

## Returning to the Unconscious

### I. On Repetition

It is necessary to return to the Unconscious. This is what I extract from what Lacan proposes in "The Mistake of the SsS," where he asks: "Why try to calm down what is not very reassuring?"<sup>1</sup> As usual, he introduces a stumbling block, this time in the order of representation since he highlights the expression *Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit*, which he translates as masking. We know it as passage to figurability, but I would already say that it not only masks.

The child resorts to it in his play as he "puts into language the real that affects him from the Other,"<sup>2</sup> and with figurability he dresses because he peeks at the undressed. He brings "the unrepresented to representation" in an inaugural operation. In this sense, it would be necessary to emphasize that Freud used *Darstellen* explicitly when he built his theory of repetition in 1920, and that therefore the association with repetition indicates that this figurability also points to the unconnected.

I estimate that children know about "that." Without knowing it, they peek at the enjoyment that the trait drags as unrepresented enjoyment. Through their playful operation, they peek at the shore that accumulates what was never satisfactory, where "repetition meets the drive's force"<sup>3</sup> and "leads us to realize the direction toward another knowledge."<sup>4</sup> That knowledge has been rejected but not replaced in the symbolic, and it is what repetition shows in its circularity, the always-present knowledge that "it is essential to consolidate for the exploration of the unconscious."<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, repetition points to the act in something that also points to the analyst's couch, not because it is guilty but, I prefer to say, because its proof is there: the extension of the clinic in its intention. Yes. It is a matter of proof as a passage from one knowledge to another, where the discourse mounted in repetition seeks the turn that determines the analyst in the hinge of their position between letter and signifier. Thus, having highlighted

until now from representation the unrepresented of what repetition takes charge of as knowledge in the real, it will be necessary to take up the idea that there would be a certain masking. I understand that by translating it in that way, once again, he addresses us to highlight that which in our practice is established as an obstacle and prevents us, I say, from returning to the unconscious in that passage from an unknown knowledge to another unknown one. According to my reading, I would say that the masking he speaks of would be the key that makes the unconscious "pale," and if these two terms are consistent with what Lacan himself titled as the mistake of the supposed subject of knowledge, it will be essential to take one step further.

## II. On Sublimation

The way we understand sublimation is linked to the way we approach the unconscious from our practice.

Sublimation, always elusive... not only for Freud, but also for Lacan and even for us, deserves a close look. At least two angles of sublimation should be distinguished, as I believe its teaching in seminars XIV and XVI offers us.

In the aforementioned writing, Lacan makes a claim: "we should listen to what is said without the subject representing himself."<sup>6</sup> I would say that this is where our practice questions us particularly about sublimation. Why? Because Lacan held it responsible for the subjectivation of the subject, and therefore the condition of the act. Now, it will be necessary to distinguish, in the dismantling of the drive to the object a of satisfaction, since the latter is the rail through which Seminar XIV runs. The repetition of satisfaction in excess will find its answer in the "Golden Ratio" as an installation of logic, in which sublimation will be the operation that allows the subjectivization of satisfaction. If we take a closer look at this seminar, we can see that it corresponds to the seat of the subject represented by one signifier for another, and in this sense it is a logic of confrontation between signifier and object a.

However, it happens that in Seminar XVI, Lacan proposes a shift in which he formulates that "it is necessary to situate sublimation at the level of object a."<sup>7</sup> How to think about this perspective? I would say that throughout Seminar XIV, sublimation increasingly returns to object a as the remainder that castration throws in as a significant operation. Each time it subjectivizes satisfaction because it operates on the lack. We appreciate that, then, by being situated at the level of object a, sublimation operates on the lack of knowledge. It is only a confrontation of object a with the unrepresented enjoyment, which emphasizes the lack but at its scribal edge.

Why does Lacan appeal to Freud's history of the cauldron? What deserves its inclusion in this small writing after "The Logic of the Phantom" and "The Psychoanalytic Act"?

It is that the masking that makes the unconscious pale finds, in some way, in this story a certain response that I dare to propose based on the fact that we are told that in this story "representations are added."<sup>8</sup> They are false arguments that distract and evade what makes truth from the rope of the real. But it is not only accumulated representations in discourse but also the analyst's lack who has taken refuge in the omnitude of the SSS when in truth it is the equivocation of the SSS, of the failed, where "the analyst must find the certainty of his act and the hiatus that constitutes his law."<sup>9</sup> It could be said that in some way he has lost the hiatus on which his act depends.

This means that repetition with its noise offers the orography of the real but can be deafened by the capture of false knowledge if the analyst does not offer, in turn, the act that as such responds to sublimation, which guards the hiatus where the unborn waits, bringing the knot of the uninterpretable closer.

The Klein group of Seminar XIV returns to the graph but to subvert it, to thread the logic of the phantom affecting the two terms that make up its structure with the diamond.

As I estimate, what I call false knowledge or calderization of knowledge allows us to realize that this small writing teaches us about the momentary weakening of the logic of the phantom.

We have learned that object a is the saddle of the subject, but we do not always consider that sublimation as the nerve of the act is responsible for the subjectivization of the subject as it carves its seat each time.

It is the psychoanalyst, in their position as object a as cause, who safeguards the diamond of the inherent logic of the discourse that concerns them. They receive the enjoyment that alienation corners in the hiding places of the phantom, the enjoyment that repetition shows and offers, whenever possible, to sublimation with which enjoyment is cut out again and again to the letter.

In short, the psychoanalyst is an agent of sublimation without disregarding the failure of their operation.

#### Bibliography

-Jacques Lacan, "Other Writings", The Mistake of the Supposed Subject of Knowledge (1,6,8,9)

-Cristina Marrone, The Game: A Debt of Psychoanalysis (2)

-Cristina Marrone, Play and Repetition (3,4)

-Jacques Lacan, Seminar XVII, "Or Piere" (5)

-Jacques Lacan, Seminar XV, Class 13 (7)