

Fetus of the verb, fetus of the names

The Third – Lalangue Working Group.

Ana Virgínia Rizzi
Inajara Erthal
Manuela Lanius
María Rizzi
Simone Brenner
Soraya Maihub Manara
Tahiana Brittes

After I began my rise to childhood,
That was when I saw how the adult is sensible!
For how not to bathe naked in the river among birds?
How not to pierce a circus tent to see the clowns?
How not to rise even higher until in the absence of the voice?
(Absence of the voice is *infantia*, with *t*, in Latin.)
For how not to rise to the absence of voice -
There where we can see the very fetus of the verb -
still motionless.
Where we can see the fetus of names -
still no fluff.
Why not go back to groping the first shapes
of the stone. To listen
The first calls of the birds. To see
The first colors of dawn.
How not to return to where the intention is virgin?
Why not ascend back to the stutter!
(Manoel de Barros, *Ascensão* – 1916 [our own translation])

We have been studying Lacan's *The Third* in our Working Group in *Convergence*.
With the approach of the VIII International Congress of *Convergence*, Lacanian Movement
for Freudian Psychoanalysis, we have the opportunity to launch the proposal of articulation
about *lalangue*, theme that always produces a lot of work for reflections and elaborations.

We start from some issues linked with questions that arise from the clinic. What can
we think about the ethics of psychoanalysis in the analyzes when the patient is a child,
considering the times of childhood and its clinical incidences? What remains of the
fundamental Freudian and Lacanian assumptions when working with them? What, in this

clinical particularity, can we differentiate, innovate, maintain, or reaffirm? Would there be any specificity that would make this modality of work another modality of listening?

When Freud deals with texts situated as the Foundations of Psychoanalysis, he refers to an impasse. He needs to convey something of his clinical experience, however, he fears that this will become fixed rules or norms – which for him would be a great danger for Psychoanalysis, and for which we must be aware. It is claimed, therefore, that all care, rigor, and fidelity to the technique, is independent of the patient or even of the time.

What would be the rule that is conserved as perhaps the one that makes an analytical work possible? Freud insists on the Fundamental Rule: free association and floating listening:

Your narrative should differentiate at one point from a common conversation. While you would normally and rightly try to find the thread in the general context of your narrative, rejecting all adjacent occurrences and thoughts so as not to lose yourself in digressions, proceed otherwise here. You will notice that a number of thoughts will occur to you that you want to ward off with certain critical restrictions. You will be tempted to tell yourself: this or that is beside the point, or is absolutely unimportant, or makes no sense and therefore does not need to be said. Never give in to this criticism, say it anyway, precisely because you feel rejected by it. The reason for this prescription – in fact the only one you should follow – you will know later and learn to understand it. So, say whatever comes to your mind. Behave, for example, like a traveler sitting at the window of a train who describes to those farther away from it, on the inside, how the landscape is changing before your eyes. And finally, never forget that you promised complete sincerity, and never overlook some fact just because for some reason that information is unpleasant to you. (FREUD, [1913] 2019; p.136 [*our own translation*])

This is the rule that governs the work of psychoanalysis. So simple yet so complex. It is from this rule that Freud points out the possibility that we have to access what we are dealing with in an analysis: the unconscious.

In the course of an analysis, it is about the subject being able to say everything that comes to them, making use of that fundamental resource that is the free association in

transference. Only then, for Freud, can the unconscious surprise us, reporting its existence, strength, obscurity, mystery.

Exhibitions of the unconscious do not take place in the depths, as was first supposed, but in everyday life, in dreams, in slips, in lapses, in shame, in jokes, while playing, in art, anyway, in our symptoms. Symptoms that make us suffer, that call us into question, but also that constitute us. They are symptoms of each one, necessarily individual and very singular.

Our symptoms are our unique ways of dealing with our unconscious. We do not know about the origin of the unconscious, however it lives in us and makes us not only decipher it, but also deal with it, long before we realize it. We know about the unconscious because we have symptoms, because we dream, because we limp, because we talk/do not talk, we learn/do not learn, we are very active/we do not move, anyway, we have them.

Language, for Lacan, in its ordering in the four discourses, is a structure that allows something to be communicated in the social bond, as there is no possibility of speech without being bathed in meaning and without the semblants parading under the ghost's whistle – each *speaker's* unique reality. In the text that brings us together, *The Third*, Lacan clearly points out: “we are all subject to the principle of reality, that is, to the ghost” (p. 58 [*our own translation*]). However, *lalangue* is not subject to an organization that serves for a dialogue between two *speakers*, since it is a sound matter that runs parallel to the structure. *Lalangue* vocalizes the smallest sound unit: the phoneme.

Maybe we could ask Lacan if we do not even work with elements that are more minimal than this unit defined as a phoneme?

Warned that the effects of language cross the *speakers*, regardless of the places they occupy, whether they are subjects under analysis or subjects who take the place of analysts, we are concerned with the debate attentive to the ethics that enables us to listen: “no psychoanalyst advances further than their own complexes and internal resistances allow” (FREUD, [1910] 1996, p. 130 [*our own translation*]).

Transference founds the possibility of listening to what *lalangue* brings with it, the reality of the voice and, on the other hand, of what cannot be vocalized, which appears in a body in motion or in tension, in a sigh, in a tremor, *lalations*, babbling, *purring*¹, noises, body fluids, elements that are more minimal than a phoneme.

The analyst makes a hole, fractures the discourse, gives way to what has no form.

We work with the Lacanian hypothesis that *lalangue* would be the alluviation of the language received by the subject through the sound matter and that reverberates in a writing of its own, profoundly marking singular paths for the passage of the signifiers that will go one to the other in a chain and that resonate in the various formations of the unconscious and other psychopathological formations, such as, for example, the psychosomatic formations. What is incorporated into the symbolic, from the body, will support the subject as a network of signifiers and will return as its representative in its manifestations. These marks will compile the historical memory of each one.

There are also indications of the incidence of the gaze, whose capture is almost inevitable, given its power of thrust. According to Lacan ([1972-1973] 1985), *lalangue* would be what primarily affects the speaking being in its most archaic perceptions, as it transmits affections with it, in a dimension inaccessible to enunciative speech. Since *The Third*, Lacan adds:

Lalangue is not meant to be said alive because it is in use. It is even before the death of the sign it conveys. It is not because the unconscious is structures like a language that *lalangue* does not have to play against its jouissance, since it has made itself out of that jouissance. (LACAN, [1974] 2002, p. 53 [our own translation]).

Operating with speech, psychoanalysis is not carried out without the incarnated subject, it deals with the body marked by the effects of language, moreover, it deals with knowledge in that is perpetuated, as in the *infinite regression technique (mise en abyme)* something of the signifier that does not find ways of inscription and that is triggered in the

¹ Lacan, [1974] 2002, p. 54 [our own translation].

corporeal imago. Body that sometimes connects to the significant grammar, sometimes gives in to the advances of jouissance, which leaves its scars on it.

We poetically play with this “ascent” to the unconscious, proposing “access” to the fetus of the verb, to the fetus of the names, with Manoel de Barros. And also, with the song Timoneiro, as Paulinho da Viola sings, “when someone asks me how to swim, I explain that I do not sail, it is the sea that navigates me” (*our own translation*).

Freud often repeats his recommendations on the extent to which there are cares, precautions and concerns that can halt an analytic work. Behold, in the analyzes of children, we are often faced with situations that perhaps we would need to return to the reservations that Freud and Lacan make throughout their works. Caveats that may distance us from the fundamental rule.

At every moment we have to know what our effective relationship with the desire to do good, the desire to heal, should be. We have to reckon with it as being liable to lead us astray, and in many cases instantly. Or rather – one could paradoxically, or even decisively, designate our desire as a non-desire to heal. This expression has no other meaning than that of warning against the vulgar ways of good, as they are so easily offered to us in their pendor, against the beneficent fraud of wanting-the-good-of-the-subject. (LACAN, [1959-1960], p. 267 [*our own translation*]).

Demands accompany a child that arrives, which approach this desire to do good, to heal, to take care of their development, their future. Usually, these are requests for help that do not originate from the patient themselves. The child is usually brought in by someone who is the voice of a concern – pre-occupation – either from family members, the school, doctors, or other professionals who accompany them. Requests for diagnosis, care for their development and future, for prognosis, for improvement, for things to be okay, for suffering to decrease and for symptoms to be cured. This is par excellence the arrival of a patient to a doctor or to those professionals who are in the place of healing, of producing improvements for the patients, of perhaps guaranteeing a future of well-being, health, and happiness. These are promises that, in the field of psychoanalysis, we cannot fulfill, not even promise without placing us in a different ethic, which is not that of Psychoanalysis.

At first, Freud, a neurologist, receives patients in his office asking him to cure their symptoms. Here, Freud is faced with an impasse, he discovers that before those symptoms, that suffering, his medical knowledge does not operate, on the contrary, he runs the risk of worsening the situation. Freud then assumes a knowledge that he did not know for sure who knew. Knowledge that does not include good will, well-being, happiness, good behavior, good development.

As Maud Mannoni says: A knowledge that one does not know – The analytical experience.

Here is the beginning of psychoanalysis, perhaps, of an analysis.

A question accompanies us: could we consider this question to be part of any analysis? Also, the analysis of a child?

In the case of a child, it is common for this Freudian impasse not to occur, but rather for the inversion of what would be the beginning of an analysis.

First, it is assumed that the request that arrives was perhaps not from the child, as it is usually said that a child does not present their own demand for analysis. Would that be it? If so, could we undertake an analysis when the subject in question does not ask us to listen to their suffering? Could we engage in analytical work at the request of others?

Anticipating a diagnosis in the first interview jeopardizes the establishment of the transfer so that, based on it, it is possible to follow the listening of the one who bears the suffering that would allow a demand for analysis. The concern with the diagnosis and consequently its cure would justify the search for someone who has a lot of experience with these disease/symptoms, that is, a specialist, which would call into question the ethics of psychoanalysis, that is, working with the unconscious.

The effects of listening can make it possible to do something else with what goes through the subject. We propose to think that these traverse both the analyst and the analysand in transference and that the subject and its invention can come from the analyst's act. These effects are distinguished par excellence from the encounter of meaning. The analyst, from the cut of their listening, provides the space where the subject can produce

fiction in transference. In the seminar *Encore*, Lacan says “language is just what the scientific discourse elaborates to account for that I call *lalangue*” (p. 188 [*our own translation*]). He is approaching the relationship with knowledge and that language is a lubrication of knowledge about *lalangue*, it connects to the real, the enjoyment, the body. In this case, “interpretation must always – for the analyst – take into account that, in what is said, there is sound, and that this sound must resonate with what is of the unconscious” (Lacan, [1975b] 1995, p. 45 [*our own translation*]).

The relationship with *lalangue* brings with it what is related to the impossibility of the primary incidence of the treasure of signifiers, linked to affections still enigmatic due to the radical opacity of knowledge and which, in any case, is not outside language. It is the place from which the child receives it, as they do not learn *lalangue*, but rather apprehend it. It is about writing.

We bring Daniel’s case. He begins his analysis at the age of five. A wandering boy, who roams, screams a lot, and articulates only a few guttural sounds. The only thing that seems to call his attention and detain him in the least are the letters: he brings pages from magazines, spends time leafing through the books he finds in the office. The computers call his attention, always writing the same sign on the screen – letter, symbol, whatever –, pressing the same key without interruption. In one of his last sessions, Daniel enters and throws himself on the floor, remaining there, with a toy in his hand, which he makes ring while humming different phonemes. Appears in the session “keko”, name that becomes the toy’s name. The analyst writes this name on the blackboard and at the same time says its writing. Daniel settles down, stands still – for the first time since the beginning of his analysis –, which takes him to the blackboard, makes him take a piece of chalk and draw in it.

Shortly after this session, Daniel arrives and, upon entering the consulting room, drinks the rest of the water from a glass he found. He goes to the door and, when he is prevented from leaving by his analyst, he begins to scream and, with the glass in his hand, utters a difficult, yet clear, “water”. WATER that **touches** his analyst who lets him go, go to the kitchen, fill his glass with water and drink it in one gulp.

Daniel gives us a clue that what lifts a body off the ground and gives it movement includes transference, which makes it possible to set up a drive. When we say set up a drive, we are assuming that there is something that was already present previously. We work with the idea that what is perhaps encrusted tries to show itself, weave itself in search of a representation, a way of “fishing”, grasping the small points of reality that seek a representation linked to sound. As stated by Lacan in *The Third* (p. 51), the analyst sustains a discourse that is capable of welding the pair analyst and analysand, and for this the analyst depends on the real, on the semblant.

The way the child moves, gestures and utters guttural sounds, Musolino tells us, in *Pulsión de Sexo*, (2020; p. 47 [our own translation]), “it is about how a language is determined by the insertion of the subject in the signifying chain during its exit from the necessary alienation to the Other, which “converts” it into a being of knowledge and a sexed being: subject of a language”.

The way in which the Name-of-the-Father is in the mother tells us how it can come to be related to the phallic meaning. From this operation, the son will come to occupy a place. The accommodation of this place when there is no alterity in the mother to be able to hand over the child to the other, can cause a disruption. In this game of alienation and separation, perhaps one finds something of the difficulties, not only of the necessary exit from alienation, but also of the obstacles to which the mother alienates him.

Writing the same sign: letter, symbol, or key, seeks the assent of the Other and, to the analyst, returns it to him like a sign on the board, like an interruption on the keyboard, alternating a writing. The lyrics read: “it is a brief exchange of glances outside the mirror, from which the Freudian *Einzigster Zug* emerges, the trace that results from this meeting of gazes”. (KAROTHY, 2019, p. 222 [our own translation]). The emergence of the unary trait gives rise to identification, the identification of the trait beyond the mirror.

Together with his analyst, he “embroidered” the strokes, that is, he interspersed spaces between the characters on the computer, the magazines, his sheets, his drools that he leaves on some surfaces, starting a sound reading of the letters that could hook him.

Analytical work weaves itself together, sculpts itself, composes itself in the manner of a refrain, and so Daniel begins to address his analyst, seeking her hand and using it as an extension of his own, so that she can write; and, afterwards, it is he who begins to write only lines or, by himself, letters; alternating a “direct” writing with a “mirror” writing. In the course of these acts, Daniel begins to hum, and then to articulate a plurality of phonemes, playing with the movements of his mouth – which twists, stretches and laughs.

For this patient, the invoking drive whose edge was able to make his body stand up and demand, arises. Possible effect of interpretation that is, *a priori*, incalculable. The invoking drive receives its importance here and its edge demands to be considered and cut into two orifices: voice and listening; mouth and ear; now erogenous. It is from this point that one can recognize the emissive and auditory dimensions of the voice with the peculiarity of its sound, singular and subjective of each *speaker*, which refers to the interweaving of imaginary and symbolic registers. Furthermore, it allows the sender to hear themselves speak and also hear being listened to.

A question arises: does the hole arm the vortex or does the vortex in its movement, make a hole? As Lacan points out (1973-1974, p.47 [our own translation]), “it is not unthinkable that the body, as we believe it to be alive, is something much more difficult than what anatomo-physiologists know. There is, perhaps, a science of jouissance, if we can express it that way”.

Some analyzers help us to read something out of these whirlpools, these holes. One of them, Armando, a 1 year and 11 months old boy who, at the peak of his loneliness in front of many people around him, starts to spin. Spin around, always in the late afternoon, after the whole family is home, between the TV and the father. Moment in which the father watches his favorite program on television.

His twirling maddens his father, makes him very angry, and he swears at him heavily. He screams, telling him to stop it right away, as that was a sign of autism. At these moments, the child’s “answer” was repeated: he fell to the ground in tears, collapsing and blacked out, he did not fall asleep, he just blacked out.

All this repetition of the scene made the nanny who was taking care of him ask herself a question and soon, a conclusion: “I wonder what he wants? I think he wants attention!”

His nanny brings up this issue so we can think about in Armando’s session together; and he, listening to the nanny tell the analyst about the scene, restarts the swirling whirlpool, which made him fall, collapse, but also made him move, spinning to “call attention”; maybe in a “bet” to be looked at.

An experience that seems to produce ecstasy and anguish, an intensely pleasurable movement bordering on a gesture of getting lost, of not knowing where the earth, the sky, right or left is anymore. Thus, he gets lots, or becomes detached.

It seems like a loss of enjoyment experience. Soon, these fragments of the self are recomposing. Similar to what Lacan says about the divides, fragmented elements that suddenly constitute a molecule, make a point, a knot, a letter.

That point, that knot, that letter, set up a function, set up some movement that, for that very reason, when setting up a function, the object could fall.

In both cases, Armando’s and Daniel’s, the cadence appears, *this* sets up rhythm, *this* animates a body. But for there to be cadence, rhythm, something needs to operate between, a space, an empty space, of silence, a muteness.

As Lacan reminds us about Freud’s second topic, *this* is a place, a place of silence, an inaugural void, a place that anticipates the field of language, that precipitates the letter, that makes it possible for a nothingness, a kind of void to set up a pulsion, to set up a demand, perhaps a demand for love.

It is precious that the signifier that emerges from Daniel’s analytical scene is WATER, the result of the experience of having found another who listens to his emptiness, listens to that part of the body that has emptied itself or that for now has not been composed, has not been substantiated.

Drizzling water, water from a glass, body water, scream, mother-sea-water, talking a liquid.

Similar to this is that Freud says about the navel in dreams. Sometimes the navel is at a limit point of associations, that which in free association on oneiric material is saturated, empties and approaches emptiness. Sometimes, we could think, by the name chosen by Freud, navel, that it could be a kind of point of origin, of emergence, something inaugural. That which is already inaugurated before having life: the fetus of the verb, of life, of being.

The cadence of the body, from which the navel of a dream emerges, the pulsion cadence, a seesaw composed of the life pulsion and the pulsion drive, and the hole in the whirlpool pulsate before the analyst. At this cadence, it happens to think that the void that makes possible the appearance of a DNA molecule, makes possible a letter that decants from there and is something of *lalangue*.

A whirlwind hole would not be a hole of non-existence but rather of ex-sistence², the hole from which, perhaps, life emerges, since what “ex-sists, this would be the origin” (LACAN, 1973-1974, p.102 [*our own translation*]).

Lacan, in *The Third*, says:

What does what I wrote, at the level of the circle of the real, the word “life” consist of? It is just that, incontestably, about life, after that vague term that consists of announcing the enjoyment of life, we know nothing more about life, and all that science induces us to do is to see that there is nothing more real, which means nothing more impossible than imagining how this chemical construction could get started, which, from elements divides into whatever it may be and that we somehow want to qualify it by the laws of science, would suddenly begin to construct a DNA molecule, that is to say, something that I pointed out to you that is very curiously the first image of a knot to be seen, and that if there is something that should surprise us, it is that it was noticed so late that something in reality – not a little thing, life itself – is structured as a knot. How can one not be surprised that, after that, we find nowhere, neither in the anatomy nor in the climbing plants that seemed expressly made for this purpose, any image of a natural knot? I will suggest something to you: would not this be a certain type of repression, of *Unverdrängt*? Anyway, nevertheless, let us not dream too much, we have a lot to do with our tracks (LACAN, [1974] 2002, p. 67 [*our own translation*]).

Perhaps we can read in this that Lacan points to something close to what Freud calls the navel of dreams. A knot, a dot, perhaps a letter that informs us of a void, of nothingness

² Lacan conceptualizes as the point of ex-sistence or extimus the point of “intimate exteriority, that extimity, which is the Thing.” (Lacan, [1959-1960] 1997, p. 173 [*our own translation*]).

that, for some reason, has set in motion. How to read the effects of this writing mark, in the analysis of children, from the shoreline of the alluvium of language? They are such primordial marks, vestiges and traces not yet inscribed, still composing the field of perception and that need to be read, in transference, so that they can be erased and retranscribed, so that there are, therefore, significant inscriptions.

Some of us have the experience of receiving a child and, from listening in transference – which is not a means, but a result³ –, maintain a floating and available attention, witness that free association is happening, unfolding from the first meeting, being fools of the unconscious, which, after all, is our only heritage of knowledge, as Lacan refers (1973-1974). Is it possible, in this listening experience, to formulate the hypothesis of a difference regarding the analysis of a child?

The analyst needs to dispose of nothing less than something of which even themselves has no clear notion, letting them be led in the dark – as in an encounter between the artist and the void of the blank canvas. Bearing not knowing, the distant echoes of *lalangue*, from the intermittence, refrains, cacophonies, and modulations proper to a saying. It is with this listening, from its own unconscious, that will make it possible for the sonority of the signifier, for the playing of the tiny *speaker being* to manifest itself.

Playing is not related to offering protocol of games or specific materials, but rather, that the analyst leaves a space free to provide opportunities for the manifestation that may emerge in transference. In some circumstances, a child, undergoing and analytical treatment, may request certain materials that may serve as a support for graphic or three-dimensional expression, or performance – in the case of staging and games. Or simply use a gesture to ask for water and start a demand from there. It is necessary to listen to these “productions” in the same way as Freud recommended listening to dream reports, knowing, first of all, that it is not a matter of a meaning to be sought and defined. There is the “navel of

³ "Because transference is not a means, it is an outcome. A result that resides in the fact that the word, through it, as a means of the word, reveals itself to be something that has nothing to do with it, and very precisely the knowledge that exists in language." (LACAN, 1973-1974, p. 60 [*our own translation*]).

dreams” and, sometimes, the sound comes from the epicenter of the whirl, still not audible, just echoes, echoes that seek a point, a listening point.

This is the challenge in the analysis of children, that is, to detach oneself from certain expectations of producing results, especially in relation to parents, educational institutions, and the assumptions of cure, given that it is a practice that “is founded on the ex-sistence of the unconscious” (LACAN, 1974-1975, p. 257 [our own translation]).

We keep asking and putting ourselves to work in face of the demands of our times with a good saying far from a good will.

Referências bibliográficas:

- EVANS, E. *Dicionario introductorio de psicoanálisis lacaniano*. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2008.
- FREUD, S. (1913). Sobre o início do tratamento. In: _____. *Fundamentos da Clínica Psicanalítica. Obras incompletas de Sigmund Freud*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2019.
- _____. (1910) As perspectivas futuras da terapêutica psicanalítica. In: _____. *Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago Editora, 1996.
- KAROTHY, R. *El niño, el espejo y la mirada*. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: Editorial Lazos, 2019.
- LACAN, J. (1953) Função e campo da fala e da linguagem. In: _____. *Escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: JZE, 1998.
- _____. (1957) A instância da letra no inconsciente ou a razão desde Freud. In: _____. *Escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: JZE, 1998.
- _____. (1959 - 1960) *O Seminário: Livro 7. A ética da psicanálise*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1997.
- _____. (1964) *O seminário: livro 11. Os quatro conceitos fundamentais da psicanálise*. Rio de Janeiro: JZE, 1998.
- _____. (1971) Lituaterra. In: _____. *Outros Escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: JZE, 2003. pp. 15-28.
- _____. (1971-1972) *O saber do psicanalista*. Recife: Centro de Estudos Freudianos do Recife. Publicação para circulação interna, não comercial. 1997.
- _____. (1972 -1973) *O Seminário: livro 20. Mais, ainda*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1985.
- _____. (1973 -1974) *Os não-tolos vagueiam*. Salvador: Espaço Moebius, 2016.

- _____. (1974) A Terceira. In: *Cadernos de Lacan*. Vol. 2.: Associação Psicanalítica de Porto Alegre. Publicação não comercial de circulação interna da APPOA, 2002.
- _____. (1975) Conferência de Genebra sobre o sintoma. *Opção Lacaniana. Revista Brasileira de Psicanálise*. São Paulo, n. 23, pp. 6-16, 1998.
- _____. Conferências nos EUA (1975b). Recife: Centro de Estudos Freudianos do Recife, 1995.
- LANIUS, Manuela. Corpo à mostra: consequências clínicas da relação corpo/discurso. 2015. 167 f. Tese (Doutorado em Pesquisa Clínica em Psicanálise) - Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2015.
- LEITE, E. A. F. Alíngua e voz: algumas considerações sobre modos de falar e ouvir. In: *Rev. Assoc. Psicanalítica de Porto Alegre*, n. 48, pp. 103-111, jan. 2015/jun. 2015.
- MANNONI, Maud. *Um saber que não se sabe: uma experiência analítica*. Campinas: Editora Papyrus, 1989.
- MILNER, J. C. *O Amor da Língua*. São Paulo: Editora UNICAMP, 2016.
- MUSOLINO, M. *Pulsión de Sexo*. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: Antonio Giménez, 2002.
- SOLER, C. *Lacan, o inconsciente reinventado*. Rio de Janeiro: Cia. de Freud, 2012.