

What ethics for the practice of analysis today? The dignity of the object.

Andrés Barbarosch (EFA)

The title of this congress: *What ethics for the practice of psychoanalysis today?*, is possible due to Lacan's seminal work on Freud's *Psychology Project* in *Seminar VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. The work on Freudian metapsychology with primary repression, with the lack of the representative of the representation (*vorstellungsrepräsentanz*) that continues in the developments on the signifier and the Thing (*das Ding*) to which it will give an operational value; while the Other of individual prehistory, the drive, jouissance and the myth of the Kleinian mother may well go to that place.

Lacan speaks of the signifier because analysis is an area where one speaks, because that speaks to whoever as an analyst in the transference has a listener available.

Lacan, while dictating the classes of *Seminar XVI D'une Autre à l'autre*, was writing a version of *Seminar VII*, nineteen typed pages that were found in a cardboard box and published posthumously along with the teaching reviews. He talks about it several times. In the *Other Writings*, this text is missing.

Perhaps some psychoanalysts did not miss it since in *Seminar XX: Encore*, Lacan explicitly proposed to remake *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*, bringing it up to date, a reformulation of what was already exposed and with the string rings: a change of paradigm.

For these reasons, in *Seminar XX*, he can define courtly love as "a refined way of making up for the absence of a sexual relationship, pretending that we are the ones who hinder it."

When he writes the table of sexuation, he does not only deduce the phallic function, the signifier of the barred Other $S(\bar{A})$, but also the \bar{A} of the crossed out woman, which allows us to pose, relying on mathematical logic where the universal makes sense, but non-existence, since the universal is erased \bar{A} , so there is no the Woman, but women. With the object a , the condition for which each one of them wants to be loved will be given, and the affirmation that there is no man without a woman, will make it possible for them to question female jouissance for both

sexes. The object *a* is what makes the cause of desire, the piercing of the whole and the division of the subject.

There are continuities and discontinuities between these developments and those of *Seminar VII* where he raised the emergence of courtly love as a meteor that, moving ostentatiously away from the lives of women, in the 11th and 12th centuries created a sensibility that was going to fade in the future through the centuries and that continues to leave sparkles in love sorrows and troubles such as those told by patients and analysands in the analyst's office.

Because it is *llanguage*, (*lalangue*) when someone speaks in the analysis, they externalize a jouissance, for which it can be said that the ethics of psychoanalysis is desire, an issue that distinguishes psychoanalysis from any psychology trapped in the endopsychic.

Faced with the quagmire in which the post-Freudians found themselves to account for sublimation, confined to the conflict between ego libido and sexual libido. Lacan gives a dimension of alterity with the Thing (*das Ding*) in what is unassimilable to any dualism, he defines it as: "Sublimation is raising the object to the dignity of the thing." In courtly love there is the sublimation of the feminine object; the symbolic creation of the lady as an object of amorous exaltation. Lacan, towards the end of *Seminar VII*, drops the definition of "sublimation as raising the object to the dignity of the thing" when speaking of the dignity of the object.

In the class of June 22, 1960, Lacan says: "*If you read that work of Lessing's which is so rich in all the kinds of insight, The Laocoon, you will find that he is absorbed from the beginning in the conception of the dignity of the object. Not that it is as the result of historical progress that that dignity of the object has been abandoned, thank God, since everything seems to indicate that always was*".

The book that Lacan gives the seminar to read to talk about the dignity of the object is entitled *Laocoon, or about the limits in painting and poetry* (1766) written by G. E. Lessing, a brilliant inveterate polemicist who wages his battles with J. J. Winckelmann from his essay *Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and the Art of Sculpture* (1755).

From the outset, Lessing - who was also fond of card games -, in a hand pass, changes the rules of the game to Winckelman.

Winckelmann's theses are framed in the visual arts and in the classical ideal of beauty of Greek antiquity, "*the noble simplicity of the form and serene grandeur of the expression*". In the figures of Greek art the expression reveals a great and serene soul in the midst of all passions. This soul is denoted not only in Laocoon's face, but in his whole body, notwithstanding his horrible sufferings.

Lessing, by changing the listed themes, is going to propose a tournament between poetry (epic, novel, dramaturgy) and painting (sculpture, architecture) in which poetry is going to emerge victorious, for which he will be criticized for his rancor with the visual arts. Painting and poetry differ by the objects and the way to imitate them. Time is the domain of the poet; the space, that of the artist. Poetry will have a greater range of register in reference to the passions, in painting the object is the bodies in an instant of action.

One of the possible literary sources of the sculptural group is *book II of Virgil's Aeneid*, which deals with the Trojan War. It tells about the death of the priest Laocoon and his two sons who, on the seashore, were sacrificing a bull in honor of Neptune and the snakes that come from the island of Tenédos double-twist the three characters in a tight knot engorged with blood in who lose their lives.

In reference to the dignity of the object adjusted to the ideal of classical beauty in the visual arts, Lessing, for poetry, is going to propose a displacement of dignity with respect to beauty.

In Laocoon we contemplate the muffled and compressed cry of the priest whose greater expressiveness would have meant a deformed face exceeding the limits of the canon. In poetry, the Homeric gods suffer and complain like mortals of their physical pain and do not lose dignity for that.

Lessing, who admired Shakespeare, fought for there to be a German literature and drama, which did not exist, and opposed the Winckelmannian ideal in order to ensure that it did not accentuate the dominance exercised by French neo-classicism in the theater of his time.

The distinction of painting and poetry of sight and hearing evoke those of the scopic and invocative field, the theater as it links both and involves the body is the greatest art in reference to the phantasy.

The word does not correspond to the tight dress of the beauty of the visual arts. Paraphrasing Lacan: the specular field is visible to me, the narcissism that involves the self and the other, but not desire.

The object dignity through the word will imply the fault, the deformed, the rest, the unworthy, the Evil. In terms of Lessing, *Ricardo III* of Shakespeare, which Freud takes up in "The exceptions" to talk about what we reject, the horrible that is in ourselves.