

VIII International Congress of Convergencia, a Lacanian Movement for Freudian
Analysis
Barcelona, 2023

The dit-femme of the Analyst

Cecilia Domijan

Rereading Lacan's intervention at the Congress of the Freudian School of Paris at La Grande Motte, after the working groups, I would like to underline some of his statements regarding the edge of the hole. He says thus:

What I think is that, in effect, if there is a hole, it is the hole where we are all swirling around simply because we dwell in language. [...] the situation is this: if I cling to an edge that is that of logic, it is certainly because it is the edge of the hole. Clinging as a foothold, as a ramp so as not to be swept away in the whirlwind¹.

In the 1970s, Lacan introduced a new turn in his teaching traced by the presentation and manipulation of the knot. This turn refers to the *Urverdrängung* as a whirlwind emptiness. Indeed, he attempts to approach primal repression from the topology of the knot. He started with a reflection on the problem of emptiness. A void in action, not a static and central void, as in the manner of the *Logos*.

Of course, such a postulate is impossible to represent: can anyone imagine a void in motion? I believe that the whirlwind provides the imaginary support that Lacan lacks.

In proposing it, he evokes an event that occupied Greek reflection. Its uncertain origin, and its devastating violence, offered the Hellenic profitable material for research

¹ “La situation est celle-ci: si je me retiens à un bord qui est celui de la logique, c’est parce que c’est proprement le bord du trou. Se rattraper comme point d’appui, comme rampe pour ne pas être entraîné dans le tourbillon” en Lacan, J. “Intervention de Lacan, Congrès de l’École Freudienne de Paris La Grande Motte”, 4 November 1973, ELP’s website, *Pas-tout Lacan*, my translation.

and, above all, for discursive speculation. Indeed, the whirlwind creates a hole by its own movement. Its rotating center moves, absorbing whatever it finds in its path. In its insurgency, it does not abide by the law of gravity but rather defies it.

In the intervention that concerns us, Lacan names Freud's invention as the hole: a hole that Freud knew how to make in the world. Lacan affirms that the analysts who surrounded him failed to realize its scope. They were not aware of the great emptiness that Freud produced by making holes in the culture. That's how they got swallowed by the whirlwind. Lacan does not recognize any subsistence in their production.

Returning to the above quotation, I would like to underline this idea that I find surprising. If, as Lacan indicates, we are swirling around by dwelling in language, then this makes clinging to the edge the only way not to be swallowed.

From here on, what does the whirlwind imply in the analytic practice? What consequences does it have in the work with the analysands?

In my opinion, it is necessary to point to what happens with the language in an analysis.

The hole swirls around and swallows in that precise moment when meaning ends, when the answers are not enough. It is the time of the *trauma of language*², that is to say, the time of the agitation of the real that implies the encounter of the subject with the absence of meaning. It is the moment when meaning does not respond to the factual reality in which we believe we live.

At this point, we don't know what to do. The *trauma of the language* touches the status of the real: there is no sexual relation. The subject seeks to cling to anything that will lead him to some meaning.

² Cfr. Lacan, J. (s/f) "April 7, 1965" in *Seminario XII, Crucial problems for psychoanalysis (1964-65)*, unpublished, my translation; and Cecilia Domijan "La facticidad en la lengua", in <https://encuentroclinicolacanian.com.ar>

Then, what Lacan points out is that, in the contingency of that instant, there is no other alternative but to *invent*³.

I want to point out that one cannot invent at any moment, and even less so because one proposes it, but rather when *lalangue* delivers its trauma, its backlash. It is a time of uncertainty, urgency, and emergency, not without anguish. It is invented in urgency, not in calm. Therefore, inventing could never be a proposal or a call. Since Lacan put there the whirlwind, it is not worth urging analysts to invent or reinvent. It is not possible to anticipate, nor to know, nor to take advantage of it. This is as true for the clinic as it is for politics.

A young woman in analysis. As she was in her adolescence, she talks about her encounter with a boy. Between laughter and tears, she says: "What? We say we love each other and we're not even boyfriend and girlfriend? What are boyfriend and girlfriend?".

A small disagreement, a brief twinkle where the language is not enough to name it. How can it be? What is stirring outside the repertoire? How to name what the whirlwind has thrown? The new name, which enters neither in the dictionary nor in the code, visualizes the movement of the whirlwind, visualizes the vertigo it produces, every time the subject looks into the abyss. In this way, to my understanding, inventing implies clinging to an edge, clinging in order not to fall, that is to say, to pass from the demolishing of *lalangue* to logic. It implies doing with the trauma, elaborating a knowledge.

However, sexuation writes that there is no knowledge about sex. That is why the formulas of sexuation are proposed as a logic to account for the invention. They question the universality of phallic jouissance, the centralism of the Logos, and sexual

³ Cfr. "...we all know because we all invent a trick to fill the hole [trou] in the Real. Where there is no sexual relation, it produces traumatisme: one invents. One invents what one can, of course". Lacan, J. (n/d) "February 19, 1974" in *Seminar XXI, Les Non Dupes Errent...* (1973-74), unpublished, my translation.

identity. Those formulas are highly clinical and highly political. They write the way to arrive at the other jouissance, named hetero, which is not without the phallic one. It is precisely because of the hetero that logic can become profoundly disturbing. It makes holes in knowledge because the whirlwind invention creates a name foreign to the Logos.

The important thing, at least for me, is to underline that a new name could be thrown into the world only by the Freudian whirlwind. In the contingency. There, analyst and analysand are surprised together. At last, they leave their Aristotelian costumes. If only for a few moments.

In Seminar XX, *Encore*, (1972-73) regarding the other jouissance, Lacan names the *dit-femme*, a French homophony. One hears "defamation" and at the same time, "called/saying-woman". Of course, it is not a question of women's sayings but, rather, it implies that, in the passage from the saying to the analysand's saying, the word could resonate in another jouissance than the in phallic one, although not without it. The *dit-femme* gives an account of a word and defamatory jouissance hollowed out by another way of saying.

To conclude, Paul Celan, a Romanian poet, exiled and persecuted by the Nazis, traversed by an opaque relationship with Heidegger, called language the "Speech-Grille" and with that he stabbed in the banishment and deportation of bodies. That gauntlet, thrown into the world, is, in my opinion, the one that Freud picks up when he postulates the *Urverdrängung*. The primal repression talks about the abyss that the poet does not fail to read in a code of exile. Not a country exile, but an exile from his own language wrongly called mother tongue.

War and the arms race, isn't that what they're talking about? What is the hole to be plugged up with such a massacre? The whirlwind is insurgent, and there is no way of not being swept away by it. It is certainly not the whirlwind that makes a Freudian hole, the

one that throws new names in the world, but the one that rebels as a result of science associated with market economies.

The *dit-femme*, barely sonorous, barely homophonic, touches that fence, touches that impassable limit, placing the analyst in the face of some whirlwind invention. Indeed, there is no sexual relation, says the apothegm. Sex cannot become gender, just as the Logos cannot essentialize the speaking being, and all because of the subject's entry into language. Man-Woman. These bastions of humanity are not enough to make sex the act in question.

That's why we follow Lacan's trail as he allows himself to be absorbed by the whirlwind hole that Freud knew how to make. For, the analyst, absorbing himself, not without the others, making himself the object of his own turbulence, gives up to the subject the responsibility of his desire.