

The function of the analyst's writing in the composition of a style or

Why do the analysts write for?¹

Luciana Pena Vila Lima de Menezes²

Can an analyst in his formation do without the activity of writing in its most literal sense?

Perhaps the question before this one is why do we humans write? What is the purpose of this practice?

Writing is undoubtedly to some extent a representative practice. We write to give some form to feelings, thoughts, emotions. We can also write with the aim of expressing better what we want to say. As writing is a representation, we can also think that we write to invent a reality, since the lived experience cannot, in its entirety, be represented. When we think of writing in this way, we write to found some record of experience.

In this exercise, writing can tie a knot: some elaboration about what has been experienced can happen. Letters can also appear. Thus, we can think of the practice of writing as some contour, some image, some clipping of the real experience.

In Psychoanalysis, whenever the subject is writing, we often see its conceptualization as opposed to writing, placing writing at a higher hierarchical level than writing, but it is important to remember that a writing cannot arise without going through through the practice of writing, it is a condition, support to convey it. Thinking in this way, we could conclude about the absolute obviousness of the importance of writing in psychoanalysis.

Even though, when we talk about writing here, we could argue that this does not necessarily need to be done literally, since when we talk about analysis, we also write (sayings). Would that be enough?

¹ Text presented at the VIII International Congress of Convergence, Lacanian Movement for Freudian Psychoanalysis, May 24, 25, 26 and 27, 2023. Working group «Style in Psychoanalysis»: Ruth Ferreira Bastos-ELPV, Darlene Gaudio A. Tronquoy-ELPV, Inezinha Brandão Lied-Maiêutica Florianópolis - Psychoanalytic Institution, Luciana Vila Lima de Menezes-ELPV, Luíza Bradley-Psicanalytic Intersection of Brazil.

This old question – the importance of writing in psychoanalysis – comes back to me again when I take over the publishing secretariat of my School and collect some important elements to think about whether we can do without this act in our path.

We repeat that the training of an analyst is based on three pillars: personal analysis, supervision and theorization of the course. Knowing these pillars does not exempt us from practicing them. And, for that very reason, I would like to dwell on the third pillar of our training: theorizing in psychoanalysis. What does it mean to say that an analyst in his training should theorize his path?

Would this be restricted to the study of psychoanalysis, reading texts, attendance at school activities – and outside of it –, oral elaborations in a cartel?

Theorizing psychoanalysis has to do with the impression of something mined in the singular path in association with Lacanian signifiers. This exercise requires an effort that goes through writing, the imaginary record of the word.

In *Seminar XXI* that Lacan establishes the three dimensions – three dwellings – of the said: Real, Symbolic and Imaginary, in which he will say, rescuing the importance of the Imaginary, that the word makes an image, it stops the meaning that would tend to infinity, she does edge, outline.

In *Seminar XX* he similarly observes that: “if there were no analytical discourse, you would continue to talk like parrots, to sing the current disc-course, to make this disk spin, this disk that spins because there is no sexual relationship”. In other words, if the encounter is always flawed, this opens up the possibility of an infinite sliding of the signifier. What in the analytic discourse would stop the record?

Lacan gives us some clue about this when he works on the imaginary facet of the word: “the word is mi-metric, it belongs to the Imaginary, it is necessary to stop somewhere” (LACAN, 1973). Thus, the imaginary dimension of the word would favor, according to Lacan, this stagnation producing an image, an edge, a limit. Something that, elided in the enunciation, oral would find visibility in the writing, attesting that this something that was already there can appear in this operation. The letter becomes present in the exercise of writing, it passes through this register, necessarily.

In this rescue of the Imaginary, carried out by Lacan, it is curious how he places the three dimensions of saying in the same degree of importance. The Imaginary would have the function of

sustaining the Real, it is only through some imagination that we can assume the Real, without that, nothing is done!

In "Lituraterra", when dealing with Japanese writing, Lacan makes a metaphor about the gesture of writing in which the way each one performs his handwriting highlights the uniqueness of an act.

This idea gets deeper when he offers the example of the kakémono: "these things that hold". He will say that in cursive writing "the singular crushes the universal".

Cursive writing, according to Lacan (2023, p. 21), adds a dimension by which one would evoke from the subject what he would call *Hum-En-plus* (the one more). In the footnote there is an important indication about the silent "h" used by Lacan in several of his creations, such as, for example, *hénade*, which refers to the "hen" and at the same time presents the void through the unpronounced letter.

I am interested here in this fact presented by Lacan that it is only when writing the letter H of hum, for example, omitted in speech, that it can appear. Writing like this, imaginary support of the word, would contribute to making the letter appear.

Following this finding, he states "Pure *li[tera]ture* is the literal. To produce it is to reproduce that unique half with which the subject subsists. That is the feat of calligraphy" (p. 21).

Given this, it seems crucial to me to affirm writing in psychoanalysis not only that which is done in what is said, but that where the letter can not only be registered, but appear.

Charles Higounet, historian of writing, even states that "writing is more than an instrument. Even muting the word, it not only guards it, it realizes the thought that until then remains in a state of possibility" (2003, p. 9). Thinking with him: what in psychoanalysis could be accomplished and removed from the state of possibility through writing? The letter?

Regarding the text, Barthes will say:

If you drive a nail into wood, the wood resists differently depending on where it is attacked: it is said that wood is not isotropic. The text is not isotropic either: the margins, the span, are unpredictable. In the same way that (current) physics needs to adjust to the non-isotropic character of certain environments, of certain universes, it is also necessary for structural analysis (semiology) to recognize the smallest resistances of the text, the irregular design (BARTHES , 2008, p. 45 and 46).

It makes me think that reading a text, all of Lacan's work or reading oneself can be configured as a crucial exercise for meeting these referred margins, cracks, isotropies, but this exercise does not guarantee the same shape in which the figure contained there could appear. Another gesture is needed to make what was there appear, to work towards realizing what was only a state of possibility. Write the letter/pen (lapse of writing). Let her appear.

Pena, maternal surname, which returns in a lapse of writing in this text, was abbreviated by me during a long time of my life. The word Pity resonated in me like a pain, a suffering I wanted to get rid of, a trait that came from my maternal lineage. I signed my name abbreviating this "inheritance" Luciana P. Only in the exercise of my personal analysis, when dealing with my own name, could I hear that pen was also a name for pen. I had a tool! From this resignification that occurred in the sayings of the analysis, my maternal surname with pride The fixation on pain gives way to the possibility of writing: write with *your pen*, it's time for invention!

REFERENCES

BARTHES, Roland. *O prazer do texto*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2008.

HIGOUNET, Charles. *História concisa da escrita*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2003.

LACAN, Jacques. "Lituraterra". In: *Outros Escritos*. Trad. Vera Ribeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2003.

_____. *O Seminário livro 20: mais ainda*. Trad. MD Magno. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1985.

_____. *O Seminário livro 21: Les non-dupes errent, 1973-1974*. Seminário traduzido para fins de circulação interna apenas elaborado pela Escola Lacaniana de Psicanálise de Vitória.