

CONVERGENCIA GROUP:

INTERROGATE THE CLINICAL

MARÍA EUGENIA VILA

In reference to the *savoir y faire avec...*

*Interrogating the clinical* is discussing within the social bond that *Convergencia* favors; it is reflecting on the remains that come to us in the saying of the analyst. A saying which exceeds the said and which brings on resonances of its practice, irremediably lost; it is *interrogating that doing with the impossible to support*; it is sharing with colleagues and friends those times of opening and closing of the unconscious, where something is produced, in which *the analyst pays with his being*. In the framework of this congress of *Convergencia*, I wish to share with you some reflections brought forward by our journey together as a group.

The practice of psychoanalysis concerns the subject, which is effect, divided between what he says and what he knows; it has to do with Knowledge deployment through his word, in transference, and with the hypothesis of the unconscious which –*structured as a language*– *finds order in discourse*<sup>1</sup> *by means of analysis*.,

In the seminar on Ethics, Lacan engages in dialog with Aristotle's proposal sustained on the Supreme Good. The ethics of psychoanalysis fits with the singular, aims to the radically unconscious – which governs our acts – articulated to the imaginary and to the real. *Not yielding in desire*, says Lacan, and at the same time he notes, *submission of man to the law of the unconscious*<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, our practice is not about doing good, or cherishing the good of the analysand (neither the contrary), but essentially about the analysand's truth. How he words his mis-encounter with the real, by which circles -which imply suffering, halting- he responds to the real. A question that I am keen on emphasizing is the distinction between

---

<sup>1</sup> Lacan, Jacques. *Lituraterre*.

<sup>2</sup> Lacan, Jacques. Seminar *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*

the real and fictional truth intertwined in fantasy, in that imaginary, symbolic weaving regarding a real that is a response to the dictates of the Super Ego, to the temptations of the instinctual Id.

In the class of January 11 1977, Lacan poses the articulation between knowing and the truth, which as he said in *Radiophonie* and later repeated, have no relationship whatsoever. In the discourse of the analytical act, knowing stands in the place of truth.

Truth has the structure of fiction; it alludes to how the subject says his mis-encounter with the real, to the signifiers, to the enjoyments that dwell in him. The analytical journey is necessary in order to interrogate the truth produced - to make room for it, to let it speak. It enables the subject to half-say or to otherwise word his mis-encounter with the real through analyst interventions typical of the moment of the act; it is all about his being able to find the best ways to respond to the real, allowing him to make progress in his desire. As pointed out by Isidoro Vegh, *Truth doesn't say the real, it aims to the real, it says to the subject how he responds to the real.*

Knowledge –an articulated set of signifiers– fails, it cannot say the truth, rather, when knowledge babbles, the truth of the subject emerges, perhaps a *lapsus*, a slip of the tongue. This occurs through the deployment of the word in transference. Lacan points out that *the unconscious is a knowledge, a skill, a savoir faire with lalangue*<sup>3</sup>.

We must note that when we talk of *savoir*, we are not talking of having *connaissance* (cognition). Knowledge is a concept of psychoanalysis, a *savoir* which touches the real: Lacan, in the same course, says: “*savoir y faire is different from savoir faire. It means to be able to make do with*”<sup>4</sup>. He contrasts *savoir* and doing. He alludes to a *savoir* that concerns the enjoyment that supports the symptom.

---

<sup>3</sup> Lacan, Jacques. Semianrio Encore. Clase del 26 de junio de 1973. Biblioteca EFBA. Para circulación interna.

<sup>4</sup> Lacan, Jacques. Seminar L'insu que sait de l'une-bevue s'aile a mourre. Class dated January 11 1977. EFBA Library. For internal circulation.

How to envision Knowledge at the end of analysis? It concerns a subject who has been warned, a knowledge experienced in transference, one which has effects in structure, touching enjoyment. Then, the *savoir faire* refers you to a transferential experience encompassing the 3 dimensions: real, symbolic, and imaginary. An experience not exempt of repetitions, the experience of setbacks, of slipping, of mis-encounter, of breaking, of finding – a time during which truth emerges.

*Savoir y faire avec* the symptom entails several issues. Sometimes, there may be a construction of a device in the real, of a new channeling of enjoyment for those remains unable to find a destination other than lurking there, poised to manifest themselves and spoil the scenery supporting the subject's desire. Other times, it is a being-warned that alludes to not getting involved with those tangled enjoyments that keep the analysand detached from his desire, not walking again those paths leading him to be muddled up with the demand of the Other which has become a drive, or with his mandates. *Savoir faire avec le Symptôme* has to do with recreating it, deploying it. A responsibility that also involves the analyst.

And on to other issues, *savoir faire avec* the symptom is doing in a different way, it has to do with the ethics of psychoanalysis, in that it does not give up the desire, not reject the unconscious; it concerns the ethics of *bien dire* (good saying), *recognising yourself in the unconscious*, as Lacan says on Television, and favoring other ways of saying in the social bond. That is to say, not drifting as an effect of those remains which, unwilling to go through the logic of the unconscious incompleteness, persist.