mirror image, where the void of the castration was expected (F66-67– E53)
  - after having constructed the Freudian structure of anxiety and identified a new object of anxiety (for Freud anxiety was without object), Lacan embarks on a “revision of the status of the object”  
– trying to put his finger on the real of this object

- after having constructed the Freudian structure of anxiety and identified a new object of anxiety (for Freud anxiety was without object), Lacan embarks on a “revision of the status of the object” – trying to put his finger on the real of this object
  - he does so via different other disciplines than psychoanalysis: biology, topology, linguistics, and so on
  - but also via different forms of clinic:
    - first of all he goes looking for the real of the object of anxiety in the old psychiatric clinic of the *passage à l’acte* and the new postfreudian clinic of acting out – as recognizable in Freud’s neurotic cases of Dora and the young homosexual woman
    - but Lacan also tracks the real of the object of anxiety in the not so freudian clinic of the perversions – in the case of sadism and masochism
    - and last but not least he also tries to reveal the real of the object of anxiety in the completely unfreudian clinic of the psychoanalyst analyzing all kinds of testimonies of the problems especially american analysts at that time experienced with their so called ‘countertransference’, which means their anxieties
- after the central part of SemX, beyond the hinge, comes one more part where Lacan explores the different forms of this new object of anxiety
  - oddly enough in SemX Lacan identifies 5 objects of anxiety
    - besides the freudian objects of the breast and the feces, and his own objects of the gaze and the voice ...
    - ... in SemX Lacan also thinks of the fallus as such an anxiety object – the object of castration anxiety  
you could say that in SemX the phallus is a signifier and an object at the same time
  - once again the Real of all of these objects will be tackled in all possible ways
    - via all forms of arts, all forms of religion, all forms of psychology
    - but most interestingly for us: also via the clinic of obsessional neurosis  
the last part of SemX undoubtedly is Lacan’s most interesting contribution to the theory of obsessional neurosis as invented by Freud

## HOW TO READ SEMINAR X

Now before you start reading SemX in the cartels I would like to give you some good advice how to read a seminar, I mean how to read it in a way that moves forward

First of all always keep an eye on the structure of the content table, the structure as I have tried to explain here  
always look away at the hinge that structures the content table – and which is JAM's orientation

and maybe it can also be of some help if you take the subtitles at the start of each lesson as hints these hints are also part of the orientation JAM introduced in SemX  
you can be critical of this way of proceeding, because often enough these subtitles are real interpretations of the texts, inspired by JAM's knowledge of the earlier and the later Lacan  
but my experience is that these subtitles can be very helpful for reading and understanding a Seminar – in any case they will allow you to identify some of the points Lacan touches upon in a lesson  
you could even read a lesson by agreeing that first of all you are going to identify the passages in the lesson these JAM subtitles allude to – and then you can read the text starting from this passages

but, please, do feel free to loose yourself completely while reading SemX



Specialist Course for UGent Doctoral School 2017-2018  
Mental Health Care, Psychoanalysis and Philosophy III

**AN INTRODUCTION TO LACAN'S SEMINAR ON ANXIETY (1962)  
AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR TODAY'S CLINIC AND CULTURE**

Dr. Lieven Jonckheere

**Lesson 2**

**THE FREUDIAN STRUCTURE OF ANXIETY  
AND ITS LIMITS**

**28 August 2018**

meedoen

- Doctoraat
- eigen doctoraat 3 delen  
+ Lacanian bestiary
- Freud – Hemmung Symptom und angst
- Alle versies Sém X
- 2 operaties van verdeling van het subject
- 2 vertalingen Ecrits (subversion)
- Magritte – condition humaine
- Wolfenman – tekening wolven

The first part of SemX is an exploration of the Freudian or symbolic structure of anxiety  
How can you explain anxiety starting from the ascendancy of the symbolic over the imaginary  
which boils down to a redefinition of Freud's castration anxiety

This redefinition of castration anxiety makes clear that it does not explain all of anxiety in the PA clinic  
And consequently, already in this first part of SemX Lacan constantly is forced to go beyond Freud,  
beyond castration anxiety

This first part of SemX contains 6 lessons

JAM has given titles to all lessons, indicating the Freudian structure of anxiety  
but also indicating the limits of this freudian structure for a real understanding of anxiety

- I. anxiety in the network of the signifiers  
= castration anxiety
- II. anxiety as sign of desire ... of the Other?  
= beyond castration anxiety
- III. from the cosmos to the unheimliche  
= beyond castration anxiety
- IV. beyond castration anxiety  
= beyond castration anxiety
- V. that which deceives – the signifier as a trace of the subject  
= castration anxiety
- VI. anxiety as that which deceives not  
= beyond castration anxiety

## LESSON I

### ANXIETY IN THE NET(WORK) OF SIGNIFIERS

mind the subtitles

- desire of the Other
- orography of anxiety
- seriousness, care=souci=Sorge, expectation=attente=Erwartung
- inhibition=Hemmung, impediment=empêchement, embarrassment  
inhibition, emotion, turmoil=émoi

#### anxiety is a meeting point

- meeting point ...  
the understanding of the fundamental clinical phenomenon of anxiety is a point where all of his theory of the signifier culminates, where all of his ways of returning to Freud's unconscious (structured like a language) come together  
... but meeting point not yet reached  
the understanding of anxiety is a meeting-point  
– but this meeting point that has not yet been reached, we see it in front of us
- now in SemX this point of anxiety has to be reached
  - based on his own teaching until that moment, based on his return to Freud, Lacan suggests 2 Freudian roadmaps that could show us the way
    - the first Freudian roadmap to the point of anxiety is his own writing “subversion of the subject and dialectic of desire in the Freudian Unconscious” (1960, written shortly before SemX (1962-1963)  
there his famous graph links up no less than 14 of Freud's ‘metapsychological’ concepts,
    - the second Freudian roadmap to the point of anxiety is based on Freud's clinical triad of ISA, Inhibition Symptom Anxiety” (1926)
  - At the same time Lacan discards a philosophical roadmap to the point of anxiety, based on the triad of care / seriousness / expectation

A short word about each of these 3 roadmaps to the point where anxiety arises

- Lacans “Subversion” linking 14 freudian concepts as a Freudian roadmap to anxiety
  - In “subversion” Lacan had tried to link 14 of Freud’s concepts  
According to Lacan if we follow the paths of the graph, that sums up the links between all of these freudian concepts, we should be able to pinpoint the point where anxiety inevitably arises, this metaphor, of anxiety as POI, as the Point Of Intrest par excellence on the roadmap of the graph  
cf. calls this graph an orography of anxiety  
– an orography is the drawing of the topographic relief of a mountain
  - although Lacan pretends to only sum up Freud with his graph, the POI where this graph converges, the point of anxiety, is a POI that is not immediately to be found in Freud  
– this point is called the desire of the Other  
– which makes Lacan say that anxiety is the sensation of the desire of the Other  
Sem X confronts us with 2 figures of this desire of the Other, in the guise of 2 voracious animals – we could say 2 inhabitants of Lacan’s bestiary
    - Praying Mantis
      - see the reference to Caillois’ ethological study  
the female mantis who has to bite off the head of the male, in order to lift the inhibition of his ejaculation reflex
      - this image had already been developped in SemVIII and Sem IX
        - Lacan imagines himself in front of a female mantis, wearing a mask without knowing which mask it is ...
        - all of a sudden he realises that compared to the giant female mantis he has the size of the male mantis ...
        - and he breaks out in a cold sweat: maybe his mask is that of the male mantis ...
    - Camel – Camel Head
      - See the reference to Cazotte’s short story of “The devil who fell in love”  
a man conjures up the devil – who appears in the window in the guise of a hughe ugly camel head, shouting at him “Che vuoi?” – “wtf do you want?”
      - This image had already been developped in Sem IV
        - there he says that the desire of thet Other is my sudden realization that the Other does not know what I want and that I do not know what the Other wants
        - there Lacan also translates the desire of the Other, embodied by the ferocious Camel, as the desire of the Mother
        - and he also adds yet another voracious animal to his bestiary of embodiments of the desire of the Mother – and that’s the crocodile who protects her babies by holding them between her jaws

- Freud's clinical triad "Inhibition Symptom Anxiety" as a Freudian roadmap to anxiety
    - In SemX Lacan also develops a second road map to the POI of anxiety based on Freud's clinical triad of Inhibition Symptom Anxiety
    - This triad is fundamental in Lacan's reading of Freud in his teaching Lacan never let go the rope of this Freudian clinical triad – he kept on returning to his clinical triad, until the end: it structures for instance Sem XXI
    - SemX tries to make out of this Freudian clinical triad a road map indicating the way to the point where anxiety arises – a chart=tableau (kaart!!) it is called you find this chart on F22&93&369&384 – E13&77&319&332 some remarks about this chart
      - How is this chart constructed?  
it is based on 2 coordinates
        - the horizontal axis represents a increasing feeling of difficulty for the subject  
I must confess you that I do not really understand what Lacan means by difficulty=difficulté
        - the vertical axis represents an increasing desintegration of movement, the movement getting wilder and wilder
- In this way a structural difference between inhibition, symptom and anxiety is introduced
- inhibition means
    - that the subject does not feel too much of a difficulty
    - that its movement is completely frozen
  - anxiety on the contrary means
    - that the subject encounters the biggest difficulty
    - that its movement completely disintegrates
- Lacan also adds a number of other clinical phenomena – that have a link with anxiety
    - The most important clinical phenomena he does not mention in the first lesson yet
      - the classical psychiatric *passage à l'acte*
      - the postfreudian acting out
    - in order to make a clear distinction between acting out and passage à l'acte Lacan first had to introduce some new clinical phenomena of his own:
      - impediment=empêchement
      - embarrassment
- indeed, in lesson VIII and IX, it will appear that the passage à l'acte is provoked by the conjunction of impediment and embarrassment – which allows Lacan to make once and for all a very clear distinction between acting out and passage
- this chart also introduces the new clinical category of the turmoil=*émoi* in SemXVII Lacan will use it als a diagnosis of the student protests in Paris in 1968 - with a word play on *le mois de mai* he would call it *l'émoi de mai*
- And last but not least, in this chart, Lacan explicitly sets apart anxiety as an affect from all other kinds of emotions in SemX Lacan even goes so far as to say that anxiety is the only human affect

	difficulty →→→→		
movement	inhibition	impediment	embarrassment
↓	emotion	symptom	passage à l'acte
↓	turnmoil	acting out	anxiety

- philosophical triad
  - A third road map is a philosophical triad – actually an existentialist triad consisting of
    - Sartre’s notion of seriousness=*sérieux*
    - Heidegger’s notion of care=*Sorge=souci*
    - Who’s notion of expectation=*attente=Erwartung* ?
      - Lacan says that it is his own notion
      - an allusion to Beckett’s “En attendant Godot” = “Waiting for Godot”  
maybe waiting is a better translation than expectation
  - for Lacan these 3 philosophical/existentialist notions
    - do not really lead to the point where anxiety arises
    - on the contrary they lead away from it



## anxiety of the analyst

a recurrent theme in SemX is the anxiety of the analyst

You could say that this anxiety of the analyst is one of the starting points for an approach of anxiety beyond Freud's triad of Inhibition Symptom and Anxiety as an affect, beyond castration anxiety

- already in lesson I Lacan is constantly alluding to the attitude of the analyst towards anxiety suggesting that the anxiety of analysts would make it difficult, and even impossible to understand and to further develop Freud's anxiety theory
- I myself have always found very intriguing Lacan's casual remark about the anxiety of the analyst starting out in his practice F13-E5
  - first he makes an interesting observation to the extent that you show "great aptitude for being an analyst" you may "feel some anxiety from your first dealings with the patient on the couch"

I only have started to grasp this clinical truth after having studied SemXV, on the act of the analyst where Lacan reveals that this is the analyst's anxiety before his *Verleugnung*, his disavowal, his double attitude towards the subject supposed to know

    - knowing that you as a subject supposed to know at the end of an analysis will fall apart
    - you nevertheless put yourself as an analyst again and again in that place for someone else, in order to make the beginning of an analysis possible
  - then Lacan asks whether this anxiety of the analyst is the same as the anxiety of the patient? in order to answer this question, we have to distinguish 2 types of anxiety of the analyst
    - the anxiety of the analyst in front of his act, his anxiety in front of his disavowal concerning the subject supposed to know  
this anxiety is inherent in the analytical position and is not of the same order as the anxiety of the patient
    - the anxiety of the analyst in front of for instance the *passage à l'acte* or a systematic form of acting out of a patient  
this anxiety has to do with his not being sufficiently analysed and **falls within the** register of the so-called countertransference  
this countertransferential anxiety is of the same order as the anxiety of the patient, it is a hysterical anxiety you could say

## LESSON II ANXIETY AS A SIGN OF DESIRE

Do not forget about the subtitles

- An ideal of straightforwardness=simplicité
- Hegel and Lacan  
the desire of the Other in 5 formulae
- Division and its remainder=reste
- "I desire you, even if I know it not"

in the case of this lesson these subtitles perfectly sum up what Lacan has been introducing, what Lacan has been talking about

### teaching psychoanalysis

a new habit: reflecting on teaching psychoanalysis?

Lacan starts lessonII with a reflection on "teaching psychoanalysis", on the knot of between being a psychoanalyst and being a teacher at the same time

from SemX on these preliminary reflections on 'teaching psychoanalysis' would become a new habit of Lacan

lessons VI, VII, XII, XVIII and XIX all start with such a reflection

in lessonXIX Lacan even develops a 'pedagogy of castration'

- if you want to make a concept, you always have to take into account some form of castration as a limit in this conceptualisation
- this will be Lacan's guideline for the conceptualisation of the Unconscious, the drive, repetition and transference in SemXI

where does Lacan's new habit of reflecting about PA come from?

we should remember that at this time Lacan was getting more and more under fire, because of his unorthodox practices as a didactician, in cures of subjects who wanted to become analysts

- there were the famous short sessions
- his analysants followed his theoretical seminars
- Lacan also mixed analysis and supervision
- and so on

As you may know this would result in Lacan being excommunicated from the International Psychoanalytical Association, precisely after SemX, at the moment when he should have started SemXI

I will not comment here any further on these polemical preliminary reflections on psychoanalytic formation – unless you should have urgent questions about it?

## Lacan's pedagogical ideal of straightforwardness=simplicité

According to Lacan the discourse on anxiety is a complete chaos F27 – E18

- everybody is talking about anxiety all of the time
  - philosophers do, psychoanalysts do,
- we discover anxiety everywhere
  - in the clinic: in neuroses, psychoses, perversions
  - but also in culture anxiety is everywhere

How can we put some order in all of these anxieties?

Lacan reviews 3 ways to put some order in the phenomenology of anxiety

- the path of the catalogue of affects
  - this means that one starts with a general theory about 'the affect' and then, on the basis of this abstract theory, tries to distinguish between several forms of affect – including anxiety, amongst many other affects
  - examples
    - this is how scholastic philosophy, for instance Saint Thomas Aquinas, operated
    - but psychoanalytic theories of 'the affect' and the distinction of affects based upon it, for instance by Rapaport, are in line with this scholastic tradition
  - For Lacan general theories about the affect and the ensuing classifying of anxiety in some catalogue does not teach us anything about anxiety
- the method of the analogue
  - this is the trap of the interdisciplinary approach of anxiety: the phenomenon of anxiety has to be studied from different 'perspectives' that would complement each other
  - this is the psycho-bio-social approach of anxiety which nowadays is hugely popular – but only in academic psychology – not in biology or sociology: it's only psychology that begs for this imaginary kind of interdisciplinarity
- finally the structural approach – which is Lacan's approach
  - Lacan calls this structural approach straightforward or simple because there's only one key – and that is: always look for the place and the function of the signifier in the production of anxiety
  - this emphasis on the signifier means that Lacan at that moment still refers to Freud's approach of anxiety as castration anxiety

## the desire of the Other comparing Hegel's and Lacan's view of the desire of the Other in 5 formulae

Lacan took some of his inspiration for his notion of the desire of the Other in Hegel's philosophy

His famous formula: "man's desire = desire of the Other is borrowed from Hegel  
"man desires to be recognised as man by the Other" means that man wants to be desired by the Other  
man desires the desire of the Other

but there are also important differences between Lacan and Hegel  
with regard to the relation man's desire to the desire of the Other

- formula 1 = impasse of Hegel's philosophical recognition by the Other  
 $d(a) : d(A) < a \rightarrow$  violence
  - condition
    - before I can be recognized by the Other, I first have to recognize the Other as my equal  
cf. protest today, now that the father is no longer respected:  
we demand respect from people we do not respect ourselves
    - recognizing the Other as my equal means that the Other becomes a 'full Other',  
in the case of Hegel this is the Other being a conscience
  - the deadlock is that this Other can only recognise me as an object  
which is unbearable to me, because of my selfconsciousness
  - this leads to violence or aggression
- formula2 = the impasse of the neurotic recognition by the Other  
 $d(a) < i(a) : d(A/)$ 
  - problem
    - my Other is the signifier, my Other is the Unconscious
    - this means that my Other is not a full Other, my Other lacks  
– the desire of the Other is what the Other lacks (and does not know that he lacks it)
  - solution
    - mediation by the mirror image  $i(a)$  and, based on that mirror image, the fantasy  
so there's no direct relation between me and the Other with his lack,  
there's only a relation between the imaginary ego and the Other with his lack
  - result  
my desire is a problem, is a kind of waste phenomenon

### formula3 en formula4 = formulae about anxiety

unfortunately Lacan does not really explain them, so they remain rather obscure

- formula3  
 $d(x) : d(A) < x$   
Kierkegaard's theory of anxiety reveals the truth of Hegel (formula1)
- formula 4  
Lacan's theory of desire reveals the truth of anxiety  
two equivalent formulae
  - $d(0) < 0 : d(A/)$
  - $d(a) : 0 > d(0)$   
Lacan comes back to the second of these formulae F381 – E329 – saying that this is the case  
where man's desire and the desire of the Other partially overlap, causing aggression

### an object (a) that desires ...

I have yet another problem with this formulae

why does Lacan, in these formulae, note the desire of man as  $d(a)$  and not as  $d(S/)$ ?

as a matter of fact he does not say “the desire of the subject is the desire of the Other”

but always says “man’s desire is the desire of the Other”

in SemX he explains that in Hegelian formula “it is an object that desires” F36 – E25

which means that the desire is finite – *désir fini*

difficult to understand – with the passage F36 – E26

I also have the impression that Adrien Price had some difficulty translating this passage

- Price: as subject of the Ucs we are stamped by finitude → our lack can be finite desire
- me: our lack, as subject of the Ucs, is stamped by finitude → our lack can be finite desire!

I would be very relieved if one of the cartels could provide me with an explanation

should we understand this finite desire of the subject as being an object (a)

- as a reference to mathematics?
- as an metonymical anticipation of expression “the object a is the cause of the desire”?  
indeed, at the end of SemX, Lacan comes back to this expression, desire of a, saying that it means “desire as determined by the yieldable=cessible object” F381 – E329  
so maybe the expression “an object that desires” was a first obscure allusion to the desire as being caused by the object a

### love according to Hegel and Lacan

at the end of lessonII Lacan comes back to the difference between himself and Hegel with two different formulae about love

- Hegel
  - As a logical consequence of Hegel’s vision of the dialectic relationship of man with the Other ...
  - ... man has to say: “I love you, even if you don’t want me to”
  - this is an impasse  
could you say that this is the formulae of stalking?
- Lacan
  - The logical consequence of Lacan’s vision of the relation of man with the Other ...
  - ... is man saying, in his unconscious:  
“I desire you, you are the object of my desire, even if I know it not ...
  - this means that you say to the Other
    - I do not know what object you are
    - For me you are of the same order as the object that you yourself lack (too)  
this seduces the other – because I accomplish for the other what he is seeking

**the division which produces**

- **the object as a remainder**
- **the subject as a processing of this rest**

the table of the division of the subject is yet another didactic model for approaching the object of anxiety

this is the table which is exploited the most in SemX

it presents the relation of the subject with the Other as a mathematical operation of division

the initial situation is the encounter between

- at the right side = S  
the subject – the subject of jouissance (as Lacan will say later on)
- at the left side = A  
the pre-existing symbolic Other

at this initial stage the fundamental question for the subject is:

“how do I fit into the Other? what is my place in the Other?”

in the mathematical model of the division this fundamental question is translated as  
“how many times do I fit into the Other?”

from that moment on an operation of division is started off

a trick that I myself have found helpful for understanding how this table works,

is making a real operation of division

say that you divide 27 by 4 – see F37, 135 – E26, 114

zie bijgevoegd papiertje

the result of this ‘effort’ of the subject to enter into the Other of the signifier is double

- at the side of the subject  
the result is the unconscious, the Other in so far as I do not reach it, – noted as A/
- at the side of the Other  
the result is the fantasy – the fantasy consists of 2 parts
  - first the divided subject
  - and then only the remainder of the operation of division – object (a)

later on in SemX Lacan will develop a more advanced version of this table of division

F190, 203 – E161, 174

More advanced means that the division has been pushed a step further

- the result is that the subject has dropped deeper, if I may say so  
zie bijgevoegd papiertje
- which makes it possible to locate anxiety, more precisely castration anxiety, in the gap between jouissance and desire

in the transition from jouissance to desire, in the constitution of desire there’s always a moment of anxiety – even if you do not experience this anxiety as such, even if you cannot catch it clinically but we will come back to that in one of the following lessons

### LESSON III FROM 'THE COSMOS' TO 'THE UNHEIMLICHE'

First of all: mind the subtitles, given by JAM

- the specular and the signifier
- from the world to the world's stage=sène
- Hamlet and the stage on the stage
- Lévi-Strauss' serenity
- Anything whatsoever in the blank=blanc of the phallus

#### construction of the Imaginary in reference to the pre-existing Symbolic

LessonIII brings a summary of Lacan's return to Freud

This summary has its importance for the construction of a structural, freudian approach of anxiety as castration anxiety

- To begin with there are 2 stages in his return to Freud
  - On the one hand there's the imaginary stage of Lacan's return to Freud's theory of narcissism – with his mirror stage
  - On the other hand there's the symbolic stage of Lacan's return to Freud's theory of the unconscious formations (dreams, jokes, parapraxes) – with his theory of metonymy and metaphor
- Here Lacan very much stresses that the imaginary is dependent from the symbolic F42 – E32  
Just before SemX), in 1960, Lacan had substantiated this point of view, in his written comments on Lagache's theory of Personality Structure – where he developed a more complete diagram of the mirror stage F50 – E39
  - the imaginary ideal ego of the mirror image, noted  $i(a)$ , is dependent from the symbolic Ego Ideal, noted  $I(A)$
  - the Ego Ideal is the point in the Other the subject has to identify with in order to be able to see his own image in the mirrorthis dependency of the mirror image from the Ego Ideal can be observed when a young child for the first time recognizes its mirror image
  - first it looks at his image in the mirror – this is the ideal ego
  - then it turns towards the adult who supports it – this is the Ego Ideal – as if to call upon his assent, as if to ask this Other to ratify the value of this image
  - only then can the child safely turn back to the mirror and 'enjoy' its mirror image only then narcissism is established

## **anxiety before anything whatsoever appearing in the blank=*blanc* of the phallus**

At the end of lesson III Lacan uses the completed diagram of the mirror stage as a means for understanding Freud's castration anxiety but in the process

- he twists castration anxiety
- he introduces an object in castration anxiety

Lacan had already at the end of Sem VIII embarked upon this operation of subversion of Freud's castration anxiety

– where, in my feeling, he stated things more clearly

thanks to the completed model of the mirror stage,

Lacan in lesson III can distinguish between 2 forms of anxiety

- Freud's castration anxiety
- another form of anxiety that lies beyond castration anxiety  
this other form of anxiety is by Lacan related to what Freud called the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*
  - *Unheimlichkeit* is difficult to translate, like all terms referring to anxiety (and colours, says Lacan) – uncanniness, oddness, weirdness, ...
  - Oddly enough, if I may say so, this feeling of *Unheimlichkeit* is not really a clinical category, to begin with it is an aesthetical category – it is a particular form of aesthetic feeling  
in 1919 Freud would try to make it usable for his psychoanalytic clinic of anxiety  
you could say that Lacan is the only one who has tried to integrate Freud's reading of the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit* in a psychoanalytic theory of anxiety



Now how does the completed mirror model allow Lacan to distinguish between 2 types of anxiety?

- On the one hand the completed mirror model allows Lacan to redefine castration in a imaginary way
  - What is the imaginary castration?

The imaginary castration is the fact that the phallus does not appear in the mirror image, the fact that the penis is not mirrored

    - normally if you let children draw themselves they do not indicate their genitals – if they do so, you might already start to suspect some form of sexual abuse
    - in order to illustrate how this lack of the phallus in the mirror can come about Lacan introduces the topological figure of the cross cap

on this cross cap we can operate a cut which divides it in 2 parts

      - one part has an image in the mirror – which means that there's an inversion in the mirror
      - the another part, or remainder of this cut, has no mirror image – which means that its mirror image is exactly the same as the original thing
  - the reaction of the subject to this imaginary castration is castration anxiety
  - how does the subject cope with this imaginary castration anxiety?

Lacan opposes the neurotic reaction to what, at that time, might be the end of an analytic cure

    - end of PA or the required reaction tot castration anxiety F58 – E46

the subject has to turn its imaginary castration into what the Other lacks  
the subject has to turn its imaginary castration into a kind of guarantee of the Other

      - the Other lacks a signifier for the subject– the subject is the gap between every 2 signifiers
      - the subject has to accept that in the Other it can only be represented by its own castration  
the subject has to make of its own castration the sign of its presence in the Other  
Lacan also says the subject has to give his anxiety, his castration anxiety F65 – E52 as if the Other only can recognise me subject at my imaginary castration:  
“oh, you are the castrated guy, come in!”
    - neurotic reaction

the neurotic refuses to be represented in the Other by of his castration
- In Lessons IV en V Lacan also identifies a form of anxiety that goes beyond this imaginary Freudian castration anxiety – with the feeling of Unheimlichkeit

how can this completed mirror model explain this feeling of Unheimlichkeit?

- In Lessons IV en V Lacan also identifies a form of anxiety that goes beyond this imaginary Freudian castration anxiety – with the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*  
how can this completed mirror model explain this feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*?
  - This form of anxiety arises
    - when all of a sudden in this void in the mirror, in this void of the fallus or the imaginary castration, in the mirror something, 'anything whatsoever' appears
    - what is the problem with this apparition, why does it provoke anxiety?  
As a consequence of this apparition of this 'anything whatsoever'
      - ... the lack is the lacking (*manque qui manque*)
      - ... the support or structuring function of the lack of castration lacks
  - notwithstanding the fact that this anxiety, as caused by the lack of the lack, goes beyond Freud's castration anxiety, Lacan refers to Freud for typical clinical examples of it  
he points out that in Freud's "Inhibition symptom and anxiety" we find this anxiety caused by the lack of the lack side by side with anxiety caused by the lack of the castration F67 – E53  
in Freud this anxiety caused by the lack of the castration assumes different forms
    - anxiety when the mother is constantly ramming something down your throat
    - anxiety when the mother is constantly wiping your ass
    - anxiety when your willie constantly occupies you  
in lesson V F74 – E60 Lacan calls the penis an un-imaged residue of the body, that makes itself felt in the place laid out for lack
    - and last but not least there's also anxiety when you succeed, when you get everything you want in life – this is the anxiety before the comments of the surperego
  - where does this object come from?
    - this 'anything whatsoever' appearing in the void of the mirror is the object of the fundamental fantasy
    - as if the structure of the fantasy all of a sudden has become superimposed on the structure of the mirror stage – with the object of the fantasy all of a sudden filling in the lack left in the mirror image by the phallus
  - in any case: this filling up the lack of the imaginary castration with the object of the fantasy – with the result that the lack is lacking – brings us beyond castration anxiety  
at this point we experience another form of anxiety, – and that's the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*  
the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit* is the mixed feeling
    - that what you see is completely strange to you, in your reality
    - but on the other hand you also have this feeling that you might have seen that thing before, that somehow you are familiar with it – because it is the object of your fundamental fantasy  
for examples of this feeling of *Unheimlichkeit* Lacan at this point ...
      - ... does not refer to the clinic
      - ... but he refers to literature – which according to Freud has much more possibilities to conjure up the *unheimliche* than reality has  
just like Freud Lacan refers to Hoffmann's Tales  
see for yourselves – but mind! this is not the *unheimliche* in the clinic!

### 3 logical scansions

#### the world / the world on the stage / the stage on the stage

another important element for Lacan's theory of anxiety – beyond Freud's theory of castration

this 'anything whatsoever' object is the waste object of the staging of the world by the signifier  
link with this 'anything whatsoever' object is the object of fantasy

in the staging of the world we could distinguish 3 scansions, 3 times

- world
  - the world that we see, the world that is "in keeping with the laws of the brain"
  - a lateral remark on Lévi-Strauss
    - who finally starts from this supposition ...
    - ... and consequently falls back into a cosmic conception, where there is no lack
- the world on the stage
  - the stage where the world is 'voiced' (things are said, spoken) ...  
... in keeping with the laws of the signifier
  - there are 2 versions of this staging the world in keeping with the laws of the signifier
    - Lévi-Strauss' elementary structures of kinship / Sartre's history  
in this staged world, in human relations and history, Descartes "advances masked"  
(*larvatus prodeo* – *larvatus* = masked, but you could also say "in a larval state", not yet having left the pupal case)
    - Freud's Unconscious  
with its reference to Fechner's *anderer Schauplatz* = the Other Scène
  - the staging of the world leaves behind a huge amount of residues  
according to Lacan, all of these residues of all of the stagings of the world, as found in the same garbage pit, make up the world – there is no original world, there's no world from before the staging of the world
- the stage on the stage

the world is always staged – but on this stage another world can be staged

  - Referring to Rank Lacan recalls the stage on the stage in Shakespeare's Hamlet-play giving this stage on the stage its place and function in the reading of Hamlet he already had embarked upon in SemVI (1958-1959)  
in lessonIII he distinguishes between 3 identifications of Hamlet – which each time brings him into a different state of manic agitation
    - Identification with Claudius, the murderer of his father = identification with his mirror image  
this identification becomes clear thanks to the stage on the stage
    - Identification with Ophelia, the object of his grief = identification with the object of his desire
    - Identification with Laërtes = identification with his ego ideal

## LESSON IV BEYOND CASTRATION ANXIETY

First mind the subtitles given by JAM

- Object as a spare part (*pièce détachée*)
- 2 levels of the object in the fundamental fantasy of the neurotic
  - first level: Object as a postiche
  - deeper level: the real object for the neurotic is the Demand of the Other

### castration anxiety and its beyond: the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*

in lessonIV Lacan for the first time makes it clear that his theory of anxiety is aiming at going beyond Freud's theory of castration anxiety  
but we did already introduce this beyond of castration anxiety in lessonIII, with the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*

### the object in technological times

(1960 = postmodernism)

the object of desire, the object of anxiety, the object of jouissance

is not without a link to the objects our culture produces

at that moment of time the shadow of the postmodern, postindustrial object has fallen partly on the object

- the object can only to be approached via a complex construction  
it's an object that is part of 'a machine'  
– cf. graph "subversion"
  - this object always has the status of spare part  
is this a good translation??
    - *pièce détachée* = component, a detachable, loose, single or even odd piece
    - a characteristic of a *pièce détachée* is that rather sooner than later it will become obsolete
- so the object is, like a postmodern industrial object a spare part that has become obsolete, that does not fit any longer into a whole, a model

## the object in the fantasy perverse versus neurotic fantasy

what shines through at the place of the lack of the phallus in the mirror image, under the guise of 'anything whatsoever', is the object of the fundamental fantasy

Lacan operates a structural distinction between 2 fantasies

both fantasies function on 2 levels: a conscious level and an unconscious level

- fantasy of the pervert
  - comment here – more interesting when Lacan goes into the 2 levels of the pervert fantasy in the case of sadism and masochism – in lessons VIII, XI and especially XII
  - but it is already important to note that for Lacan perversion is not the contrary of the fantasy just like neurosis perversion is based on a fantasy  
you cannot say that the pervert just acts out what the neurotic fantasizes
- fantasy of the neurotic

neurotic fantasy functions on 2 levels

  - first level = conscious level of neurotic fantasy
    - on the conscious level of his fantasy the neurotic is in the position of the object a
    - the object position remains uncomfortable, cos the neurotic does not really identify with it  
cf. several expressions of Lacan
      - “the object a position becomes the neurotic like gaiters become a rabbit”
      - “the neurotic wears this object a just like it would wear a postiche”
      - “the neurotic makes a fallacious use of the object”
    - so why then does the subject identify with the objet a – what are the advantages, the gain?  
In this way the subject defends itself against the anxiety in front of the desire of the Other – it functions as a bait onto the Other
    - this is the superficial hysterical nature of the neurotic fantasy  
as can be seen in the seduction of the Other, by Freud's hysterics
      - dream of the Butcher's wife in Freud's “interpretation of dreams”
        - Butcher's wife identifies in a uncomfortable way with “the rather thin phallus” ...
        - ... in order to catch, to neutralise the desire of her husband
      - Anna O
        - catches Breuers desire, neutralises it ...
        - ... by her perfect free associations without any allusion to sexuality
  - deeper level = unconscious level of the neurotic fantasy
    - the true object of the neurotic is the Other's Demand  
the only thing the neurotic desires is that the Other demands something of him  
the structure of the fantasy  $\$ \diamond a$  reveals itself as  $\$ \diamond D$  (F80 – E65)
    - this is the profoundly obsessional level of neurotic fantasy  
as revealed in the obsessional fantasy of oblativity F65 – E 52
      - the subject suggests to the Other that it is prepared to give everything, to give itself completely, heart and soul (the subejct inflates itself) – the Other only has to demand
      - but of course, the moment the Other really demands something, nothing comes out of the subject (but air)

## LESSON V THAT WHICH DECEIVES

Subtitles by JAM

Slightly rearranged by me

- triad of the Other – in the production of anxiety
  - the Other's Demand
  - the Other's Jouissance
  - the Other's desire
- the relation between signifier and drive
  - the signifier is the result of the effacement of a trace of the subject
  - the drive=pulsion is the result of a cut=coupure in the mirror image
- vacuum experiment by Pascal

### the aim of PA

interesting introduction about the aim of PA

- not the philosophical aim = know yourself
- therapeutical aim = to improve the subject's position
  - not by aiming at that better position as known on beforehand because as they say "the way to hell is paved with good intentions"
  - cure is always a kind of additional bonus (*guérison vient de surcroît*) one of the most controversial sayings in "Variations on the standard treatment" (1955) that would pursue Lacan ever since
- nothing about the real end of PA!!

### the 3 dimensions of the Other in the production of anxiety

- the Other's Demand
- the Other's Jouissance
- the Other's desire

### objective and experimental research of anxiety as behavior misses the Other's Demand in the production of anxiety

2 classical examples of objective research on anxiety as behavior

- Pavlov  
in his theory on the experimental neuroses he produces in animals, Pavlov misses the dimension of the Other's Demand in the production of anxiety
- Goldstein  
in his study of the reaction of people to organic lesions Goldstein misses the dimension of the Other's Demand in the production of anxiety  
nevertheless Goldstein's work allows Lacan to make an important Freudian distinction
  - catastrophic reaction = Freud's traumatic anxiety or helplessness=*Hilflosigkeit*=*détresse*
    - the lesions are so important that the subject is completely put out of action
    - no Other is be present
  - anxiety = Freud's anxiety signal  
anxiety arises, under the following two conditions
    - the lesions do not put the subject completely out of action  
– implying that the subject can perceive its own lack, if i may say so
    - the subject perceives its lack under the effect of the Other's Demand

### Jones on the nightmare misses the Other's Jouissance and the Other's Demand

Jones points to the nightmarisch figure of the *incubus* (for woman) or *succubus* (for man)  
But he misses the two dimensions embodied by this figure

- It embodies the Other's jouissance  
it crushes you with all of its opaque weight of foreign or Other jouissance
- It embodies the Other's Demand  
it is also a riddle, it also embodies a question  
it is an opaque signifier

### the relation between signifier and drive

- the signifier is the result of the subject's effacement of his traces
- the drive=pulsion is the result of a cut in the mirror image
  
- the signifier is the result of the subject's effacement of his traces
  - the signifier is the trace of a subject who has been working on his own traces
    - in SemIX Lacan remarked that man returns on his own footsteps, in order to erase them so a footstep that has been erased is a sign of human presence
    - in SemX Lacan even goes a step further: man creates falsely false traces of his true passage – he holds out that the traces of his true passage are just made up, only in order to make his pursuer believe that he precisely passed this way  
or with the classical jewish joke: “why do you say you go to Lemberg, so that I would believe that you do not go to Lemberg, while you are really going to Lemberg?”  
in creating a signifier, by working on his own traces, the subject addresses itself in the most radical way to the Other
  - how does the signifier as a trace of the subject who has worked on his trace show itself in the clinic of the neurotic
    - hysterical conversion
      - the hysteric is only too happy when a signifier or effaced trace writes itself on her body, and thereby introduces a lack in her body, for instance under the form of an arm that has become insensitive  
the proof is the typical *indifférence hystérique* – hysterical indifference to the suffering caused by this lack in the body
      - on the other hand, when this lack lacks, the hysteric gets anxious
    - obsessional making unhappened = *ungeschehen machen* See also F161 – E137  
if a signifier or effaced trace tries to write itself on the body of the obsessional, for instance some anal dirt on the hands,
      - he thinks he can undo it  
– reasoning this is only a signifier, this is not the real shit
      - but the more he tries to efface this signifier, the more of a signifier it becomes: you cannot efface something that is effaced  
– and he gets anxious
- the drive is the result of a cut in/by the mirror image



- the drive is the result of a cut in/by the mirror image
  - you could say that the mirror image
    - cuts off (*couper, sectionner*) or breaks off (*cassure*) parts of what the subject until that moment thought to be his own body – making objects out of these body parts
    - creates voids=vide at the level of the body  
these are the points where the drive originates
  - this cutting operation is a rather ambiguous operation in 2 ways
    - in one of the next lessons we will see that it is not always clear where exactly the cut by the mirror in the body of the subject passes
    - in lesson IV Lacan stresses that this drive-creating cut in the body of the subject is not only a passive proces, by the sheer fact of the mirror stage – the subject also actively participates in it
      - with its burgeoning teeth the subject itself bites off the nipple from his own body
      - with its sphincter the subject itself cuts of the scybalum from his own body
- the philosophical *horror vacui* (horror of the void=vide) = horror of the drive  
with his experiments Pascal tries to overcome this philosophical horror vacui

## LESSON VI THAT WHICH DECEIVES NOT

### Subtitles by JAM

- Ferenczi: the displacement of erogeneity of the clitoris to the vagina is a hysterical mechanism
- The object of anxiety is framed=*encadré*
- Anxiety does not deceive – action borrows its certainty from anxiety
- The Other's Demands  
the Demands of Jaweh to the Jewish people

### The paradox of Ferenczi

- **Woman reaches genital maturity (vaginal orgasm) ...**
- **... via the hysterical mechanism of conversion (displacement of the erogeneity of the clitoris to the vagina)**

### the paradox of Ferenczi

- Ferenczi is the champion of the mature genital relationship between man and woman, of the succesfull sexual relationship (*rapport sexuel*)  
in the case of woman genital maturity means vaginal orgasm
- Yet, also according to Ferenczi, the erogeneity of the vagina actually comes about in the same way as a hysterical conversion – leading to the same problems
  - To begin, from the anatomical point of view, with the vagina is insensitive -
  - In order for the vagina to become sensitive, or eroticised, the erogeneity of the clitoris has to be transferred to the it – just as it can be transferred to an arm
  - in a reaction against this erotization the arm can become insensitive – the arm becomes a void or a lack in the body image  
same for the vagina – in a reaction againts this phallic erotisation, it also risks to become insensitive –to become a void a lack in the body image

## **the object of anxiety (the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*) is framed**

the frame is a structural characteristic of the particular form of anxiety called the feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*

you have to look for this frame, every time an object produces a feeling of *Unheimlichkeit*

this frame is the frame of the fantasy

I already gave away that the object appearing in the lack of the phallus in the mirror image is the object of the fantasy – as if the fantasy was superimposed on the mirror image

So it is not only the object of fantasy that appears at that moment but also the frame that is so typical for the fantasy in the scopic field

For this fantasy frame Lacan gives 3 references:

- Margritte's painting "La condition humaine" (the human condition)
  - a painting of the landscape that is supposedly to be seen through a window is put in the frame of this very window, hiding the supposed landscape
  - this is done in order to "not see what is to be seen outside the window" although there's a strong suggestion that it is exactly the same
- the Wolfman's childhood nightmare
  - to begin with in this dream the Wolfman is confronted with a dark window
  - but all of a sudden this window bursts open just like in the theatre, says Lacan, when the curtains open in itself this opening of the curtains is already a moment of anxiety – of expectation anxiety
  - in the theatre the moment the scene starts to come alive this expectation anxiety usually immediately disappears but in the case of the Wolfman something is revealed "that cannot be said in the world"
    - 5 white wolves sitting in the tree in front of this window and staring at him
    - later on Lacan will say that the object of the gaze (the white wolves, their eyes) is supported by the fallus, the castration (the tree)
  - consequently in the case of the Wolfman the expectation anxiety at the opening of the curtains does not fade but develops into a full blown anxiety – his dream turns into a nightmare
- by way of contrast, as a kind of negative reference, Lacan also refers to the drawing of a schizophrenic woman, who was a patient of Belgian psychiatrist Bobon
  - this drawing also represents a tree F200 – E74
  - it could be interesting to compare this drawing, by a schizophrenic woman, with the drawing of the obsessional Wolfman
    - I call this a negative reference – because this drawing is characterised by the absence of a frame – the object of anxiety does not appear within a frame why not? Probably because in schizophrenia there's no such thing as a fundamental fantasy that can be superimposed on the mirror image – but probably in schizophrenia there's no mirror image either
    - another difference – which maybe also has to do with the lack of a frame – is that the object that appears is not only eyes, or the gaze, but also a form of writing, a formula, with an equivocal signifier: "Io sono sempre vista" – the equivocal signifier is *vista* = I am seen + I am a view

**anxiety does not deceive  
consequently action borrows its certainty from anxiety**

anxiety does not deceive

when we get anxious, we can be sure that something is there that concerns us  
but what can we be sure of?

- that we are approaching our desire, like i told you in the introductory session?
- that we are approaching the R?
- that we are approaching the object!

Lacan says that anxiety is the sole subjective translation of the object

In any case it is in a flight before anxiety, before the object of anxiety, that we swing into action,  
that we start undertaking all kinds of actions of which we are sure that we must do them  
action borrows its certainty from anxiety, says Lacan

However sure these actions driven by anxiety are, they are not positive actions, if I may say so  
Indeed, the action Lacan refers to are

- acting out
- passage à l'acte

in this lesson he gives both actions their place in the chart that he already constructed in lesson I around  
Freud's clinical triad of inhibition, symptom and anxiety F93 – E77

as already said he will clearly distinguish acting out and *passage à l'acte* in lessons VIII and IX  
we could already say that both attest to a typical twist in the relation of the subject to the object

- acting out = the subject shows that it has the object (of anxiety)
- pasage à l'acte = the subject shows that it has become the object (of anxiety)

## anxiety for the Other's Demand the Demands of Jaweh to his people

difference between the gods of the 3 monotheisms

- Islamic God, Allah  
not here
- christian god
  - the god of the philosophers  
modelled after Plato's sovereign good and Aristoteles universal mover
  - a Father figure
- god of the Jews, Jahweh  
the god of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, Jakob
  - you speak to Jahweh, you ask him things
  - but Jahweh also speaks to you  
he asks you something, he demands something of you
    - he asks you to enjoy (rejoice!! = Hallelujah)
    - this demand causes anxiety  
because you do not know how to enjoy or what Jahweh means with jouissance
    - and thus Jahweh tries to soothe that anxiety  
by giving you the instructions how to enjoy  
he indicates you the condition for your jouissance namely circumcision
      - circumcision is not castration – with the ensuing castration anxiety
      - circumcision is a symbolic operation  
soothens your anxiety before your jouissance as ordered by the Other in 2 ways:
        - by isolating an object under the guise of the foreskin  
that you can offer to Jahweh – who is happy with that
        - by ensuring you of your manhood, and your manliness  
by making more clear the distinction between man and woman  
by removing the female element of the foreskin and revealing the male element of the glans

Specialist Course for UGent Doctoral School 2017-2018  
Mental Health Care, Psychoanalysis and Philosophy III

**AN INTRODUCTION TO LACAN'S SEMINAR ON ANXIETY (1962)  
AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR TODAY'S CLINIC AND CULTURE**

Dr. Lieven Jonckheere

**Lesson 3**

**LACAN'S REVISION OF THE STATUS OF THE OBJECT**

**29 August 2018**

meedoen

- Sem VIII

the first part of SemX was Lacan's exploration of the Freudian or symbolic structure of anxiety  
How can you explain anxiety starting from the ascendancy of the S over the I  
This boiled down to a redefinition of Freud's castration anxiety – as the lack in the phallus in the mirror

this redefinition of castration anxiety made clear that it does not explain all of anxiety in the PA clinic  
anxiety is not caused by castration but by an object that appears in the lack of castration

- castration is not the cause of anxiety but only the condition for the appearance of an object that causes anxiety
- and maybe castration is not even a necessary condition for the appearance of this object of anxiety, maybe it can also appear under other conditions

in any case, in the second part of SemX Lacan starts exploring this newly discovered – or invented – object

at the start of lessonVIII Lacan immediately states that anxiety is its sole subjective translation  
F119 – E100 – which means that anxiety is the only way to approach this object



let's first have a quick look at the titles JAM gave to these lessons

In order to identify immediately some of the crucial points in what JAM calls "a revision of the status of the object"

- VII. not without having it (il n'est pas sans l'avoir)  
common formula for the fallus ??? not clear at all  
cf. SemIX "il n'est pas sans l'avoir – cela ne veut pas dire qu'il l'a" (promis)  
he's not without having it – which does not imply that he does have it (it's only a promiss)
- VIII. clinic of the object of anxiety  
the object is the cause of desire  
the subject is the object in passage à l'acte
- IX. the object is a lack that is not reducible to the signifier
- X. punctuations on desire  
introduction to the problem of countertransference  
or the difficult relations of the analyst with the object of anxiety **beter**

## LESSON VII NOT WITHOUT HAVING IT

### Title by JAM is incomprehensible to me

Allusion to the castration

Cf. end SemIX he/man is not without having the phallus – wich does not imply that he does have it -it's only a promiss (cf. SemIV)

### More luck with the subtitles by JAM?

Inspired by what Lacan says at the start of this lesson, in the reflection on teaching which from SemX on would become the standard start of each lesson of his seminar

There Lacan says that you have to approach new material with as many existing conceptions as possible

And this is what he does in SemX with the new material of a new object, the object of anxiety – especially in this lesson

So JAM in his subtitles simply lists Lacan's different approaches in this lesson of this new object of anxiety

- physics – more precisely: optics
- linguistics
- sociology
- physiology
- topology

## the completed diagram of the mirror stage and the appearance of the gaze

the complete diagram of the mirror stage makes it possible to distinguish between 2 types of objects in order to make this distinction Lacan

- brings a topological object in front of the mirror – which is the cross-cap (end of this lesson)
  - it is possible to cut (the cut of the signifier!) the cross-cap in such a way that it falls apart in 2 pieces
    - the main piece that has a mirror image
    - a kind of rest piece that has no mirror image
- a complicated topological undertaking, not my cup of tea  
I understand the basic idea, but not the technical execution of it
- objects that have a mirror image
    - the model for this object is the main piece isolated by the cut on the cross cap
    - these objects can be shared with other people  
these are the objects that, according to the proto-Lacan, at a time when Lacan still was a weird surrealist psychiatrist, start off a kind of transitivist and even paranoid rivalry between humans – my object is the object of the other, my object is the object of my mirror image
  - objects that have no mirror image
    - we have already seen that the phallus has no mirror image  
the phallus is a blank in our mirror image
    - now it is in this lack in the mirror, the lack of castration, that the other piece, isolated by the cut on the cross-cap, can appear  
of this piece it also can be said that it has no mirror image, because you do not recognize it as a part of yourself that has been mirrored – nevertheless it is a part of your own body
      - it can be your eyes for instance
        - your own eyes that you do not recognize in the mirror as your own eyes
        - your own eyes that lead an independent existence in the mirror
        - your own eyes that continue to look at you, even when you turn your back to the mirror  
this is Lacan's first definition of the gaze, in SemX – as an object of anxiety F104 – E88  
the problem is that the apparition of the gaze in the mirror, in the blank spot of the phallus in the mirror, makes a double out of your mirror image  
see Lacan's reference to Maupassant
      - but it can also be the phallus  
at this point Lacan still thinks of the phallus as an object  
and thus, in the case of the phallus, the problem is the same as in the case of the gaze  
the phallus can appear in the blank spot of the phallus in the mirror – as an object of anxiety  
see Lacan's reference to the anxiety when we realize that in being exchanged between men, women are reduced or rather raised to being the phallus
    - the anxiety of the subject before this appearance of the gaze in the lack of the phallus in the mirror image, the anxiety before the appearance of the double, causes the vacillation or fading of the subject – which is the same as the division of the subject, the subject is divided by the gaze  
in general: object of anxiety is what really causes the division of the subject

**clinical problem**  
**male impotence**  
F108 – E91

Endlust-Vorlust

- the *Vorlust* (preliminary pleasure or forepleasure) is rising and rising – and this is becoming painful
- so this has to stop
  - by the intervention of the Other – by castration we could say
  - the *Endlust* or final pleasure, with its detumescence, is a kind of natural form of castration

Freud's Psychology of love life

- division in man between love/desire
  - impotent with the one ideal woman they love
  - potent with all those other women that they desire, but under the guise of despising them: prostitutes
- you should read the original texts by Freud (1910), that remain very contemporary
  - 'On the Universal Tendency to Debasement in the Sphere of Love',
  - 'A Special Type of Choice of Object made by Me'

**2 dimensions of the transference: signifier and object**  
**the problem caused by forgetting about the object in the transference**  
F110 – E 93

Lacan distinguishes between 2 sides of the transference

These 2 sides will be the basis for his conceptualisation of transference as a fundamental concept of PA in SemXI

- **diachronic side of transference = transference as a historical repetition**
  - the importance of the S in transference
  - transference as a repetition of the imaginary of lived experience as far as this has been signified
    - cf. towards your analyst you repeat the feelings you had towards your parents
    - cf. in the relation to the analyst you repeat a trauma – you once again get seduced
  - Lacan refers to his first writing on transference where he commented on Lagache's distinction
    - transference as repetition of a need
    - transference as the need of repetition
  - this is the side of transference that in SemXI is conceptualised as the subject supposed to know
- **synchronic side of transference = the object in the transference**
  - the object in transference was announced in SemVIII on transference when Lacan was talking about what he calls in SemX "a love present in the real" F128 – E108
    - he approaches this love in the Real in several ways
      - the metaphor of love
        - a hand reaches over to a log = the object
        - just as the hand is about to reach the log, the log catches fire – and in this flame another hand appears, reaching back to the first  
this means that loves turns the desired (eromenos) into a desirer (erastes)
      - the agalma, the treasure, hidden deep in the ugly Socrates, according to Alcibiades – in Plato's "Symposium"
    - the best known formula for this love in the R is  
"love is to give what one hasn't got", "love is to give your lack, your castration"
  - this "presence of a love in the Real" is the side of transference analysts tend to forget about  
Lacan gives 2 examples of analysts who are blind for the object in the transference, because they only have an eye for the repetition of the signifier in transference  
2 examples who only stress the oedipal repetition
    - Bouvet (without name!) – in the case of obsessional women
      - they should feel penis envy, they should want to suck off the father – in the transference
      - the object is the shit in the fantasy of oblativity
    - Freud – in the case of young hysterical women they should love the father – in the transference
      - Dora – Freud forgets about MrsK
      - Young homosexual woman

## LESSON VIII

### THE OBJECT IS THE CAUSE OF DESIRE

Can we learn something from JAM's subtitles?

Yes, we can

- Displacement of the object of desire
  - the 'false' or intentional object of desire lies in front (en avant) of desire
    - this object stretches desire
  - The 'real' or causal object of desire lies behind (derrière) desire
    - this object pushes desire, you could say
- Clinic
  - The sadist's identification with the fetish object
  - the masochist's identification with the common object
- 2 dimensions of transference
  - repetition of the trauma
  - real love – and agalmasee previous lesson
- The young homosexual woman, dropped by Freud

**anxiety is the sole subjective translation of this new object**

Lesson VIII starts with a very important remark

anxiety is the sole subjective translation of this new object

anxiety is the only moment that this object is present, that we become aware of this object

this object also functions in desire – as far as desire is based on the fantasy (which is an objectrelation) but when we desire, on the basis of the fantasy, we are not aware of this object – we only have to do with substitutes of this object, with objects that make us say again and again: “this is not really what I want, next object please!”

Only in the moment of anxiety we can say of the object – “this is the thing!”

## displacement of the object of desire from the front to the back

- the 'false' or intentional object of desire lies in front (*en avant*) of desire
  - this is the object that we want, the object we think we want
  - you could call this an 'internal' object – we have already a preconceived idea of an object, and then we look for it in the outer world
  - but all we find are an endless series of interchangeable objects that never match this preconceived idea, that never fill up the void of desire
  - you could say that these objects stretch desire, because they make desire always reach out for 'something new'
- the 'real' or causal object of desire lies behind (*derrière*) desire

Lacan calls this the precession of the object F122 – E 103

  - this object pushes desire, in the back  
or in more conceptual terms: this object is the condition or the cause of desire
  - we do not already have an internal image of this object, that we then can go looking for in the outer world  
this object is “an outside that stands prior to a certain internalization”, which means that it has not been integrated in the body image at the moment of the mirror stage
  - this is the object that we only meet or experience in anxiety
  - example the fetish as an object
    - it's not that the shoe is desired
    - but if the shoe is present, desire fires



**the object in the perversions  
sadism and masochism**

Perversions are the clinic par excellence of this new object, the clinic of the object of anxiety  
Which makes SemX the most interesting seminar for the Lacanian study of perversions  
Especially sadism and masochism

First of all Lacan makes it very clear that masochism en sadism are are two completely separate structures, with a logic of their own  
masochism is not the result of turning your own sadism against yourself  
In neurosis this might be the case, that you turn your sadism or agression against yourself, and behave like a victim  
But perverse masochism cannot be explained by this kind of reversal

In LessonVIII Lacan embarks on a comparative analysis of the differences between the fantasy in sadism and the fantasy in masochism  
in both perversions the fantasy has two levels  
but what happens on both levels, the relation to the Big Other and the object, the new object, is in both perversions completely different

In lessonXII Lacan will come back to the structure of sadism and masochism

- sadism
  - based on Lacan's writing "Kant with Sade" (1963), written during SemX
  - Lacan distinguishes between 2 levels
    - the conscious level

I am an object for the Other

      - sadist aims at the anxiety of the Other, he wants to make the Other anxious  
he does so by introducing a split, a dissociation in the Other, by dividing the Other
      - how does the sadist achieves this
        - by posing as being only the instrument/agent of the Law of the jouissance of the Other
          - instrument of agent means that it is hard work, that he's not working for his own jouissance ...
          - ... but for the Other's jouissance  
in sadism the Other's jouissance can assume different forms
            - the jouissance of God
            - the jouissance of Mother Nature, of the Law of Nature  
everything must constantly fall apart in order to create constantly new life
            - the obscene and ferocious jouissance of the moral law or the Superego –  
this is Sade as a pastiche of Kant
        - by posing as a pure object, as a black fetish F124 – E104  
Lacan refers to the Painting of a petrified Sade by Man Ray, of a Sade turned to stone
    - the unconscious level – which is the level of the fantasy

"the Other is reduced to an object for me"

the sadist does not know that what he really wants, what he desires
    - he desires to lay hands on the object (a) in the Other – on the object (a) as the nether side of the Other  
*j'ai eu la peau du con* – I have succeeded in isolating the cunt-skin F193 – E165 **bad translation**
    - he does so by turning the Other inside out, like a glove

- masochism
    - check the most interesting comments by Lacan in SemXVI, starting from Deleuze's analysis of Sacher Masoch 1967
    - Lacan distinguishes between 2 levels
      - the conscious level  
"I am an object for the Other"  
this is the level of the scene organised by the masochist  
this is the level of the contract drawn up by the masochist
        - in this contract, on this scene, the masochist let's the Other, his Master, declare:  
"whatever I desire is your Law" – often enough this Law is what the Mother desires (a domina)  
in lessonXI&XII Lacan says that the masochist wants to guarantee the Other's jouissance in embodying the Law for him
        - how does the masochist achieve this – by posing as an object – but which object
          - the common object (not a fetish, unless you would say he's the fetish after the orgasm, reduced to waste)
          - he's just a piece of merchandise, dealt with by contract sold as common object, an exchange object
- for Lacan this relationship of the masochist with his Other reveals something deeply human: "to recognize oneself as the object of one's desire is always masochistic"
- the unconscious level – which is the level of the fantasy  
the masochist does not know that what he really wants, what he desires
    - he desires to provoke the anxiety of the Other (see lessonXII)  
– this is the Other breaking the contract, the Other fleeing from the scene  
F178-E152, F192-E163
    - in Christian masochism what is aimed at is God's anxiety  
unfortunately God does not flinch!
  - This reading of masochism implies that there is no such a thing as a structural female masochism F222-E190  
Lacan even goes so far as to say that female masochism is but a male fantasy  
Man projects that he himself sustains his own jouissance by anxiety

## the object in the action acting out and passage à l'acte

acting out and passage à l'acte are actions motivated by anxiety, that borrow their certainty from anxiety

anxiety does not deceive

when we get anxious we can be sure that something is there that concerns us

we can be sure that we are approaching the object!

Lacan says that anxiety is the sole subjective translation of the object

now it is as a kind of flight before this point of anxiety, this object, that we swing into action, that we start undertaking actions – actions of which we are sure that we must do them

Action borrows its certainty from anxiety, says Lacan

The actions that borrow their certainty from anxiety are:

- acting out
- passage à l'acte

I also recall

- passage à l'acte stems from the classical psychiatric clinic
- acting out stems from the classical postfreudian clinic

5 cases where Lacan, like a real detective, detects acting out and passage à l'acte over several lessons

- 2 Freud cases
  - in both cases there is a link between the passage à l'acte and the acting out, a passage à l'acte all of a sudden puts an end to a extended period of acting out
  - in both cases the acting out and the ensuing passage à l'acte happened in relation to fathers, who afterwards were completely upset and brought their daughters to Freud
    - Dora
    - young homosexual woman  
in this case Lacan also goes into the way Freud handles acting out in the cure
- 2 postfreudian cases  
of acting out in the cure, under transference
  - Acting out in a case of Ernst Kris
    - Lacan looks for the responsibility of the analyst
    - best known example of acting out in Lacan's teaching
  - how to handle acting out according to Phyllis Greenacre and the deadlocks of it
- Lacanian case of a double passage à l'acte  
Piera Aulagnier

## acting out and passage à l'acte in Freud's young homosexual woman

- oedipal situation  
to begin with this woman had felt deceived by her father
  - she always had wanted a child from the father – as a substitute of the phallus
  - so she gets very mad at her dad when it appears that her mother expects yet another child from him, a late arrival
- acting out
  - in reaction to this 'traumatic event' she had started a love relation with an older woman, a kind of luxury prostitute  
this love relation took the form of courtly love, she behaved like a medieval knight towards this prostitute, following her everywhere and trying to save her – and neglecting herself
  - for Lacan this is but an acting out towards her father  
she shows her father how a real man should treat a woman, how he should have treated her
    - she sacrifice for this woman what she has, the phallus F146- E123
    - she makes this woman the phallus
- passage à l'acte

- passage à l'acte  
This acting out sets the scene for the clash with her father – which will lead to the passage à l'acte that has brought her in PA
  - parading with her female lover on a some place m'as tu vu in Vienna she runs into her father and then something happens which pushes her to a passage à l'acte: she tries to commit suicide by jumping from some low bridge  
what has happened? What are the conditions for this passage à l'acte  
there are 2 conditions – these 2 conditions are clinical phenomena that Lacan already had identified in Lesson I, while constructing this chart around Freud's Inhibition, Symptom Anxiety
    - embarrassment  
she's embarrassed by the furious looks her father gives her, when he sees his beloved daughter walking arm in arm with this prostitute  
embarrassment = being effaced by the bar
    - emotion  
she's overcome by emotion when her lover starts to panic, "is this well known man your father?" – and lets her down  
emotion = disorder of movement (ex-motus)
  - her passage à l'acte is the consequence of this conjunction of embarrassment towards her father en emotion towards her love: she jumps from a low bridge  
in this passage à l'acte the subject leaves the scene
    - In this respect jumping of the bridge is of the same order as the typical passage à l'acte in adolescence of the fugue – the adolescent running away from home jumps of the scene, with all of its history based codes, fictions and semblances, in order to get lost in a kind of virgin world
    - the young homosexual woman leaves the scene as being dropped or by letting drop herself – this remains ambiguous F131&136 – E111&115
      - Freud makes this being dropped of letting drop herself even more ambiguous, using the ambiguous word *niederkommen* – which also means 'to give birth'
      - and Lacan recalls a typical passage à l'acte of the so called phallic mother
        - the mother who always has her child on her lap – as a phallus ...
        - ... is also the mother who inexplicably one day let's this child slip from her lap: from phallus of the mother it has all of a sudden become her object a
      - in any case in letting herself drop Freud's young homosexual woman shows that she is no longer the phallus she was as the knight of her Lady, but she becomes the object a
  - Freud's handling of the acting out in the cure, under transference

- Freud's handling of the acting out in the cure, under transference
  - Lacan does not explicitly say so, but I think the the transference of this young homosexual woman must be understood as a form of acting out
    - At first sight there was no transference – nothing of what Freud seemed to touch her
    - But upon closer inspection Freud discovered a kind of negative transference upon him she provokes Freud just like she had provoked her father – but now the provocation has been reversed, if I may say so:
      - In the reality she provoked her father  
by her homosexuality, by her courtly love for an older woman
      - In the transference she provokes Freud  
by dreaming of a perfect heterosexual future, with a loving husband and children  
absence of transference, this negative transference
  - How did Freud handle this negative transference?  
by a passage à l'acte: he drops her and sends her to a female colleague  
what are the 2 conditions for this passage à l'acte?
    - Embarrasement
      - Before his followers: can the unconscious lie?
    - Emotion
      - Freud's passion was that a woman should tell him everything, that woman always should tell him the truth and nothing but the truth
      - Freud immediately realises that these dreams lie, that this is not what she desires, that she only dreams this in order to make it very clear to him that she will never do that
      - the homosexual woman showed him that in speaking there's also something else than the truth: her jouissance??

acting out and passage à l'acte in Freud's Dora

in the next lesson IX

- acting out
  - her paradoxical behavior towards her father in his relation with Mr and Mrs K
    - on the one hand she goes on long walks with Mr K, in order to make it possible that her father can be alone with his lover, Mrs K
    - on the other hand she complains about the fact that her father pushes her into the arms of Mr K and does not mind her
- passage à l'acte
  - conditions
    - embarrassment  
Mr K saying to her "my wife means nothing to me"
    - emotion  
something in relation to Mrs K ??  
the fact that a maid had told her that Mr K had also made advances to her??
  - Passage à l'acte  
Dora slaps Mr K in the face and runs away



## Ernst Kris' responsibility for an acting out

In lessonIX

But already analysed in "Direction of the treatment and the principles of its power" (1958)

- A intellectual is obsessed with the idea of committing plagiarism
- Ernst Kris, being a great intellectual himself, checks this obsession in reality – and learns that in reality it is the other way round: his patient is being plagiarized by the colleague he thinks he is plagiarizing himself – and he says so to his patient: you do not plagiarize, the other does let's say that this is an imaginary interpretation – which does not take into account the desire of his patient, his desire to plagiarize, for one reason or another
- The result is an acting out
  - Here Lacan says that the patient after each session starts eating a plate of fresh brains in reality he only goes looking around at the menus of restaurant where he can find this plate – he does not eat them in reality
  - It is as if the patient is holding this object of the fresh brains up high before his analyst showing him the object that causes a desire that is ignored by the analyst, by the Other
  - This acting out appeals to the Other  
this acting out calls upon interpretation by the Other
    - this is the difference of acting out with a symptom – in itself the symptom does not call upon interpretation by the Other, the symptom is jouissance
    - acting out = transference that escapes analysis / wild transference / transference without analysis

## Phyllis Greenacre's handling of acting out

In lesson IX

According to postfreudians there are basically 3 ways to handle acting out  
all of these ways of handling forget about the relation of acting out with the object

- 2 of these ways are immediately recognised by Greenacre as a deadlock
  - forbidding acting out
    - Lacan remarks that an analytic cure, or the transference, in itself already is a kind of prevention of acting out – instead of acting out all the time in the outside world subjects who have started an analytic cure commit a couple of acting outs in relation to their analyst, in relation to his sporadic misunderstanding of their desire
    - Of course when the misunderstanding or denial of desire by the analyst becomes systematic, the acting out can also become systematic, even more systematic than it was in reality – in this case analysis itself produces a new kind of pathology called borderline F168 – E142
  - interpretation of the acting out – looking for its meaning
    - Greenacre understands that one cannot continue to give meaning to everything endlessly
    - But only Lacan explains to us that what counts in this acting out is not its meaning, but the rest that is shown to the Other
- the 3th way is the good way according to postfreudians  
reinforcing the ego, so that the patient becomes more realistic
  - this boils down to an identification with the ego of the analyst supposed to make realistic actions in relation to reality
  - the deadlock of this way of doing reveals itself at the end of analysis with the manical fit, resulting from the insurrection of the object that has remained entirely untouched, because it was ignored, even if the subejct tried to show it in his acting out  
F151- E128

double passage à l'acte  
in a case by Piera Aulagnier  
F218-E186

Psychotic man

- first passage à l'acte
  - birth of a child
  - conjunction of 2 conditions for a passage à l'acte
    - empediment=*empêchement*  
the man is impeded by the obstetrician from seeing his child being born – or come out as it turns out the child is stillborn
    - not the emotion  
but the turmoil=*émoi* – turmoil of being unable to overcome another impediment
  - passage à l'acte  
written assertion of his right as a father to eat his stillborn child
- second passage à l'acte
  - goes to the police, declaring that no law forbids him to eat his stillborn child
  - conjunction of 2 conditions for a passage à l'acte
    - not empediment=*empêchement* – but embarrassment  
the police officer keeps his cool
    - not the emotion  
but the turmoil=*émoi* – the choc of the turmoil he wanted to provoke
  - passage à l'acte  
not clear which actions – but as a consequence he is jailed

**LESSON IX**  
**PASSAGE À L'ACTE AND ACTING OUT**

Subtitles by JAM

- egoization = *moïsation*
- natal cut=*coupure*
- jouissance of the symptom
- lies of the unconscious
- Freud's passion

On most of these subject I have already commented on in my introduction to the previous lessonVIII

There remain 3 points

## object in love and in the regression to identification

three times F139 – E117

1. you are the object  
you are eromenos (the one who is desired)
2. Switch or metaphor (substitution)  
you become erastes (the one who desires) = one loves with what one hasn't got  
you show your lack
3. being the object again  
but now the object (a), not the desired object

## Object in the clinic of psychosis

fragmented body in schizophrenia & depersonalisation = fragmented soul/psyche ... not only psychosis

- To start with you have autoerotism = Lacan's fragmented body (*corps morcelé*)  
Lacan calls this the disorder of objects (breast, faeces, gaze, voice, phallus)
- these disordered objects have to be clasped, united by the mirror image
- in psychosis this does not happen – the objects remain in their originary chaos  
they are unsuitable for egoization = *impropres à la moïstation* F141 – E120  
this remaining unbound of these objects has a double effect
  - On the body  
the feeling, the fantasy of a fragmented body  
according to Piera Aulagnier the way to this fragmented body of the schizophrenic is paved by the impossibility of the schizophrenic's mother to represent the child in her womb as a whole, as a human being – it remains an embarrassing thing, a sheer real
  - On the soul  
feeling of depersonalisation  
this is the impossibility to recognize the mirror image as oneself  
for Lacan this has to do with the fact that in psychosis there is no Other standing behind the subject in front of the mirror, no Other the subject can turn to for a confirmation that this is really you, that you can enjoy this image of you and make it yours

## Birth and the paradigm of the constitution of the object

in SemX Lacan distinguishes 5 objects

that all come about as the result of a cut, as the result of the cutting off, the breaking off of the body of the subject from the body of the Other

- The 4 objects he finally would retain, in SemXI
  - oral object of the breast
  - anal object of the faeces
  - scopic object of the gaze
  - invocative object of the voice
- the phallus as an ambiguous object

oddly enough he also isolates a kind of 6th object

or rather a first mythical object – because it comes about at the moment of birth

for Lacan birth is a kind of paradigm, because at birth it remains ambiguous where exactly the cut between the subject and the Other passes, and consequently it remains ambiguous what the subject at the moment of birth loses

- the cut is not between the child and the mother  
the child does not lose the mother not the mother
- the cut is in the egg  
the child loses a part of itself, being the embryonic envelopes (later on: the placenta)

this will be the paradigm for the constitution of the oral object at the moment of weaning

- the cut is not between itself and the mother  
the child does not lose the mother
- the cut is in the child itself, between the child and the breast that is experienced by the child as a part of itself

## LESSON X ON A LACK THAT IS IRREDUCIBLE TO THE SIGNIFIER

First of all JAM's subtitles – slightly restructured

- differential topology of holes=trous  
identifying a lack=manque for which the symbol cannot compensate
- Margaret Little's countertransference interpretations (inspired by her ideology of total responsibility)
  - deny the object in the transference
  - but nevertheless function as a cut=coupure

**lack=hole that cannot be closed=filled up**

there are different approaches of the hole/lack/void

- classical logic misses the essence of the hole=lack=void
  - always ignored, masked, reduced holes=lacks=voids
    - by saying that all holes/lacks/voids are the same
    - by saying that all of these holes/lacks/voids can be reduced to nothing, to a point the holes/lacks/voids are reduced with I en S constructions
  - so logic = one big acte manqué = act that completely misses the manqué (hole/void/lack)

- Lacan attempts to approach the hole/lack/void

tries to distinguish between holes/lacks/voids that can be reduced by a signifier and holes/lacks/voids that cannot be reduced by a signifier

- Metapsychological triad privation / frustration / castration

- Sem IV en V – table

	agent	lack/void/hole	object
privation	I mother	R hole= <i>trou</i>	S signifier
frustration	S mother	I harm= <i>dam</i>	R breast
castration	R father	S debt= <i>dette</i>	I phallus

- Base is the privation
  - hole/lack/void is a matter of the S – only a S can lack (in the R nothing lacks) this is the lack of the S for woman
  - this lacking S is the structural fault (vice!) at the origin of the Symbolic – see “this site whence emerges the fact etc F159 – E134
  - castration is an attempt at filling the hole of privation with the lack of the I phallus Lacan calls this I phallus an attempt at symbolisation of the hole of privation F160 -135 – but this does not succeed
- topology of surfaces
  - with the triad Möbius, torus, cross-cap
  - bodies where we can distinguish between different holes/lacks/voids some of these holes/lacks/voids cannot be reduced to nothing, to a point see the cuts on the torus – 2 of them are irreducible



## the object and the lack – and how to handle these in transference with or without countertransference?

How do Kleinian analysts handle the lack/void/hole and the object?

- Their discourse has 2 sides
  - On the Side of the analysant
    - Everything the subject does is repetition – transference is but oedipal repetition
    - Transference projects the analysant's object (good/bad) in the analyst
  - On the Side of the analyst
    - Analyst has to accept to interiorize the object (good/bad) of the analysant
      - This is very annoying for the analyst, a very heavy burden
      - But on the other hand this is also the basis of what the analyst can say to the analysant he has to say how he feels now that he has introjected the analysant's object (good/bad) – this is proceeding from his 'countertransference'
- A paradigmatic example is Margaret Little

as a matter of fact Lacan comments on 2 articles by Margaret Little both have to do with her handling of the lack – first as a patient, then as a psychoanalyst

  - 1951: counter-transference and the patient's response to it
    - preliminary remarks or rectifications
      - In Seml Lacan had already commented on this article – but under the wrong name, he erroneously attributed the article to Annie Reich
      - little did Lacan know that Little is talking about her own analysis with Ella Sharpe
    - What happened
      - Little gives a talk on the radio on a subject that her analyst, Ella Sharpe, is working on after that she becomes depressed
      - Sharpe interprets "you are depressed because you think you have wounded me by encroaching on my territory"
    - comment of Little
      - "my depression was not the effect of rivalry with my analyst"  
"Sharpe's interpretation only translated translated her rivalry with me – it was her countertransference who made her make this interpretation"
      - "my depression was due the complication of my mourning for my mother: she should have heard my radio talk"  
this gives Lacan the opportunity to comment on the object in mourning F166-E141
        - in love we give to the other what we do not have ourselves, our lack
        - when the loved one disappears
          - we get our own lack back – we realize that we have left the loved one wanting and we get depressed by this (like Little did)
          - the cure is that we should realize that it is precisely by being the lack of the loved one that we meant something to him or her, that he or she did love us

- 1957: R - the analyst's total response to the patient's needs
  - R means total responsibility as an analyst for the patient – this is a kind of leftover of her second analysis, with Winnicott who always had one patient to whom he completely dedicated himself, in the sense that he regressed together with that patient – Little had been one of these privileged patients
  - Who's the Patient? What is the problem
    - a kind of borderline – called neurotic character which is, as already said, according to Lacan but another name for a systematic form of acting out
    - the acting out in Little's patient is that she compulsively steals – kleptomania! upon closer inspection it appears that she always steals something when her mother comes too close – her mother always had to be the first to know that she had stolen as if she was showing that stolen thing to her mother, saying "I am not your phallus, I am not your object, see, I have an object myself"
  - Little gives 3 countertransference interpretations each of these interpretations functions as a cut, a cut introducing a lack
    - Interpretation 1
      - One day this patient is depressed because some far away relative of her parents has died – pathological mourning, you could say
      - Reaction of Little
        - She bombards the patient with all kinds of interpretations but as was already the case before the mourning, the patient does not feel concerned at all – on the contrary she gets more and more depressed
        - So Little decides to risk a countertransference interpretation, admitting to the patient her own anxiety – telling her that she can make neither head nor tail of it and that seeing her in this sorry state saddens her
      - As a consequence of this countertransference interpretation the depression starts to lift and a normal process of mourning sets in
        - For Little this is the positive effect of a kind of communication of real feelings
        - For Lacan this positive effect rather has to do with the realisation, by the patient, that there was someone for whom she could be a lack – for her own parents she had never been someone who lacks, someone who had a lack
    - Interpretation 2
      - The patient keeps on nagging about money issues with her mother
      - Reaction of Little: "stop nagging!"
    - Interpretation 3
      - The patient keeps on making small degrading comments on the interior of Little's cabinet
      - Reaction of Little: "I really do not care what you think about my taste!"

## Neurosis / perversion / psychosis

### A different relation with the object in the fundamental fantasy and the handling of transference

F164-E139

- Perversion/psychosis
  - Object a is on the side of  $i(a)$  = ego  
this object seems real, authentic object, the object a
  - In the transference we have to take the object (a) in us???
- Neurosis
  - Object a is on the side of  $i'(a)$  = the other as an object  
but this is only a semblance of an object, a substitute
  - Mind you! The real object always is at the point of jumping onto the scene  
the neurotic showing that we did not take into account his real object, his object a  
this is acting out??

## LESSON XI PUNCTUATIONS ON DESIRE

Subtitles by JAM

- From countertransference versus the analyst's desire
- Perversion: Desire as will=*volonté* to *jouissance*
- Desire as conflict=*lutte* versus Desire as love  
Hegel's battle to death between two consciences, where nothing else than prestige is at stake  
Kojève's rather aggressive interpretation of Hegel – which Lacan adopted

### In politics morality is on the side of the real

Against Camus' imaginary heroism of the absurd (Nobel Prize 1957) (Sartre declined it in 1964)  
Which does not allow him to take sides in a contemporary question at that time (1962)  
has to do with his stance in the independence struggle of the French colony Algeria – Camus, who was born in Algeria, condemned the terrorist attacks of the insurgents, saying “they attack the public transport. My mother could be on the bus. Well, if this is justice, I prefer my mother to justice”

### Theories and practices of countertransference

- Why do analysts fabricate all of these theories on countertransference?  
Why do they feel obliged to admit their countertransference, which is their anxiety?
  - they are afraid of their desire as analysts  
not clear yet what is the desire of the analyst in SemX
    - in SemXI it is linked to the problem of Freud's desire  
which is the cause of the problem of the analyst to develop his own desire
    - in SemXV the desire of the analyst is for the first time seriously conceptualised  
as the act of the analyst – which means that at the end of his own analysis he sees no other way than allowing someone else to go to the same experience, knowing that it will finally make of him a kind of waste object, just as happened with his own analyst at the end of his own analysis
  - they are afraid of the Signifier in the discourse of the analysts  
– and consequently they have to repress these signifiers

## desire in perversion versus desire in neurose the real of desire, the real desire

- perversions (here sadism and masochism)  
desire is at two levels
  - conscious level  
a will to jouissance, subverting the Law
  - unconscious level, the level of the fantasy  
he implements a (new) law
    - that halts him on his path to jouissance
    - that guarantees the Other's jouissance
- neuroses (here hysteria and obsessional neurosis)
  - conscious level  
split between love and desire F180-E154  
in as much as desire enters the fray of love, it does not pertain to the love object
  - unconscious level, level of the fantasy
    - he can only desire in accordance with the law
      - in the case of hysteria this law guarantees that his desire remains unsatisfied
      - in the case of obsessional neurosis this law guarantees that his desire remains impossible

## anxiety as a signal of the desire of the Other

anxiety is a signal

but what exactly does anxiety signal

- for Freud anxiety signals an internal danger, the drive
- for Lacan anxiety signals the desire of the Other  
here we find one of the best descriptions of this desire of the Other F179-E  
– in a typically lyrical passage
  - Hegel = no desire of the Other
    - the Other has to recognize me
    - but the Other never recognizes me enough – so I engage into a permanent conflict with the Other
  - Lacan
    - the desire of the Other
      - the Other who does not recognize  
and with whom I cannot engage into a permanent conflict
      - the Other who puts in question my very being, soliciting my loss, my getting lost
    - anxiety before this desire of the Other is expectation anxiety  
cf. anxiety as a temporal tension in the proto-Lacan (temps logique)
      - aggression is the sign of a spatial tension, a tension in space,  
when you realise your place in space, in relation to the fundamental antecedence of the little other
      - anxiety is the sign of a temporal tension,  
when you realise your place in time, in relation to the fundamental antecedence of the Big Other

what is the link between Freud's Trieb=drive and Lacan's desire of the Other

Specialist Course for UGent Doctoral School 2017-2018  
Mental Health Care, Psychoanalysis and Philosophy III

**AN INTRODUCTION TO LACAN'S SEMINAR ON ANXIETY (1962)  
AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR TODAY'S CLINIC AND CULTURE**  
Dr. Lieven Jonckheere

## **Lesson 4**

# **ANXIETY BETWEEN JOUISSANCE AND DESIRE**

**30 August 2018**

meedoen

this part 3 of SemX, called by JAM “anxiety between jouissance and desire”, is the central part of SemX because it contains the hinge-phrase about the franchissement of anxiety, the stepping over anxiety

E175: “anxiety is a intermediary term between jouissance and desire, in so far as desire is constituted and founded upon the anxiety phase, is constituted once anxiety has been stepped over”

F204: *l’angoisse est terme intermédiaire entre la jouissance et le désir, en tant que c’est franchie l’angoisse, fondé sur le temps de l’angoisse que le désir se constitue*

This part 3 of SemX contains 4 lessons

With titles given by JAM

XII. Anxiety as a signal of the real

XIII. Aphorisms on love

XIV. Woman is truer and more real

XV. Men’s Business (as usual)



## LESSON XII

### ANXIETY AS A SIGNAL OF THE REAL

Can we snub the Subtitles by JAM? No!

But we can always give them a twist, we can expand them

- Turning around the opposition between fear and anxiety  
Chekhov's Panic Fears (frayeurs) are without object
- The gaze
  - Oedipus' anxiety before his own eyes on the ground
  - No anxiety of catholics before Lucia's eyes on a plate
- Perversion and the Other's anxiety  
already treated in my previous introduction, for part 2 of SemX
- some parts of the body are predestined to become a separated object,  
in as far as they are not really a part of the body but are only attached or stuck to the body
  - at the moment of birth the child loses 'its' envelope
  - at the moment of weaning the child loses 'its' nipple
  - at the moment of detumescence of the penis the subject loses its penis  
which is a kind of natural castration, a castration without the intervention of the Other=Father

### turning around the opposition between fear and anxiety

- Freud's anxiety is not without an object
- Chekhov's Panic Fears (frayeurs) are without object
  
- In this lesson Lacan recalls the classical differentiation between fear=peur and anxiety=angoisse
  - Fear=peur has an object, always corresponds to an objective danger
  - anxiety=angoisse has no object, does not correspond to an objective danger
- now PA makes this classical distinction turn around
  - in a first move Freud already introduced an ambiguity concerning anxiety=angoisse
    - On the one hand he continued to speak in the classical way of anxiety, as having no object *Objektlosigkeit* or anxiety being without object
    - But on the other hand he introduced the idea that anxiety is always Angst vor etwas or anxiety is always anxiety faced with something, before something
  - Now, in a second move Lacan also tries to introduce an ambiguity concerning fear=peur
    - On the one hand, after Freud, he unambiguously maintains that anxiety has an object – anxiety is not without an object
      - this object is irreducibly real F188-E160
      - anxiety is our only experience, the only subjective translation of that object neither in the jouissance nor in the desire we are confronted with that object this is what Lacan shows with the table of division of the subject – labelling its 3 levels as jouissance, anxiety and desire – a only appears at the level of anxiety he says: in anxiety with are dealing with that object at a moment that logically precedes the moment we are dealing with in desire F190-E161
    - But on the other hand he also introduces an ambiguity concerning fear=peur Referring to some short stories of Chekhov he can show that in some cases fear does not have an object either, does not concern an objective danger it is very difficult to translate the russian word Chekhov uses for the feeling that he wants to convey with this short stories – in French you have frayeur, translated in English as 'panic fears', etymologically it's origin would be the latin frigor, cold – and it would mean something like "the cold shivers" – anyway it remains unclear whether Chekhov really used a russian word meaning fear=peur

### the gaze as an object

- Oedipus' anxiety before his own eyes on the ground
- Catholics have no anxiety before Lucia's eyes on a plate

Object as irreducible

Object as unsayable – everything that can be said can also be reduced

What cannot be said cannot be reduced

Lacan explores two mythical cases where the eyes are an object  
Iconographic cases

- Oedipus
  - Greek tragedy
  - Gaze
    - As a result of his desire to know Oedipus has discovered that he has slept with his mother, that he has seen his mother naked – and with the pin which held the clothes of his mother together, he cuts out his own eyes
    - Sees his own eyes lying on the ground in a sorry heap of waste  
the impossible sight of his own eyes lying on the ground
    - And looking at you

See also texte about Marguerite Duras, a year later (1964): ce qui vous regarde sans vous regarder – regarder is a *double entendre*: what looks at you without looking at you / without any more having to do with you

  - This is an object of anxiety
- Saint Lucia
  - Painting by Zurbaran
  - Saint Lucia presents her cut out eyes to the worshippers, on a plate
  - This is not an object of anxiety, but an object of desire – for the neurotic  
it's not our own eyes

## objects of desire

### **somatisches Entgegenkommen by the deciduous appendages (*caduques*) of the body to the cuts of the signifier in the body**

The constitution of human objects of desire is the result of a conjunction between

- the necessity for jouissance to pass via the signifier resulting in the crumbling of jouissance
- anatomical particularity of deciduous appendages (*caduques*) of the body  
these deciduous appendages (*caduques*) constitute a kind of *somatisches Entgegenkommen*, a somatic compliance to the cuts operated by the signifiers F207-E177, F344-297
  - Birth  
at this moment of separation between mother and child the cut does not pass through the same spot for one as it does for the other
    - The mother loses the placenta or the decidua=*caduques* – as a part of herself
    - The child does not lose the mother, but it loses the envelopes – as also a part of itself
  - Weaning  
at this moment of separation between mother and child the cut does not pass through the same spot for one as it does for the other
    - mother loses the child – as a part of herself
    - child does not lose the mother, it loses the breast, or the nipple – as also a part of itself
  - Orgasm  
much more complicated what Lacan tells about orgasm, the constitution of the object and anxiety  
Because he also refers to clinical phenomena
    - Orgasm
      - leads to the detumescence of the penis, its deflation, its becoming deciduous=*caduc*
      - this detumescence can be seen by the subject as a kind of natural form of castration
        - a castration without agent, with no Other  
a castration that has not to be attributed to the father (mostly via the mother)
        - it could be considered the biological condition (*somatisches Entgegenkommen*) for the interpretation of the castration  
castration then is the promotion of this detumescence to the level of the subject in the form of an irreducible lack F206-E176
    - Lacan relates to clinical phenomena to this detumescence
      - Anxiety is a consequence of this 'natural' deflation or castration of the penis
        - Immediately clear in the case in *coitus interruptus*  
cf. *Angstneurose!* F177, 197, 225, 230, 232, 305 – E150,198)
        - but this also plays a part in 'full' sexual intercourse  
anxiety is the result of the subject being focalised in, or identified with the falling away penis
      - The 'natural' deflation or castration as a consequence of anxiety  
cf. the classical freudian case of the obsessional's ejaculation at the height of anxiety which actually repeats the situation of the anal training of the child F198-E169
        - During the examination the obsessional remains petrified with anxiety in front of the white page, he cannot write down anything – this has to do with the Other's Demand, or the Other's expectation=*attente*, his waiting for the anal object (a), the anal trace on the white paper
        - The moment he has to hand over this blank page to the Other, the examiner, at the height of his anxiety the obsessional ejaculates

## LESSON XIII

### APHORISMS ON LOVE

#### JAM's subtitles

- Desire and the professor  
see remark about Lacan's teaching, in the comments on the first part of SemX
- The subject of jouissance  
see remark about the table of division of the subject, in the comments on the first part of SemX
- The expletive negation translates the anxiety of the enunciator
- The object (a) is not a signifier
- Man and woman

## the expletive negation

A negation

- which gramatically is not really necessary
- But which translates the implication of the subject in what it is saying  
The signifying trace of the subject of enunciation, of the encunciating subject  
it translates the anxiety as a temporal dimension, the anxiety of the subject as all of a sudden it experiences time

Lacan very often comes back to the expletive negation

The example he always gives is “Je crains qu’il ne vienne” – “I fear that he might come”

One could also say “je crains qu’il viendra” – “I fear that he will come”

In the first version your implication as a subject, your anxiety, transpires

## relation love/desire/jouissance and anxiety is different in man and woman

Lacan does not really develop a theory,  
but only launches aphorisms that we should not try to combine in a non contradictory theory  
there's no theory of love  
there's no theory of the difference of man and woman with regard to love

end of lesson XIII, and lessons XIV and XV

- MAN  
love/desire/jouissance and anxiety
  - Aphorisms  
basic aphorism: "only love allows jouissance to condescend to desire" F209-E179  
condescend = arrogant, patronizing attitude, "I am above", I just give, because it's the only thing that remains, but I am above" – this is desire as a necessary evil, as despised
  - this will result in the classical split in love life of men
    - Love
      - Love is a sublimation of desire
      - Love is a cultural creation:  
"we would never have loved but for hearing talk of love" (aphorism La Rochefoucauld)
    - Desire – and its complications
      - all of a man's jouissance has to be satisfied in his desire – desire is the only way to jouissance  
man lacks jouissance
      - if man puts himself forward as someone who desires (erastes), he show/confess that he is wanting of the object (a), that he desperately wants object (a)  
this causes anxiety in all directions
        - anxiety of woman before man  
a man wanting a woman as object (a) will trigger her anxiety  
– because the man reduces her to a, I a-yse her (aïser)
        - anxiety of man before woman  
man thinks that the woman he shows his desire to, will want to enjoy his being ...
        - ... because in order to enjoy his being she has to castrate man
      - as a result desire is despised, desire is evacuated from the love relation
  - No case

- WOMAN  
love/desire/jouissance and anxiety
  - aphorisms
    - basic aphorism  
woman lacks nothing / woman has nothing wanting as regards jouissance F211-181
      - woman does not lack jouissance
      - cf. experience of the mythical Greek Tiresias
        - Punished by the Gods for disturbing the sexual relation of 2 snakes, he was transformed into a woman
        - Once become a man again he testified that “the jouissance as a woman is superior to that of a man”
    - this original bond with jouissance has a double consequence  
this double consequence is summed up in the expression “woman is truer and more real”
      - woman is more at ease with her own desire
        - for her jouissance she’s not completely dependent on her desire  
for a woman desire is not the only road to jouissance – desire being the road to jouissance via the Other  
for a man desire is the only road, via the Other, to jouissance
        - which means that woman is more at ease with her desire, that she has a more loose bond with desire, there’s less pressure on her desire  
– she knows the worth of the yardstick of what she is dealing with in desire
          - object a also plays its full role for woman
            - she also speaks – which means that she also wants an object in so far that she doesn’t have it (Penisneid)
            - later on Lacan will say that the child is an object (a) for a woman
            - but in the end she realises that this object is but an extra F221-E189  
because this object is not the filling up of the lack of castration
        - this implies that woman is less subjected to anxiety,  
more precisely castration anxiety
          - letting her desire to be seen is anxiety provoking, because she has not much to show
          - but a woman always shows what there is (while a man has to show what he does not have)  
so, she has to be careful with masquerade, where a woman does not really show what there is
      - woman is confronted directly with the desire of the Other
        - the desire of the Other gives her jouissance (which is without object) a ‘suitable’ object
        - this implies more anxiety – beyond castration anxiety



- a Lacan case of a woman's relation to jouissance and to desire F219-E187  
in 3 times
  - first love
    - in the letters to her first love she had turned herself into the personage she wanted to be for him – this literary personage had nothing to do with whom she really was
    - afterwards this first love had had a tough time getting over this imaginary image
  - husband
    - in her marriage she tolerates that her husband does not desire her sexually ...
    - ... as long as he does not desire another woman
- two interpretations
  - she values his desire, it's important for her that he has a desire ...  
... only he should not show it to anybody, it should be a desire without object
  - it should not be known to another woman that she is not the object of his desire
- analyst Lacan
  - Lacan does not say for what problem or symptom she came to him
  - but he mentions two strange=psychotic?? phenomena  
both correspond to an apparition of the object of anxiety
    - the apparition of the object of the 'bad gaze'
      - with her eyes she cannot absorb everything that she sees  
= apparition of the object gaze: some things look at her which is a moment of anxiety
      - her response to this unseeable object of the gaze?
        - she feels a vaginal swelling, as if her vagina would be a penis  
this defence against the apparition of the object is not sufficient
        - so, under transference, she also thinks of Lacan as an eye-witness to all she sees and more particularly as an extra pair of eyes, as the good gaze that looks back at this bad gaze
    - the apparition of the object of the 'bad voice'
      - cf. her sudden confession that she is "remote-controlled"
      - Lacan does not mention how she defends herself against this voice  
but this is always very difficult, critical

- female fantasies
  - “Don Juan”
    - What kind of a man is Don Juan?
      - the one man who can never lose his phallus ... to a woman consequently
        - he is not divided, he never changes
        - he has not the usual, complicated relation of a man to the object – a woman leaves no trace on him
      - but he can only maintain this image by being an absolute fraud by always taking the place of another man, literally
    - This is woman’s projection on a man of what she herself is in reality for a man
      - Woman cannot lose the phallus
      - Man leaves no trace on a woman
        - cf. Salomo’s Proverb about the 4 things that leave no traces F232-E200
          - a fish leaves no trace in the water
          - a bird leaves not trace in the air
          - a snake leaves no trace in the sand
          - a man leaves no trace in a woman
      - this fantasy is anxiety reducing
        - a woman gets anxious when she feels that she really is the object at the centre of a man’s desire (that he is obsessed with her, that he has no other obsessions than her)
- erotomania (sacred or not) F234-E201
  - man is completely identified/merged with the object (a)

- Lucia Tower handles the desire of her patients as easily as Don Juan handles love  
A countertransference nightmare and its happy ending  
proving that female analysts have a lesser implication in the difficulties of desire F229-E197  
that they are at ease with the desire of a man and with their own desire
  - patient with anxiety neurosis (diagnosis by Lacan)  
meaning that desire does not find its place, is not in its place F230-E198
  - Countertransference nightmare
    - to begin with Tower has this tendency to protect the wife of one of her patient's against his lack of masculine assertiveness
    - But then Tower has this dream about this wife that makes her change the idea she had about the desire of her patient toward his wife: he actually is capable of behaving like a real man towards his wife
    - once she has realigned the axis of her relation to her patient's desire, and has succeeded in putting back his desire in its place, the transference of the patient brutally changes: he starts to really scrutinize her every word and every move
      - Lacan compares this transference of the patient to the sadistic cutting up of the victim, in quest for the little piece that is missing, the cunt-skin in one of Sade's stories
      - In any case, before this sadistic quest Tower gets anxious, feeling the patient himself might fall to pieces should any gesture or word of her ring hollow
  - The sudden vanishing of countertransference
    - Nevertheless, the moment her holidays start, Tower is divested of this worry, this anxiety "as easily as a fruit is divested of its soft ripe peel" (an allusion to Joyce)  
all of a sudden the countertransference completely vanishes  
what is the reason?
      - Her easiness as woman with respect to desire!
      - But also a theoretical conception of the next goal of his cure
        - she knows that he will never find anything in her, that he has to mourn ever being able to find his own lack in a woman
        - only then will he be able to participate in the oedipal 'comedy' ie he will be able to blame everything on the father – which is where analysis can really begin
    - in this respect Tower, and all of female analysts, according to Lacan, could be compared to Don Juan, who also completely is committed to the desire of a woman the moment he sleeps with her, and who also completely forgets about this desire the moment he leaves the sleeping room

**LESSON XIV**  
**WOMAN IS TRUER AND MORE REAL (than man?)**

Subtitles by JAM

- The hole=trou, the void=vide and the pot
- Woman  
see comments on previous lesson
  - Tiresias, struck blind, knows about woman's jouissance
  - Woman lacks nothing
  - Don Juan as a woman's dream/fantasy
  - Lucia Tower's desire in her handling of countertransference

## The creation of a lack in the real and the appearance of the object in this lack

### First time

#### introducing a lack in the real via the creating of a pot

- the basis is: the real is always full / the real lacks nothing  
this is in the line with “woman lacks nothing”, which means woman or rather her jouissance is real, she does not lack jouissance (man does lack jouissance, woman does not lack jouissance)
- so the question is: how to introduce some form of lack in the real
  - there is only one way of introducing some lack in the real – and this is via the S
  - the paradigm for introducing a lack in the real, is via the S creation of a void=vide is the making of a pot=pot or vessel=vase
    - the pot is basically the creation of a void
    - or a creation around a void – and in this sense the pot is the archetypical creatio ex nihilo  
the making of a pot, or vessel, is the creation of a void in the real
- this void created by the pot or vessel is compared by Lacan to the castration F237-E204

### second time

#### in this symbolically created void in the real the object (a) of desire can be appear

- the object (a) of desire only has any meaning or value when it has been poured back into the emptiness of this castration created by the pot or vessel  
Lacan says ‘poured back’ because to begin with this object (a) has been cut/broken off from the narcissistic mirror image
  - The object makes a hole in the mirror image of the body, at the level of the mouth or the anus,
  - And it is put back in the new hole in the body-image, created by castration
- This is the normal structure of desire  
in itself this does not have to cause any anxiety – as long as the object is not seen in the hole of castration as represented by the vase/vessel
- Anxiety only arises when the object is seen in the hole of castration as represented by the vessel and when, as a result of this apparition of the object, the vessel undergoes a transfiguration or metamorphosis  
Lacan triest to visualize this metamorphosis of the vessel with the topological surface of the Klein bottle

## LESSON XV MEN'S BUSINESS

### JAM's subtitles

- Lucia Tower and the Oedipal Comedy
- What lacks, that's a male's business
- What is ridiculously termed perversion
- A vessel with neither inside nor outside
- Circumcision, an institution

### Mirror stage

Lacan differentiates the reactions of girls and boys in front of the mirror, seeing their image in the mirror and relates these reactions to anxiety

- Girl
  - In the girl he notices a kind of anxiety she rapidly passes her hand over her genitals
    - as if the sight of her genitals makes her dizzy/giddy
    - as if she's looking for something to hold on
  - you could say that after this first fit of anxiety, she's at ease, she has had the worst
- Boy
  - The boy is just a bit puzzled by the presence of his penis
  - Anxiety comes afterwards – when he will learn
    - That his penis is nothing, nothing compared to the penis of the father
    - That his penis does as it pleases

Consequently he will have to renounce his penis, to accept the castration so for the boy, after the initial satisfaction of having a penis it is one anxiety after the other

### Circumcision

F240-E206

Circumcision as a cultural institution

- Brings some order into the hole/lack of castration
- creates an object, a lost object namely the foreskin  
And normativates that object, by placing it in the Other
- alienates the subject – who has to obey to the Law

Specialist Course for UGent Doctoral School 2017-2018  
Mental Health Care, Psychoanalysis and Philosophy III

**AN INTRODUCTION TO LACAN'S SEMINAR ON ANXIETY (1962)  
AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR TODAY'S CLINIC AND CULTURE**

Dr. Lieven Jonckheere

**Lesson 5**

**THE FIVE FORMS OF THE OBJECT (a)**

**31 August 2018**

9 lessons

With titles by JAM

- XVI. Buddha's eyelids
- XVII. Mouth and eye
- XVIII. Yahweh's voice
- XIX. Evanescent phallus
- XX. What comes in through the ear
- XXI. Piaget's tap
- XXII. From anal tot ideal
- XXIII. A circle that is not reducible to a point
- XXIV. From the a to the Names-of-the-Father



## LESSON XVI BUDDHA'S EYELIDS

### JAM's subtitles

- The cause as a syncope of the object
- The certainty of anxiety
- religions and the object
  - monotheism
    - The Jews and the function of the remnant=reste
    - Christian masochism
  - Buddha: Man or woman

## the object (a) as cause of desire

remember lessonviii

- displacement of the object of desire
  - the 'false' or intentional object of desire lies in front (en avant) of desire
    - this object stretches desire
  - the 'real' or causal object of desire lies behind (derrière) desire
    - this object pushes desire, you could say

the object is not the objective object, in the outside world (kant)

the object is a part of our body

- part of our body snagged in the formal machine of the signifier, f249-e215  
part of the body lost due to the signifier = the fact that we are speaking
- this part is a pound of flesh  
cf. what Shylock the Jew in "Merchant of Venice" asks from those who borrow from him F254-E218  
cf. the causal innards F250-E216

bodily cause in philosophy?

- recognition of the body as causal  
Maine de Biran = only through my own bodily effort I can know where I am free and where I am not
- Denial of the body as causal
  - theories of cognizance=connaissance = inventions of the final cause  
the certainty about this first cause is a derivative of the certainty before the object of anxiety,  
that is hidden by this first cause F252-E218
  - criticisms on cognizance  
Plato (Sovereign Good) & Aristoteles (Prime Mover) & Nietzsche (desire to know)
  - back to cognizance
    - Kants *Schwärmerei*
    - psychological myths of needs, instincts (false bodily causes!!)

bodily object only causes when it is framed in the fantasy

- bodily object can only cause desire in its syncope/fading/vanishing
- fantasy realises this syncope/fading/vanishing of the object

## **the bodily object as cause in religion**

### the bodily object as cause in monotheism

difference between Jews and Christians

- Jews and the causal bodily object
  - Ruthless God wants his share, or he gets furious
  - debt of the jews
    - debt has to be settled in the flesh = sacrifice a part of your body by way of circumcision
    - Jews themselves become a kind of waste object, a remainder that is left behind by God
- Christians and the causal bodily object
  - Loving Father God asks nothing
  - masochistic solution to the problem of the Jews  
Identify with Christ as The Remainder left behind by the Father → God's anxiety
  - and then in a second move, just like Christ, they can become the son of God???
- Islam  
exploded body

### The bodily object as cause in Zen-Buddhism

- non dualistic theory of desire
  - desire is illusion
  - you are your own object of desire – in the other you only see yourself
- Buddha nowhere to be seen, we only see a series of Bodhisattva's  
these Bodhisattva's all have the same ambiguous expression = gaze
  - directed outwards (to me) or inwards?
  - our image or not?
  - male or female?

this gaze causes a return of the desire that had been banished in Buddhism  
proof? in the course of history nuns have tried to wipe away Buddha's tears – resulting in the  
disparition, fading, syncope of the slit/split between the eyelids

## LESSON XVII MOUTH AND EYE

Subtitles by JAM

- lips, teeth, tongue
- the nursling as a parasite
- anxiety-point and point of desire
- anxiety and orgasm
- scopic cancelling out of castration

**anxiety-point and point of desire  
at each level of the in the structuring of desire**

anxiety-point should always precede the point of desire??

- birth
  - paradigm for the constitution of the object=point of desire
    - child + placenta = unity → birth separates child from 'its' placenta – and not from mother  
cf. supra: child + envelopes = egg unity → birth separates child from its envelopes
    - in any case: the cut not between mother and child but internal to “the sphere of the child’s existence” F270-E234 = separation F273-E237
  - anxiety-point?
    - birth as trauma of the mother?
    - Suffocated by the intrusion of the Air-Other??
- point of desire and anxiety-point at the oral level  
– at the moment or level of weaning
  - oral point of desire
    - child + mamma = unit
    - cut is internal to “the sphere of the child’s existence”  
– but it remains ambiguous where the cut passes
      - lips as cutting?  
cf. first words (mama, papa)
      - the teeth as cutting?
  - oral anxiety-point
    - the lack of mother = breast drying up
      - is my jouissance responsible for it?
      - cf. anxiety of the vampire
      - (Kleinian???)

- point of desire and anxiety-point at the anal level  
– at the moment or level of anal training
  - anal point of desire
    - how does the anal object become an object of desire?
      - by the intermediary of the Other's demand  
this Demand is ambiguous
        - Other=mother is very interested in the *caca*, the poo = substitute for phallus  
in this way the *caca*, the poo becomes agalma
        - after being praised as the ultimate object, the poo is flushed through the toilet  
becoming nothing but dirt
      - consequently the relation of the subject with anal object remains ambiguous  
cf. obsessional's reduction of the Other's desire to demand demand demand
        - should the subject have/contain this object or not?
          - object that makes the subject valuable
          - object that the subject should drop, should distance himself from
        - should the subject identify with this object or not?  
indeed, the poo is the first time the subject has the opportunity to recognize himself  
in an object
          - an object that is valued highly by the mother
          - but also an object that finally is thrown away
        - should the subject give this object to the Other or not?
          - the anal object is the first gift, the first offering ...
          - ... that afterwards is thrown away
        - the anal object finally comes to symbolize the loss of the phallus  
(the phallus of the subject?? the phallus of the mother??)
    - cases of anal object of desire
      - Freud's wolfman  
faced with the primal scene = disappearance of father's penis F302-E260
        - on the one hand
          - freezes and becomes himself an imaginary phallus
          - reduced to his eyes = scopic jouissance of looking
        - on the other hand  
ends this scene by defecating  
constitution of the anal object– as a gift, an offering, as a sacrifice
      - Jones' study of the Madonna's conception through the ear F345-E298
        - Maria got pregnant because the Holy Ghost puffed and blowed in her ear
        - fertilizing breath = a fart, the anal wind
      - signature of the burglar F353-304  
the burglar who at the moment he takes your stuff away always has to take a shit  
– as a kind of payment
    - anal anxiety-point
      - ???

- point of desire and anxiety-point at the phallic level  
– at the moment or level of castration complex
  - 'male' side (same for woman as for man??)  
reversal anxiety-point and point of desire – in comparison with the oral stage
    - phallic point of desire  
(a) in the Other
    - phallic anxiety-point
      - at the level of the body of the subject
      - orgasm=detumescence as point of anxiety
        - because of its two sides
          - castration
            - a natural castration
              - the subjective experience of disparition of the penis in detumescence is a 'natural' form of castration, without intervention of Other  
the organ does not hold up on the road towards jouissance F305-E263
              - phallus = instrument of might, mediating a genital relation man/woman, mediating both their jouissance – but in orgasm, phallus disappears so the phallus does not guarantee a sexual relationship F311-E268
            - anxiety (Angstneurose)  
anxiety produced at the locus of the lack of object F371-E320
          - satisfaction of death drive F305-E263  
orgasm satisfies our demand for death (*petite mort*)
        - orgasm borrows its certainty from the certainty of anxiety  
and even: orgasm is the only form of anxiety that is actually concluded
        - as a result orgasm is satisfying – but we also come to fear orgasm
  - female side F306-E264  
female jouissance has 2 sides
    - on the one hand, in relation to man
      - to start with, standing before a man a woman is rather uneasy
      - once she has made love to him she's completely at ease
        - she knows what man wants
        - she knows that sooner or later man will disarm himself (detumescence)  
– and that man with this phallus cannot really touch her in her jouissance
      - and from that point on she can take two different ways
        - *Penisneid* – asking for a penis that does a better job
        - masquerade – playing the phallus for man, by making her feminine attributes the sign of man's almightiness
    - in both cases she is not true to her self, to her own jouissance  
she takes her jouissance down a peg (toontje lager doen zingen)
    - on the other hand, in relation to herself, to her own body as Other

- the point of desire and the anxiety-point at the scopic stage
  - the structurally hidden gaze
    - the gaze ('eyes') is excluded/occulted in the mirror stage F276-E240  
you do not see your own eyes looking at you
    - the gaze reappears outside this mirror, in fantasy – but there the gaze remains hidden  
in fantasy point of desire = anxiety-point coincide – point of desire hides anxiety-point  
F278-E242
  - scopic point of desire
    - the gaze nearly always appears as a point of desire – within the frame of the fantasy
    - bv. fantasy of third eye or beauty's grain (on face or body of the Other) F293-E253
      - cf. statue bodhisattva: third eye pops up, thanks to disparition of slit between eyelids
      - third eye = point zero of desire
        - completely captures or fascinates our desire
        - we completely fade before it, we sink into an appolinian contemplation ...  
... the wrenching of desire being suspended
  - scopic anxiety-point
    - anxiety-point disappears behind point of desire as framed in the fantasy  
the scopic object of desire in the fantasy, cancels out castration  
→ no anxiety, in principle
    - nevertheless the anxiety-point can all of a sudden appear in the fantasy  
cf. 2 cases
      - fantasy of the third eye or the beauty's grain  
always the risk that this zero point of desire, transforms itself into anxiety-point –  
looking back at us, regarding us
        - cf. bodhisattva all of a sudden opens his rubbed away eyes  
most restful desirable (eromenos) shows itself as a desirer (erastes) F314-E271
        - cf. the dead-still eye of the sea-monster at the end of Fellini's "La Dolce Vita"  
this eye telling the party goers, as it were: "I am the death and I have seen you all!"
        - cf. completely tattooed female body, a body full of beauty's grains
      - fantasy of the Wolfman F301-E260
        - he has seen disappearing the phallus in the primal scene, during a coitus a tergo
        - the fantasy of the Wolfman is a reaction to this – but not clear what this fantasy is
        - his nightmare as a child reveals what is behind the screen of his fantasy
          - the window bursts open
          - in this frame appears an anxiety-provoking scenery
            - return of the phallus, in the guise of the tree
            - the gaze appears, in the guise of the 5 wolves who stare at him  
for Lacan this scene mirrors the primal scene
            - before the disappearance of the penis of the father ...
            - ... the wolfman
              - froze en became an imaginary phallus
              - was reduced to his eyes, to being nothing else but scopic jouissance
    - Lacan also mentions a common fantasy about the Other's scopic fantasy



- Lacan also mentions a common fantasy about the Other's scopic fantasy
  - Starting point is our anxiety before the desire of the Other = some obscure God
  - In order to capture the desire of that obscure god, we put up a trap we build an altar and offer them something on this altar
    - Nowadays, on the altar of our daily routines, we bring this obscure god the daily sacrifice of a part of our desires
    - In former days we offered this obscure god victims – but victims who had to be spotless, who can be perfect objects of desires – for instance children or virgins this is in contrast with the object of desire of the subject, which is precisely the spot on the victim, if I may say so  
so also contrary to what happens in the human subject what triggers the anxiety of the divine Other, is the apparition of a spot on the victim

- the point of desire and the anxiety-point in the invocative stage
  - voice as object F288-E249  
Lacan is not very clear – cf. JAM 1988 Lacan et la voix
    - What is the voice?  
a waste-object, a remainder of the articulation of the signifier as a system of oppositions
      - ≠ the voice we can hear when someone is speaking
      - cf. strange feeling when all of a sudden you can hear our own voice when speaking  
cf. voice coming from nowhere en breaking through the voices we hear with our ears  
cf. a surplus voice  
cf. tinnitus??
    - what does the voice do?
      - the voice resonates in the void of the Other, as the otherness of what is said and there it resounds as an imperative that demands ... F318-E275
        - ... obedience (neurosis)  
the voice of my conscience, of the superego – that I have to obey
        - ... conviction (psychosis)  
an obscure, unintelligible sound – that I have to interpret  
leading to the conviction that something is said that concerns my intimacy
      - and in this way the voice can model our void F320-E277  
and anxiety is solved by making us guilty, guilt covers anxiety
  - examples of the voice as an object
    - the voice of conscience or superego  
– in Kant's categorical imperative
    - the sound of the shofar F282-E244
      - What is the shofar
        - shofar is a horn blown at particular occasions in the Bible and in Jewish traditions and which produces a very particular, odd, weird sound ...
        - ... leading to the emergence of an unusual emotion in the listener  
is this emotion anxiety?
      - Lacan uses Reik's study of the shofar
        - Notwithstanding his criticism of Reich's reduction of the symbol to an analogy ...
        - ... Lacan accepts Reik's reading of the biblical passages where this shofar resounds, leading to the conclusion that the sound of the shofar should remind us of the voice of Yahweh F287-E249 or, more precisely, the roar of God F289-E250, and even his death rattle – it recalls the murder of the father as origin of our desire
    - the hypnopompic monologues of very small children F315-E273
      - prior to the mirror stage, before falling asleep, small children fabricate long monologues with the few words they already know – these buzzing, murmuring immediately stops when someone else enters the sleeping room
      - for Lacan this monologuing is comparable to dreaming, to the play of the signifier in the dream – but what it produces is not 'sense' but the object of the voice, a voice unfastened from its support, a voice as a remainder
  - the relation between the point of desire and the anxiety-point  
the voice exceeds the occultation of anxiety in the desire of the Other
    - invocative point of desire
    - invocative anxiety-point

## LESSON XVIII YAHWEH'S VOICE

JAM's subtitles

all integrated in previous comments

- voice as an object
  - Jewish shofar according to Reik
  - May God remember
- Gaze as an object
  - Function of the beauty spot
  - What regards us

## LESSON XIX THE EVANESCENT PHALLUS

### JAM's subtitles

- Pedagogy of castration  
see my previous comments, in the 2nd lesson, on Lacan's recurrent preliminary remarks, from SemX on, on teaching psychoanalysis as a psychoanalyst
- The sopic object  
Jouissance in the fantasy  
see previous comments
- The anal object  
The wolfman's defecation  
see previous comments
- Always too soon
- Desire's dead ends

## LESSON XX

### WHAT COMES IN THROUGH THE EAR

#### JAM's subtitles

- Phallic object  
Deceptive almightiness of the phallus
- The infant's monologue
- Invocative object
  - Isakower's prawn=crevette
  - Incorporation of the voice
- The gods ensnared in desire (piège)

## LESSON XXI PIAGET'S TAP

### JAM's subtitles

- The object (a) as cause
  - The object (a) as the cause of the symptom taking on its form
  - The denial of the object (a) as cause in Piaget's psychological research
- 5 levels in the constitution of object (a)

## **object a = cause of the symptom taking its form**

in the table of division of the subject  
the symptom is on the level of desire

- the symptom is only a symptom
  - when the subject becomes aware of it, notices it – as *Fremdkörper*
  - when the subject starts to think that there might be a cause to what he's doing, feeling, etc  
cf. the obsessional's realisation of the cause = embarrassment
- from that moment on the symptom can be tackled by PA
  - not by interpreting the transference as oedipal repetition  
from our position as subject supposed to know
  - but by handling the transference,  
from our position as object a, as cause

## **epistemology of the cause**

there's always a gap between the cause and its effect=desire  
which means that desire is something non effectuated F343-E296

## Piaget's denial of the object as cause

- experiment Piaget
  - method
    - tells 2 different types of stories to children
    - lets children repeat what he has said to other children
      - checking whether there's a difference in understanding
  - differential results
    - realistic quasi scientific explanations
      - eg functioning of a water tap
      - second child can understand how the tap works, even if the first was not able to reproduce Piaget's explanation correctly
    - fictional story
      - eg Greek myth of Niobe
        - because of hybris towards gods, she was changed into a rock, her tears forming a river
      - entropy or dissipation in the understanding from Piaget to the second child
- Lacan's criticism on both types of story, as constructed by Piaget

in both types of story P denies the object (a) as a cause  
– which explains the success and the failure of their understanding by children

  - realistic quasi scientific explanations of how a water tap functions
    - better understood than explained ...
    - ... because Piaget does not explain the water tap as constructed upon a causal object
      - a tap is not a device that opens and closes
        - a tap is only made for closing, as a stopper of the waterstream a tap becomes the cause of this waterstream when opened
      - the tap is also a causal object for the desires of children who see it
        - When there's water running from this tap, it makes them want to wee
        - And when it's closed it pushes them to the acting out of damaging it in a way that the water keeps on running
  - fictional story of the Greek myth of Niobe
    - this is very poorly understood ...
    - ... because Piaget completely amputates the story of all of its object (a) qualities



## different forms of the Other on different levels of the constitution of the object a

### Lesson XXI

- oral
  - need in the Other ???  
need of the Other has to pass through the signifier as Demand of the Other???
  - not the subject that demands – because the breast is part of the subject's inner world
- anal
  - Demand in the Other
- phallic
  - jouissance in the Other ???
- scopic
  - might=*puissance* in the Other
  - in his fantasy and contemplation of this Other the subject forgets that this is fake
- invocative
  - desire in the Other
  - desire of the Other provokes anxiety  
how to defend oneself against this desire of the Other? Cf. Subversion
    - Obsessional
      - reduces the Other to a demand (voice of the superego)  
he does not do anything except when the Other demands him something  
but once the Other has demanded him something he is never able to do it in time
      - regresses to the anal level (link between the invocative and the anal)

## different forms of the Other on different levels of the constitution of the object a

### Lesson XXIV

- mythical level of birth
  - radical intrusion of the other, under the guise of the air  
child is suffocated by the inhalation of this fundamentally other environment
  - reaction = a cry = first cession, first yielding of a part of myself
- oral stage
  - need ??
  - the child weans himself in an active way (desire for weaning??)
    - plays fort-da with the breast, detaching himself from the breast and taking it up again
    - this game can become one-sided = anorexia  
could you say that the desire to wean himself, the biting off of his own breast, is the result of the anxiety at the moment of birth, with the intrusion of the Air-Other?
- Anal stage
  - Demand of the Other
  - Anal object is the object wherein or whereby the subject is first required=demanded by the Other to show himself as a subject  
but he does not show himself as a subject, but as a remainder  
and thus this anal object a in the subject will become the cause of his desire to hold back in relation with the Other, his desire will take on the form of an inhibition

## LESSON XXII FROM THE ANAL TO THE IDEAL

### JAM's subtitles

- The object's circular constitution
- The anal object  
The Immaculate Conception through the Ear, according to Jones
- The obsessional and the desire of the Gods
- Woman has to love man beyond the phallus

## **circular constitution of the object**

here the phallus for the first time receives its exceptional status not a???  
not object like all the other objects??

- Phallic stade
  - The missing phallus joins desire to jouissance which means that it is the gap of anxiety??
  - The phallus is an exceptional object
    - It's the only missing object, the only object that only shows itself as a lack
    - This missing phallus central, as a kind of point the capiton which means that it is no object like the others, and maybe it is no object at all
- In every regression there's a progression  
in every progression there' a regression
  - Link between the oral and the invocative stage (superego)
  - Link between the anal and the scopic stage (gaze)

## **woman has to love man beyond the phallus, beyond castration**

movement towards the jouissance of the other entails the constitution of the castration F352-E304  
when man and woman try to connect on the level of jouissance, they always encounter castration

- problem with the phallus  
phallus falls down before entering the jouissance of the female partner  
phallus does not stand up or stand firm on the way towards jouissance  
cf. detumescence in the moment of orgasm
- response
  - man
    - only present as his failing phallus, he's identified with it
    - anxiety??
  - woman has two options:
    - longing for an almighty phallus, that would always stand up or stand firm (Penisneid)  
(but also masquerade = making herself into the Phallus of this man)
    - recognizes that her jouissance is only in herself  
(SemXX woman is her own Other, Other jouissance  
and loves the man beyond this phallus-business)

## the obsessional

F354-E305

- desire is not symbolised
- obsessional tries to 'make' himself his own desire  
he does this as might, as self-mastery – on the scopic level
  - inflates his ego, like a balloon = strong ego or i(a)
  - inflated image of himself has to be supported: seen by an Almighty I(A)  
cf. believes in God=eye that watches down on all our actions
- the problem
  - return of the anal object (a) in this I(A)  
blasphemous fantasies about Christ's arse
  - this makes his desire impossible ...

**LESSON XXIII**  
**A CIRCLE THAT IS IRREDUCIBLE TO A POINT**

JAM's subtitles

- 5 forms of yieldable=cessible objects
- obsessional neurosis
  - inhibition = desire as a defence against desire
  - anal stand-ins (*suppléances*) for the phallic hole
  - love and desire
- acts and deeds=oeuvres

this is no doubt the most difficult lesson

**the chart of Inhibition Symptom anxiety**  
**on the anal level, in the case of the obsessional**

F369-319

	difficulty →→→		
movement ↓ ↓	inhibition desire to hold back	impediment not being able to hold oneself back = compulsion	embarrassment there must be a cause to what I think
	emotion not knowing where to answer	symptom doubt	passage à l'acte <i>exploit??</i>
	turnmoil= <i>émoi</i> subject cannot withhold (a)	acting out <i>ungeschehen machen</i>	anxiety

- inhibition
  - inhibition is desired = desire to hold back (the object a, the feces)
  - origin of this desire to hold back (the object)
    - reaction-formation to toilettraining, the Other's demand for the object
    - inflates his ego (strong ego) – suggesting that inside there's an (a)
      - strong ego i(a)
        - fears that the other would not know what to do if he would not be a strong ego a form of altruism, of oblativity (he gives the other an image of himself)
        - but on the other hand in this way
          - he is alienated from his own self
          - he destroys the desire of the other
      - (a) inside i( )
        - inhibition is the result of the introduction of anal desire in the genital function
          - accessed the phallic level but it's impossible to satisfy himself at that level – because of the Castration
          - and thus he falls back upon holding back the anal object, as the asset=bien?? that nevertheless makes him worth something anal desire is a defence against genital desire F371-E320 t
        - anal object = stopper – and thus the cause of his desire to withhold
- symptom (fundamental symptom)
  - doubt ...
  - ... about the dubious anal object (wordplay *objet douteux*) are these objects worth something??
- anxiety
  - before the dawn of the first object, the anal object ... before the return of this first object
  - ... for instance when a PA cure is pushed to its terminal point
- turnmoil=émoi F360-E311
  - impossibility of the subject to withhold the anal object at the sight of the primal scene the yielding=céder of the subject in front to the primal scene
  - cf. Wolfman, who ends the primal scene by defecating
- emotion
  - subject does not know how to go about responding: "He did not know it was that"
  - cf. catastrophic reaction before a task (Goldstein) – or Pavlov's experimental neurosis
- impediment
  - the subject is impeded from sticking to his desire to hold back the subject is not able to hold himself back
  - compulsion
- embarrassment
  - subject starts to realize that there must be a cause to his symptom, to what he thinks, etc
  - this can lead to transference (someone might know this cause)
- acting out
  - cf. the to and fro of the signifier that posits and effaces by turns (*ungeschehen machen*) – in order to find back the original trace, the authentic object-cause
  - but he keeps on looking for this original authentic object without ever finding it – because it is the abject and ridiculous anal object
- passage à l'acte
  - ??? feat???

**the object is yieldable=cessible (alienable)**

afstaan, overdragen = to yield

yieldable=cessible is of the same order as caduc = deciduous appendage

- oral
  - subjects yields the breast as being a part of himself
  - as a consequence the oral object can be substituted, replaced endlessly  
this is the origin of Winnicott's transitional object
- anal
  - the most natural form of the yieldable object
  - and it is also demanded (and even desired) for by the Other  
a case of compliance of the natural tendency to yield the feces with the Demand of the Other
- phallic  
???
- scopic
  - the object a  
the eyes as being handled, in the case of real human eyes added to a mechanical doll  
– origin of the feeling of Unheimlichkeit
  - the mirror image i(a)  
photographs that lead a life of their own – leading to a feeling of horror in primitives (but  
nowadays, for the digital natives, the snapchat porn pic that leads his own life)
- invocative
  - the voice as registered and categorized in libraries and shop

**LESSON XXIV**  
**FROM THE OBJECT (a) TO THE NAMES OF THE FATHER**

Subtitles JAM

- on the scopic level the object (a) is masked
- Birth is an intrusion of the Other
- To separate (oral) and to hold back (anal)
- Mourning, mania, melancholia
- Voice, father, name, love



## Lacan's reformulation of Freud's theory of anxiety

- anxiety-signal  
= anxiety for the danger of the cession=yielding, that is constitutive for the object (a)
- traumatic anxiety  
= anxiety before the desire of the Other, that is prior to the cession=yielding of the object = anxiety

## theory of the end of an analysis?

F382-E331

Proces of a PA

- First phase: object is brought upon the Other stage under the form of a tragedy and then also of a comedy
- at the end of a PA
  - object falls back down again from the stage of the Other
  - subject has to recognize itself for what it finally and really is: a yieldable object, an object that can be exchanged
  - subject has to recognize that jouissance only can meet desire if it steps over (franchir!!) castration anxiety (cf. table of the division of the subject)  
subject has to make the switch from castration anxiety to castration desire (vouer sa castration à la garantie de l'Autre)  
cf. Oedipus in Kolonos = castration that is desired

**the chart of Inhibition Symptom anxiety  
on the scopic level  
in the case of the obsessional???**

F384-E332

	difficulty →→→→		
movement ↓ ↓	inhibition desire not to see	impediment powerlessness= <i>impuissance</i> to sustain the desire not to see	embarrassment concept of anxiety (Kierkegaard)
	emotion misrecognition = <i>méconnaissance</i>	symptom (obsessional) fantasy of almightiness= <i>toute-puissance</i>	passage à l'acte fantasmatic suicide (melancholia)
	turnmoil ego ideal I(A)	acting out mourning	anxiety anxiety is masked

- inhibition
  - desire not to see
    - the scopic level is the best protection against the appearance of the object (mirror and fantasy)
- symptom
  - fantasy of allmightiness (obsessional!!)
- anxiety
  - completely masked – no anxiety
- impediment
  - powerlessness to sustain the desire not to see (compulsion to see???)
- embarrassment
  - concept of anxiety (Kierkegaard) as the sole final grip on reality
    - for Lacan there's no concept of anxiety!!
- emotion
  - misrecognition or not wanting to know
- turnmoil
  - ego-ideal = part of the Other that is most convenient to introject (as a support for the identification with the mirror image)
- acting out
  - mourning
    - Freud
      - consummating for a second time the loss – via a piecemeal painstaking remembrance of every detail of the bond with the lost love object (as a narcissistic object i(a))
      - withdrawing the libido in the ego
    - Lacan
      - Restoring the bond with the masked object a
      - and then we are ready for a new love object that hides this object for us
  - case of Shakespeare's Hamlet (SemVI)
    - starting situation = two idealisations
      - idealisation of his father – in the style of courtly love
        - this father was cut off in the blossom of his sin
      - idealisation of Ophelia
    - his mother does not mourn his murdered father
      - but immediately marries the murderer of his father – her
    - Hamlet can not kill the murderer of his father
      - Hamlet cannot desire Ophelia any longer
    - Hamlet sees how his friend Laertes mourns his dead sister Ophelia
      - and as a consequence
        - He can mourn himself for Ophelia
        - He can kill the murderer of his father – be it after being deadly wounded himself
- passage à l'acte
  - fantasmatic suicide
  - melancholia
    - withdrawing the libido in the ego does not succeed
    - we cannot restore the bond with this hidden object, the object triumphs, the subject is identified with it – as manifested in the passage à l'acte of the defenestration
  - mania
    - no (a) as ballast → subject is delivered to the infinite metonymy of the signifying chain

## voice, father, name, love

F388-E336

difficult end of SemX – 2 last lessons are chaotic

Lacan in a hurry to conclude, to say all the things he had prepared

JAM simply juxtaposes the concepts, the notions

The function of the father at the invocative level, in relation to the object voice

The father is introjected

- via the unary trait that he supports  
= basis of the law (normalisation of desire according to the law)
- via his voice  
= basis of the superego (a desire that forces itself upon all other desires)

these 2 different introjections of the father lead Lacan to the conclusion that there must be at least 3 Names-of-the-Father

- the Father of the Law
- the primal father
- the perverse father – the père-version of SemXXII  
the father who knows what is the object-cause of his desire (who takes his wife as an object a)

## object a in the PA cure

- transference – 2 sides
  - subject supposed to know (my unconscious)
  - situating the object-cause (a) in the Other – search for agalma in the Other
- how to handle transference?
  - Interpretation  
bears on dependence of desires in relation to one another
  - nomination
    - *A s'est nommé* = Other says his name / Other is named / (a) in the Other is named??
    - this leads to (real) love of the Other
    - and this to the surmounting or overcoming of (castration) anxiety  
(franchir or step over)
  - in order for the analysant to get beyond this castration anxiety the analyst should have merged his desire sufficiently in the object a (being object a for his analysant)