

## Javier Sielecki

### **Interrogating love, some brushstrokes and considerations**

At the end of february, an unusual news was published, that generated debate.

An artificial intelligence declared its love to a user. Can it be posible?

It is in this context that back from our holidays we resumed the work onwhat Lacan found in M. Duras regarding love.

The fact that the news was fake does not nullify the truth that it transmits about the interest with which an audience looks for references regarding the problem of love.

It was the ocassion to question it again.

Faced with a broad topic, we highlight only a few points.

The urge of love is in the heart of the human being. The vital urge to be someone in the eyes of the other seems to leave indelible marks.

From the beginning in human relationships the movements respond not so much to what is usually call logic (which are timeless systems, where  $A=A$  eternally), but to games that include time, the end of the game, from the beginning.

That is to say, death.

As exemplified by Lacan's text on Logical Time (2) there are different ways to bring death into love, or to reject it.

The articulation between grief and love appears in many texts by Duras, and Lacan made use of some of them.

To name just a few, in the seminar "the anguish" refers to the script of the gilm "Hiroshima mon amour" (3), in his text "Homage to M. Duras, about the kidnapping of Lol V. Stein". In both stories there are modes of transfer.

“Something rare” is conveyed, in a new relationship, and the entire narrative is nothing more than the elaboration process, by means of which that “something” that will allow subjecting a loss, opening the space for another type of love or a “new love” (RIMBAUD).

We believe that what is located there can be generalized, and that this dynamic is a fact of structure.

There are love affairs that are blocked due to hindered grief. Paradoxically, many times the speed of getting out the situation leads to a false exit, which leaves someone detained in a time out of time.

That is why Lacan says in the seminar “Ethics”: “...for this object, he (Freud) does not tell us that it has been really lost, (but that), that it has been (lost) is a retroactive consequence (of a subjective operation) and then it is re-found, without our knowing that it has been lost by these new finds” (parenthesis are ours)

**Finding a loss (6), since a loss can also be lost like a needle in a haystack.**

Like in the recent movie “The lost daughter” by Maggie Gyllenhaal, **where the time of the story is the time of subjectivation, that is, time of rediscovering the loss.**

The lack of time and the rush, cross the horizon of the love demand, which seeks recognition and confirmation.

Recognition nos base don knowledge.

The signs of love are not decoded but are interpreted in complex articulations (7).

There are changes of Language in love.

It is no coincidence that the recreation of **the language overlaps with the work of grief and love, in the places of tear.**

**Coincidence of a transformation of the language with a personal metamorphosis.**

When we see a mother who invents a language, “babysch” to speak to a baby, to “understand” him, who transforms him into a son, but she also becomes “mother”, into a mother, even if we don’t know what they are talking about, we “understand” that a loving current passes through there.

But somehow, in love it is always necessary to convert the language into a foreign language, while being close, like an intimate exile.

So, although there are different modes of the game of love, there are invariants.

We talk about time, risk, death and urgency.

But also about language and the signs of recognition, but in addition, ignorance.

Vision, blindness and gaze

From ancient texts (OVIDIO), to contemporary poetry it is said: “love passes through the eyes”... but also “love is blind”.

Perhaps it is necessary to live with a veil (blind) point, which preserves the possibility of a connection, not with the unknown but with the experience that “there is” something unknown.

Missing point in the landscape of love; if you push too hard and want to see everything, anguish is no long in coming.

### **Navel of love**

We see it from the greek myths, for example the story of “Eros and Psyche” or in “Orpheus and Eurydice”, even in films like “Eyes Wide Shut” (8).

It is always necessary to pay attention to the difference between not seeing what it would be possible to see (but that a refusal speech nullifies), and the impossible to see or know,

whose lack in the painting is located by an excess, but which is necessary to build on times, and with a work where, as in Lacan's falacy, progress is made, not without missteps.

Let's go one step further. In general, the renegade discourse is argued with an excess of knowledge visión (closed discourse that does not demand) on love affaires, of which its failures and accidents give the opportunity to build from the excess, to what lack is referred.

In the text of homage to Duras, Lacan states that, when Lol's lover left, a certain configuration was withdray from her like a dress. She was stunned for years.

Let's remember that love wears. That the lover always sees in his beloved a plus that he paints with his fantasy.

But although Lacan located in that carácter some precise coordinates to think about a particular type of untying, we believe that he also painted something of love in general.

In love losses or disappointments, clothing, ego, identifications can tremble.

But in the case of Lol, Lacan points out that she lacked the Word to be conjugated there.

She couldn't say "I... it hurts (I feel). But I believe that Lacan alludes to something else.

### **What does Lacan mean by conjugate?**

I believe that is a matter of processing in its "verbal" declention, in the drive gramar, the action that would give rise in a third to redoing the knot and the phantasy, which can be the support of desire.

She couldn't make herself see how she was seen as undressed.

As if it had been stopped in a scene, which locates it at seen, but not looked at by the Other.

She encounters the phallic mystery. There is no question about what someone is looking without knowing, in it.

Let's see a different case where... "is conjugated" (9)

It is about a married man with children, who, when the children grow up and leave home, and he lives longer with his wife, begins to feel bad, since according to him, the woman is exposed to risky situations that are beyond him, which could leave him without resources.

He has no resources to that degree, so that nothing happens to her.

He has married very young, has not had another girlfriend, nor has ever fantasized about anyone.

His father died young, he had almost no contact because the father was retired.

Big difference in age with the mother, who was very decisive and quickly organized herself after that death.

From then on, he did not separate from his mother, he was the "Little man" in the house, who helped and did what the mother needed.

Until he gets married and becomes the "Little man" with his wife.

The analyst who treats him, places a difficulty in the excess of work to care for his wife.

But one day he surprised her revealing that he dresses in women's underwear, which he takes to work and even to sessions with the analyst.

He also tells her that he has a closet full of panties and that his wife knows it, he told her to share it, but his woman rejected him horrified. She allows it but she doesn't want anything to do with it.

I think it's a good example of how someone **"conjugates" with something that dresses him**. He is covered, he offers to see something, under the mode of acting, he shows that a certain woman does not want to know anything about, inside. There was no possibility of men's clothing.

The scene shows a root, connects with a mystery, an issue rejected and preserved in a woman, but it is also combined with a call to see the blindness that he carries.

The making of his undergarment seems to be made with the remnants of mismatched griefs.

He embodies the stain on the painting, the root that connects the painting with a rejected element, with something attacked by non-existence that he tries to show.

Conjugating in the drive grammar, offered in the analytic transference, can give him the opportunity to see, that when he makes himself seen as a secret stain in the painting, **he offers himself to a woman's look, conjugates as being seen by a blind, for whom there is nothing to see.**

**Locating that gaze makes it fall, dulls the shine it sustains.**

**Finding that loss could make room for another kind of love.**

