

## Nomination: about effectiveness

Cecilia Domijan, ECLAP

Regarding efficacy in the clinic, I believe that there is no single efficacy. The different moments of Lacan's teaching set in motion different modes of it.

Here I would like to make some clarifications regarding what Lacan calls "nomination" at the time of the seminar *RSI* (1974-75). As we all know, it refers to that major term, that clinic's climax that Freud called *Urverdrängung*, the primal repression, topologized by the Borromean knot.

The signifying action that promotes this nomination, this power of the signifier to make a hole: can it be specified as what in the clinic, drives to something else? Is it what under analysis, gives way to continue speaking in another way? What effects result from the leap through the *Urverdrängung*? What efficacy?

Passing to something else no longer refers to the Other scene, but to something new, closer to a *hetero* jouissance than to a jouissance of the Other. Indeed, I am referring to a tracing of the word, *Das Wort*, when it abandons a certain identitarian investment, when it takes off from its fixed jouissance and makes something else.

A young girl says about her new love, crying and laughing at the same time: "What's the difference between being sweethearts and not being sweethearts, we just started and we already call each other love!". "We call each other love without being boyfriend and girlfriend." Something happened, a certain *décalage*, the time established to say one's own thing slipped. The unexpected happens. Does the *Urverdrängung* work with language to say something else? Doesn't the nomination go through this bias?

Paul Celan, the German poet, exiled and persecuted by the Nazis, sunken in an opaque relationship with Heidegger, called language the "Speech-Grille" and threw down the gauntlet into the world. To my understanding, this is the one that Freud took up when he outlined the primal repression.

The incorporation of the field of language as the first identification leaves us prisoners of that grille from which it is not possible to do without. Nevertheless, the nomination touches that fence, it touches that impassable limit, it puts the subject facing the real and opens the possibility of saying in new ways.

In the session of April 15, 1975, regarding the hole, Lacan affirms: "...a hole - if you believe in my little schemes - a whirling hole - it rather swallows - then there are moments when it spits out.... What does it spit out?, the Name, it is the Father as Name"<sup>1</sup>.

The analyst, by the bias of the act, forwards the analysand's sayings to his saying. The action of knotting, that unimaginable point where the nomination acts, is rooted in the word, *das Wort*. The analyst extracts the word from the whirlwind twist. In that way, it may happen that names are spat out. But that name is not of an object nor is it of a subject but retains the poetic character of the word. It makes a hole.

Carolina Fábregas, analyst, comments on a woman analysand who says: "I was spying on him through the door and I felt an immense anxiety". The analyst thinks: "She is hysterical", and suddenly, in the course of the wordy avatar, the analyst is surprised by her mumbling and says to herself: "No, this is serious, this is something else!"

The nomination touches the analyst, it swallows him and then it spits him out as *object petit a*.

The *Urverdrängung* moves, it turns, it puts the analyst's ex-sistence in check.

The *object petit a* animates the whirlwind, it transforms the peacefulness of transference love into an insurgency. The arrogant whirlwind, in its passage, names the time where meaning ends, where the answers are not enough. In the turbulence of the hole, one does not know what to do. Neither the analysand nor the analyst knows what to do. It is the moment of the drowning of the transference. The traumatism of the language (which became nomination) touches the status of the *lalangue*'s grille: there is no sexual relation. The subject seeks to cling to anything that leads him to some meaning.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lacan, J (undated). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: RSI, 1974-74* Staferla.unpublished, own translation.

Belena Tauyaron, an analyst of my association, presents one of her clinical pearls. A young woman tormented by her thoughts cannot distinguish between the limits of nightmare and reality. She says: "I can't avoid it, it's a nightmare but I'm awake". In the course of the transference, a path traversed by microphysical catastrophes, the analysand comments that she asked her mother about the alcohol by volume of vodka. Imitating her mother's voice, the analysand says "I don't know, but it's alcohol!".

For some unknown reason, the analyst begins to laugh and the analysand begins to smile.

It goes from the subject's demolishing to something else. The plot is broken without knowing what it is about. Laughter occurs, naming moments of cut. Unpredictable. They do not refer to anything, they are not deciphered, they do not follow any associative chain and even, by their surprising emergence, they blur a certain ontological difference between the one who "is" the analyst and the one who "is" the analysand. Perhaps, when the whirlwind spits, when the imminence of its centrifugal force comes into play, when the nomination comes into action: who is the analyst? And who is the analysand?

Sometimes on the couch, the analyst and the analysand, their supposed differential status vanishes in a shared laughter, and with a departure to something else.

