

We will only know afterwards:

Patricia Leyack

Escuela Freudiana de Buenos Aires

In our field, efficacy will always be verified *a posteriori* and by its effects. Hence, the title of this paper.

Effective intervention is not planned and it sometimes shares the risk and the bet. It rather depends on transference management¹, which he calls “*ressort*” and which later specifies as a certain *savoir y faire*² with whatever the transference temperature puts forward. That is to say, being capable of being (adopting), in every case and at every moment, the object’s *semblant* which the analysand requires. And there is no warranty – sometimes, a leap into the void.

Writing this, I have realized that it is not just a ready-made phrase but, rather, that I am alluding to the significant work on the real’s hole border. Efficacy will arise from whether the intervention has been able to bite a piece of the real. And it will be verified, not without a surprise for both poles of transference, by the effects on *jouissance*.

War neuroses lead to trauma repetition and, says Freud, only the bodily wound protects, through overinvestment of one’s own affected body, from catching a disease. The not wounded at war dream of traumatic lived scenes over and over, dreams that, as posed by Freud, attempt to connect the burdens, not yet fulfilled desires.

In neurotic melancholias, efficacy may result from an intervention which, like a kind mirror, lifts the melancholic heaviness stained by fantasy. Freud called these conditions «peace time traumatic neuroses». Brilliant definition.

And he identified neurotic melancholia trauma: the *Liebeversagung*, the amorous refusal in originating times, and, later, the subject’s love frustration. Which sets up a

¹ J.J. Lacan “La dirección de la cura (...)” (*The direction of the Treatment*) in *Writings I* Ed. Siglo XXI Editores S.A. 5ta. Edición en español, México 1977.

² J.J. Lacan “Seminar 24 L’insu (...)” For internal circulation at EFBA, Buenos Aires, Argentina

damaged narcissism, with a baseline wound that melancholizes the subject.

My clinical verification in these cases is that the advent of an intervention aiming to the I, to narcissism and its images, arisen under the spell of what the analysand has at play, may provoke unexpected subjective efficacy effects while displacing egoic images degraded by melancholy, providing the subject with a mirror where to be reflected with some achievement restoring the devastated egoic instance.

These are interventions in the imaginary which affect the *jouissance* real.

There is a surprise effect when intervention arises from a *semblant* of *a*, of the realm of *a*, in the place of the analyst³ because it operates from a not-knowing, or at least, from an egoic not-knowing. It is the setting in function of the analyst's desire which takes over, and it is sometimes shaped like a risk, a bet without a guarantee. And only *a posteriori* and by its effect, will we be able to place transference as a *savoir y faire avec*.

It occurred on our farewell. I found myself telling an analysand that at a different analytical time, she had written a very good storybook fictionalizing disturbing dreams, but that later on, she had been unable to resume writing. The literary workshop coordinator with whom the analysand had worked on the book once asked me whether she was still writing because, so she had said, she writes very well.

The analysand bid me farewell, deeply moved. And the question fell on the place of the analyst: what had she done?

The surprising benefic effects did not take long to show up. Recovered, after some time, she decided to put an end to analysis.

In these severe narcissistic disturbances, the question is to what extent this true hole, operated by the analyst's word like an infinite straight line, can be permanent where before there used to be a false hole⁴ -the persistent trapping on the Other's mirror, in this case.

³ J.J. Lacan *Seminar 17 El reverso del psicoanálisis (The reverse side of Psychoanalysis)*. Ed. Paidós, Buenos Aires año 1.999.

⁴Based on Ilda Levin's work in "Símbolo y síntoma: ¿falso agujero? ¿agujero verdadero? Una lectura desde la clínica psicoanalítica" (*Symbol and symptom: false whole? True hole? A Reading from psychoanalytical clinical*) Presented at an EFBA 2023 Summer colloquium on the basis of a proposal by Lacan in Class # 1 of *Seminar 23, Le Synthome*

Because *jouissance* redistribution did not derive from whether the subject might have transformed *jouissance* into *j'ouis-sense* (I hear sense) as a response to symbolic intervention but, rather, that it was the effect of one word, which, with the force of transference, knotted differently, and this enabled desire where, before, inhibition had prevailed.

I wish to say that this was not an end-of-analysis, inasmuch as there had been no *des-être* (dis-being) on the part of the analyst. It would not be possible on account of structure, in this case. To further specify, the question is whether we may bet on enduring effects in a dis-identification with a ruinous object, but without the transference fall. Once lightened of the melancholic heaviness, the analyzand was able to do without analysis. And this was the effect of an analytical intervention *sinthomatic* artifice which proved efficacious.

«A practical bias to feel better». This is how Lacan defined our trade. And this definition, in all its seeming simplicity, looks like it was tailor-made for this cure.