

Presentation of the Perspectives Group. Love, Hatred, Jealousy

Alejandra Ruíz Lladó

Some time ago, we formed Perspectives in Psychoanalysis, a working group within Convergencia that aimed to identify the main differences in contemporary psychoanalysis, taking as a reference those differences that arise within the movement itself. Among these differences, we must take into account not only those that arise from history and the different paths traced by certain practitioners, but also those that emerge from diverse geographies, cultures, and especially those produced by the passage of languages, "because recognizing the difference between languages enriches psychoanalytic work and prevents the hegemony of one language over others" (1). In the gatherings of analysts who work according to these proposals, there are numerous differences that can be heard, although they are not always easy to grasp because there is no single line of reading or a single "psychoanalytic language." Instead of considering this multiplicity as a defect, Convergencia has embraced it, proposing to "embrace within itself the principle of a fruitful difference present in this multiplicity" (3).

Faced with this fruitful difference, the complexity of its reading and production, and the numerous publications circulating among participants, we also want to make our contribution. Therefore, the challenge that our group seeks to overcome with the publication of *Lapsus Calami* is the periodic publication of a selection of texts that represent some of these fruitful differences on a chosen theme each time, in order to situate multiple perspectives, read them, and put them to work through a device we call "reading notes." The task is not easy, as each one tends to argue in favor of positions closest to their own, without making enough effort to understand the reasons and situate them in order to enrich or modify their own position. Situating the differences that manifest in exchanges does not mean establishing a mere theoretical confrontation without unfolding its foundations; it means putting a mark on the reality of analysis, situating transference at different moments in the works of Freud and Lacan, and the context in which these variations occurred. It means trying to identify the interpretive decisions made by those who produce within this framework.

For this first issue, we present our reading notes. Since there could be no "lapsus calami" on our part, each person must find their own. Signed in our own names, these notes reflect a fragmentary and incomplete attempt to constitute a certain reading device. Instead of merely communicating them, the goal is to construct them, adding them to the work carried out during our meetings. During these gatherings, using a simpler language than what we could employ on these pages, we exchange opinions with the right to disagree, approve or emphatically reject what we cannot always justify or express in writing.

Sometimes, significant differences that seem insurmountable from a theoretical point of view, when written down, reveal a clinical aspect that brings them closer together (because in psychoanalysis there is no more theory in clinical practice than there is clinical practice in theory). It is not simply a matter of translation either, as we know -in psychoanalysis- that saying two different words never means the same thing (although the glass can always break on the same side). Sometimes, from the marginal lines of the main argument, we allow ourselves to digress, carried away by the echoes of certain comments. At times, we seek to explain or clarify certain points raised by the authors, while at other times we engage in a transversal reading to follow the trajectory of a term across different texts, or we simply use a secondary line of the main argument. In doing so, we always push the boundaries of our own reading while attempting to renew it. "[...] it is

by chance: You have no idea how many errors are made in writing. The lapsus calami is not prior to the lapsus linguae, but it can be conceived as a touch of the real."

Faced with the blank page, we always confront a decision. A quotation comes to mind, sometimes to support what we write, sometimes to correct or give an unexpected meaning to it. We could even say that when we attempt to appropriate a certain statement by Lacan, we are also translating it, since his statements, far from being a comfortable support on which to rely, often present, through irony or what slips into the interdiction, multiple lines of meaning that do not always appear with the clear transparency we expected. Just as in translating one word for another, we lose nuances of the original language and gain others in the target language, similarly, by decontextualizing a phrase and placing it in another context, we can say, if we believe in Pierre

Menard, that it is and is not another phrase. The obstacles that arise in the attempt to address issues in psychoanalysis allow us to identify some of the risks we seek to overcome.

On one hand, in the face of the difficulty of identifying the criteria that underpin a particular position, arguments run the risk of becoming moralistic, and debates, instead of stimulating the production of fruitful differences, can turn trivial differences into coins that change hands. It is not about using theoretical differences to confirm our own position (although it may be strengthened through confrontation with other opinions). Far from advancing psychoanalysis with clinical suggestions and contributions, we regretfully observe that the narcissism of minor differences, the falsely erudite presentations, and the exchange of slogans that, instead of questioning knowledge, seek to exhibit it, could deplete its richness or bore new generations with an apparent complexity empty of content.

On the other hand, we witness a media-friendly psychoanalysis that, although it does not intimidate non-experts with its extreme complexity, flattens the choral polyphony, turning it into a promotional melody. There is a "Lacan for everyone" that is far from being Lacan. From this Lacan and his former new readers (who obviously are not the new readers to whom Lacan was addressing in his *Écrits*), we begin to read monographic works and papers that, by pretending to make the application of concepts a valid procedure for psychoanalysis, abuse citations and assume that the precision of a good statement could protect us from questioning our own enunciation. In other words, speaking here would not be merely translating, as psychoanalytic concepts could be communicated objectively, neutrally, without questioning the implied enunciation when they are transmitted. The risks of the material we deal with remind us once again that there is no meta-language. As Lacan has the audacious beginner say, not without irony, "There is no field where one exposes oneself more fully than when speaking about analysis" (8).

Forty-four years after the first edition of the *Écrits* and nearly forty years after its publication in Spanish, several generations of analysts have succeeded each other in the reading and transmission, not only of Lacan's texts but also of the enunciation that has supported and continues to support such transmission and the clinical practice that allows us to question it. These are the perspectives that challenge us because, as Lacan pointed out, although we hope for the

permanence of writings, "it is more the case with words: because their indestructible debt, at least, fertilizes our actions through their transference" (9). To quote a text by Roberto Harari in homage to a teacher and friend, we will say that in the face of death, there is not only pain and sorrow but also a certain legitimate pride and joy for what

has been created. Harari's introduction to this text takes up a proposal by Goethe, cited by Freud: "What you have inherited, you must acquire to be able to appropriate it" (10). It is this enunciation, this discreet margin of freedom to translate and at the same time address the subject, that we would like to appropriate because Harari was able to carry to its ultimate consequences the problematic question that speaking is, in more than one sense, translating.

(8) Ibid., p. 463.

(9) Jacques Lacan, "The Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter'," in *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*, trans. Bruce Fink (W.W. Norton & Company, 2006), p. 7.

(10) Other translations of this phrase: "What you have inherited from your parents, conquer it in order to deserve it." "What you have inherited, you must acquire it so that it is yours," and the well-known version by Silvia Bleichmar: "What you have inherited, work on it so that it is yours." It is important to note that "appropriate it" obliges the subject to a more determined action.