



SCRÍOBH - Special Dossier

Knottings Seminar of the NLS

A View from the Exit



Daniel Roy		
<i>Introduction</i>	p. 2
Caroline Heanue		
<i>Threshold</i>	p. 5
Sheila Power		
<i>The Libidinal Factor</i>	p. 9
Florencia F.C. Shanahan		
<i>A Letter</i>	p. 13

INTRODUCTION¹

Daniel Roy

Exiting, Getting Through

It's not certain that the practitioner of psychoanalysis has come out of it - perhaps he shouldn't exit it [en sortir], but at most he should get through it [s'en sortir]²

We are here, many of us as “practitioners of psychoanalysis,” and it is hard not to feel concerned by one of the opening sentences of this text, which is rather enigmatic.

So, the question is as follows: in order to be able to welcome -to accompany what is at stake at the entry into analysis, what is it that the practitioner must get through? I can only see one answer: he must extricate himself from the logic that is established at the start of the analysis. J.-A. Miller doesn't say it in the past tense: “the practitioner must have gotten through it” (pew! I got through it!), from the unconscious, from the transference... Of all this, Lacan's and Miller's idea is that the analyst does not have to get out: the unconscious continues to work, the transference is displaced - work transference, transference towards the School. Therefore it's *someThing else* that is at stake.

The stroke of genius of this text is that it does not tie together the entry and the exit for the analysand, placing them in a dependent relationship with each other on the same itinerary, but to instead knot together the entry of the analysand with the exit of the analyst insofar as he functions as an analyst on condition that he gets through, that he gets out of what was established for him when he entered analysis. We understand, then, that this is not a “once and for all” situation; the game is played with each new patient.

It's a question, then, of the analyst getting through what was played out for him when he entered, to leave this place to he or she who becomes the analysand.

That which is played at the *entre* and which links [knots] the analysand to he or she who becomes “his analyst” is divided by J.-A. Miller into two terms: an investment and an

¹ The *Knottings Seminar* of the NLS, “A View from the Exit,” took place in Dublin, Ireland, on the 9th of December 2023. A day of work on Jacques-Alain Miller's text “Vue de la sortie,” [View of the Exit/ Seen from the Exit], in *Comment finissent les analyses. Paradoxes de la passe*, Navarin Ed., 2022, pp. 71-78. [Unpublished in English. Working translation by Florencia F.C. Shanahan.]

² Miller, J.-A., *Comment finissent les analyses. Paradoxes de la passe, op.cit.*, p. 71.

[TN] Play on words between “exiting” [*sortir*] and “being able to manage, to cope” [*s'en sortir*].

investiture. To this end, he constructs with Lacan the stage, the picture, where the game will be played out.

And he illustrates this with the device constructed by and for Hans Holbein's painting 'The Ambassadors', as Lacan puts it into operation in his *Seminar XI*.

The Anamorphosis

[...] the reference of his words (of the subject in analysis) will only be one from the point at which he is in the process of leaving.³

So, we have the subject in analysis who enters and speaks, and then there is the one who is "in the very moment of leaving" who, for his part, sees these words have a reference, which the other did not see. The identity of this process with that of the detachment from the object of the gaze can already be seen in this movement.

Holbein's painting is a device in which this operation takes place [is effectuated]. The painting originally belonged to its commissioner, the imposing figure on the left, Jean de Dinteville, master of Polisy and French ambassador to London, who is shown here next to Georges de Selve, his friend, also a diplomat. When he returned to France, he took the painting with him and installed it in his *château* at Polisy. At the time, the painting was already considered to be one of the most beautiful of its day. As you enter the main door of the *grand salon d'honneur*, you come face to face with an image that is at once majestic, erudite and strange because of the presence, on the flagstones - depicted with great care - of an object that is not identifiable, in the sense that it has no existence in the picture of the big Other of the era, unlike all the other objects which are well identified as part of the discourse of the epoch. It's not even an object, it's something that doesn't have a name and that seems to move in a space other than that of the picture, which is truly a completely signifying space, a space that *takes the place of representation*. You are there, with your host Jean at your side, facing the Jean de Dinteville of the painting, who stares at you from the height of his splendour; you can very well identify with his friend Georges, with his humble and modest attitude; you can take an interest in all those valuable objects arranged on the two central shelves: each one deserves a comment and contains remarkable details. And if you are an attentive observer, you will see in the top left-hand corner of the painting a crucifix, half hidden by the heavy green curtain, and therefore half visible, looking down on this scene. This is a good way of describing the place of the divided subject, divided by this thing that he sees without being able to see it, since this thing has no available place in the divine order of creation.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

Your host then invites you to leave and points to a smaller door that opens to the right of the painting. But as you cross the threshold, once again intrigued by this uncanny [*Unheimliche*] presence, you glance over and see a sneering skull appear before your astonished eyes. This is the imaged form of the end of analysis [pictorial/ pictured form], designated as such by J.A. Miller, one of the versions of the “bone of an analysis.”⁴

He who leaves sees that which he who enters cannot see, the reference of all wealth and all knowledge, in this case death, according to the logic of the “Vanities”.

In this cunning device, the analyst is the one who has glimpsed this reference in his own treatment, but now, for the analysand who leaves, he is in the place of the strange object, “left behind” by the visitor; he is like that bone itself which he no longer has any use for.

So now we can say that the analysand has lodged the reference of his sayings in the analyst, that the analyst was his reference, the supposed reference to all the significations that appeared in the analysis, impossible to understand, to grasp, to bear, to say.

From the outset, knowledge and the reference of this knowledge are lodged in the analyst, who inflates in the eyes of the analysand with what he has placed in him: either because he assumes that his analyst keeps it preciously, to give it back to him when he leaves; or because he deprives him of the enjoyment of this possession, so precious that he doesn't even know what it is.

Turning Around

I want to emphasise another sentence in this part of the text:

*The pass is, if I may say so, the geometral point of a psychoanalysis, the point that cannot be reached by going from beginning to end, from entry to exit, except by turning round in leaving.*⁵

I would especially emphasise this statement by J.-A. Miller, which designates the act of the *passant* who turns around, and which both designates for him the geometral point that governed his statements in the analysis and, at the same time, brings to light - makes emerge - the object that mattered most at the very moment when it fell. This is strictly homogenous with the crossing of the fantasy as constructed by Lacan around the object gaze.

⁴ Cf. Miller, J.-A., *Analysis Laid Bare*, WAP Libretto Series, June 2023, p. 19.

⁵ Miller, J.-A., *Comment finissent les analyses. Paradoxes de la passe*, op. cit., p. 72.

THRESHOLD
Caroline Heanue

Teaching

Lacan's teaching was founded upon the experience of psychoanalysis. When we work his seminars, *Écrits* and other texts, we note deviations, apparent contradictions, changes in perspective - in other words, the literal marks of a work-in-progress, the capture of an emerging knowledge, new, and not without inventions. This is what Lacan nominated as his teaching.

The end of this teaching had one purpose – the training or what we call the formation of psychoanalysts; only not one from the perspective of imparting a knowledge to be learned and somehow applied to each one *en masse* as solution. It is exactly this relation to knowledge that a psychoanalysis modifies. Rather, training as the experience of a psychoanalysis taken to its end, which allows for a psychoanalyst from this singular point of view, to be able to see, “really see what is at stake in psychoanalysis.”¹ Lacan posed the question like this:

*[...] how is it that an analysand could ever yearn to become a psychoanalyst? It's imponderable. They come to it like the marbles in some backgammon sets [...] they end up dropping into the side tray. They come along without the faintest idea of what's happening to them. Well, once they are there, they're in it, and at that point something awakens. This is why I proposed to study it.*²

The word “imponderable” at first glance seems a curious word to choose, but its definition as “something that cannot be guessed nor calculated – it's completely unknown,” realises the precision of its use. It is with these coordinates that Lacan invented the device of the Pass procedure; the verification (or not) of the logical end of an experience of psychoanalysis for each one who takes the risk to testify to the singularity of such awakening.

J.-A. Miller's teaching, and specifically the collection of papers on the subject of the Pass published last year, emphasises Lacan's words in a crucial way:

*[...] the Pass [...] modifies the notion of the analytic process [...] by a hair's breadth, Lacan says in his Discours à l'École freudienne de Paris but it changes the demand of analysis which aims at formation.*³

¹ Lacan, J., “My Teaching,” transl. D. Macey, Verso, London/New York, 2008, p. 43.

² Lacan, J., “Talking to Brick Walls,” transl. A.R. Price, Polity, Cambridge/Medford, 2017, p. 91-92.

³ Miller, J.-A., “Introduction to the Paradoxes of the Pass,” *Comment finissent les analyses. Paradoxes de la passe, op. cit.*, p. 22. Unpublished in English. [My translation.]

This opens the pathway to thinking of how both the entry to and the exit from a psychoanalysis may be linked together.

Entry to

Let's say that the subject enters the experience of a psychoanalysis at a moment when the fantasy has been disturbed by a contingent event. That which functioned according to varying degrees of success up until that point, no longer suffices to capture pathos nor contain an enveloping suffering. However, that which we name the fundamental phantasy remains to be constructed during a treatment under transference, so this cannot be what orientates the treatment. Rather, the rope which the analyst holds onto, that which is the only guide, is the red thread of the symptom and the work of fully constituting it with the structure of transference.

Transference presupposes that the subject has already pre-interpreted his symptoms, tying these to a knowledge of which he is unaware, but which can be deciphered, interpreted, revealing a meaning of what it wants to say. However, the paradox is that the subject is also encumbered with a passion for ignorance, a horror of knowing exactly that which he works so hard towards receiving the delivery of. Except when he does receive it, it's never quite that.

Let's further say that the "accumulation of gleaming objects" in Holbein's *The Ambassadors* is a representation of the libidinal value we attribute to all those objects so very precious to us. They are that around which we meticulously compose our tragedy, and little by little throughout the experience of a psychoanalysis, they lose their brilliance, ceding a jouissance session by session, until finally drained of importance they can be left aside, discarded, spent.

Miller says it very beautifully like this:

An analysis session is like a parenthesis.⁴ Nothing more, but nothing less. A parenthesis in the timed existence of the contemporary subject [...] doomed to direct utility. Each [...] session with all its contingency, chance and misery, nevertheless affirms that what I am experiencing is worth saying. This is how a session of analysis, which is nothing [...] where we formulate what we can, while we are asphyxiated [...] however little it may be, is there to contradict the principle of direct utility.

It is faith in an indirect utility, a mysterious utility, a causality that we would be hard pressed to detail, of which we do not know through what channels it passes, but which ultimately prevails. It is in this sense that an analysis session is always an effort at poetry [...]⁵

⁴ "The information inside () used in a piece of writing to show that what is inside is considered as separate." Cambridge Dictionary.

⁵ Miller. J.-A., "Direct Utility," in *Psychoanalysis and Society* published in Quarto n ° 83, Jan 2005, pp. 6-11. [My translation.]

I underline “a mysterious utility” – in other words, it’s imponderable.

If an analysis session is a parenthesis, the course of a long experience of psychoanalysis holds fast to the symptom. Its red thread is the one upon which the ends are played out.

Exit from

“What does one see from the *threshold* of the exit?” This is the question that Miller poses in the paper under the heading of *Anamorphosis*, taking as example Holbein’s painting. For, if what gets revealed throughout the course of a psychoanalysis is the “accumulated gleaming objects” concealed but no less present at the entry, that which reveals itself at the threshold is the distorted image of the hidden skull.

Within Miller’s paper and all the nuggets that it contains, it’s this signifier “threshold” upon which I paused. How to think its relation to:

- frontier - a border between what is known and what is not. One cannot but recall Freud’s words in reference to the drive as “lying on the frontier between the mental and the physical.”⁶
- border – separation of that which has something in common - but also edge or seam. The seam between desire and knowledge, but one which functions differently when embodied by an analyst.
- fault - of the divided subject. That which the psychoanalysand accomplishes a leap over at the moment of the pass implying a structural passage to analyst.⁷
- littoral – a frontier delineating that which is foreign to both domains, i.e., not reciprocal.

Threshold – a point of entry or beginning, defined as “the level or point at which you [...] experience something, or at which something starts to happen.”⁸ Little wonder then that Miller cleverly guides us in linking this signifier “threshold”, under the cloak of anamorphosis, that which if taken from its Greek roots, means “transformation.”

From the threshold of the exit stands the same subject who entered the experience of psychoanalysis and yet, not the same. For a step, indeed a structural leap has taken place

⁶ Freud. S., “Three Essays on Sexuality”, (1905), SE, Volume VII, Hogarth Press, p. 168.

⁷ Miller. J.-A., “Introduction to the Paradoxes of the Pass,” *op. cit.*, p. 25. Unpublished in English. [My translation.]

“... a turn, which implies *an articulation, a passage, a step* from the position of analysand to that of analyst - paradoxical perhaps but structural.”

⁸ Cf. Cambridge Dictionary.

allowing for the one who was one's analyst to be cast aside, "like the mooring rope that's cast off to go out to sea."⁹

To return to my point of entry under the signifiers "teaching" and "imponderable," not only offers the opportunity to conclude, but allows a weaving, a knotting of these signifiers to that of "transformation" in relation to knowledge and desire. No longer the horror of knowledge but a new desire to know and further, a transference on work. No longer fuelled by the passion for ignorance, rather the birth of the passion of ignorance allowing for the possibility of the new, of invention to emerge.

⁹ Miller. J.-A., "Remark on the Traversal of the Transference," in *Comment finissent les analyses. Paradoxes de la passe, op. cit.*, p. 127. Unpublished in English. [My Translation.]

THE LIBIDINAL FACTOR

Sheila Power

The Entry into Analysis

Miller takes the title of the chapter we are discussing today from a paper he presented at the Study Days entitled “The Entry into Analysis: Moment and Stakes” which was held in Marseille in May 1989. We have an entry into analysis and an exit from psychoanalysis. What Lacan tells us in the *Proposition of October 1967*¹ is that there is a link between the entry and the exit, in that the exit is already written on the entry ticket. What is written on the ticket is subjective destitution. Lacan adds that this inscription will never stop the innocent whose only desire is his Law.

Entry into analysis is not a question of capacity - intelligence or suffering, nor is it a case of just showing up, the subject must do more, however not all will enter. Many will enter analysis by formulating a request for psychoanalysis with an S_1 as symptom, where the demand and signifier of the transference is in search of an S_2 to produce a meaning to this suffering.

In order to enter analysis proper, the analysand has to question the jouissance of his symptom that is his libidinal investment related to his malaise - passions and suffering. The act of entry into analysis is one of which the subject is the agent, he has a question about his actions. This is what Lacan called “*in a direction of the treatment [...] a process that begins with rectification of the subject with the real and proceeds to development of the transference and then to interpretation.*”²

In the *Proposition of October 1967*³ Lacan tells us that in the beginning is transference and this exists from the outset. The question to ask at the beginning is the nature of the transference. Lacan says that everything to do with transference hinges on the Subject Supposed to Know. Knowledge is supposed to the analyst on how to read a symptom. The analyst causes the desire of the subject and puts the subject to work, it is the analysand who does the work under transference. The analysand must place his jouissance on the side of the cause of his analysis, which later passes to the cause of desire.⁴ The analytic symptom is built within the experience of an analysis it does not have the same consistency as the medical symptom, it is not to be got rid of but explored.

¹ Lacan, J., “Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School”, *Analysis*, Issue 6.

² Lacan, J., “The Direction of the Treatment and the Principles of Its Powers”, *Écrits. The First Complete Edition in English*, Norton & Co., 2006, p. 500. [My italics.]

³ Lacan, J., “Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School”, *op. cit.*

⁴ Requiz, G., “The Entry into Analysis and Its Relationship to the Analytic Act from Lacan’s Late Teaching”, *Lacanian Compass Express*, Issue 3 Vol. 2, February 2021.

My questioning is what and where is the libido in Lacan's teaching? I try to follow his thread.

Lacan follows Freud in viewing libido as a sexual energy that fluctuates and can be directed towards a number of objects. In Lacan's early teachings the libidinal dimension is situated on the side of the Imaginary and the jouissance of the self-image. This is the specular body of the mirror stage, the libido of the ego circulating between a - a^1 . In this early teaching libido impedes the signifier, it obstructs by its inertia the proper functioning of the signifying mechanism. At this time, *"it is the image and not the signifier that attracts libido. Lacan abandons this idea as it does not conform to practice."*⁵

Lacan then thought the problem could be solved by means of phallic identification. Here the invested signifier in the symbolic plus the quantitative factor is that which attracts libido and *"leads the subject to place himself under its control."*⁶ In this teaching libido circulates within the symbolic signifiers, however, there is part of the libido that is not taken up by the symbolic, it escapes. This is the jouissance which is situated beyond the pleasure principle. Jouissance is that part of libido outside the symbolic circulation and it is forbidden to the one who speaks.

After Seminar X Lacan introduced the object a as a remainder of jouissance which is resistant to phallicisation and to the signifier. Lacan approached libido through the fantasy $\$ \leftrightarrow a$, where the signifier and jouissance come together. The fantasy which is a window onto the real, ties the imaginary, symbolic and real. The reduction operation of an analysis concentrates at this point, a reduction to the necessary and to the impossible, *what does not cease not to be written.*⁷

In the course of an analysis libidinal investment decreases and densifies and it becomes even more remote. As the analysand moves towards the fundamental fantasy the subject will see how in the construction of the fundamental fantasy the libido has controlled destiny and sustained his world. This contracted libidinal investment is the point where Analysis is laid bare (lessening of the imaginary towards symbolic; descent of phallic jouissance and the traversal of the fundamental phantasy leaving bare the object a .) Miller calls the reduction of the libido "a bone" or a stone in the road and Lacan calls object a .⁸

In *Analysis Laid Bare* Miller gives a reading of the fundamental fantasy: it is to be read *"as a representation, a scene in the imaginary, and also a signifying articulation where the subject of the signifier is present, moreover completed by a libidinal quantity marked as object a ."*⁹

⁵ Miller, J.-A., *Analysis Laid Bare*, op. cit., pp. 48-9. [My italics.]

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 50. [My italics.]

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 43. [My italics.]

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

The barred subject in its relation to the Lacanian libido in a way represents the Freudian libido with the signifier on one side and jouissance on the other.”¹⁰

Miller says that entry into analysis is only conceivable on the condition of a displacement of libidinal investment onto the analyst. In Miller’s paper *View from/of the Exit* he highlights how libidinal allocation is on both the side of the analyst and the analysand, the analyst invests as object and is included in the libidinal economy, intertwined with the Subject Supposed to Know.

On the traversal of the fantasy there is a jouissance that is separated and a jouissance which does not separate. This irreducible point iterates and is present at the entry and the exit of analysis, it is a form of jouissance which in the reduction operation of analysis reduces to a saying of the subject towards an essential statement. For Sonia Chiriaco it was reduced to “*we desired you when we thought you were going to die.*”¹¹

In Lacan’s later teaching the symptom goes beyond the fantasy: the signifier refers to the body under the modality of the symptom. To quote M.-H. Brousse “*psychoanalysis is a discipline of textual and of the letter which tends to transform the symptom into a text ciphering jouissance from where the sinthome is approached.*”¹² The signifier that negated jouissance (prohibited to those who speak) is not the one referred to here - the signifier is now the cause of jouissance and does not attract the libido but produces it in the guise of surplus jouissance. Miller puts it like this: “*The symptom as a body vivified by the signifier.*”¹³ This later teaching signals the libidinal secret of the One in the symptom as the most real of the subject.

To Conclude

Freud proposed that one enters analysis every five years in order to address the rock of castration. In Lacan’s teaching both the entry into analysis and its exit differs throughout his teaching, from the primacy of the signifier and Other of jouissance, the subject of the unconscious - crossing of the fantasy to today where the end of analysis is the speaking being [*parlêtre*] *lalangue* and sinthome. The exit is the moment of the pass and its transmission. The analyst’s transference changes towards the School and a further setting to work. Miller ends this chapter we are reading today by say that “*there is an affinity between the x of libido and the signifier, what is at stake is what Lacan calls Jouissance, namely libido insofar as it has affinities with speech.*”¹⁴

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 51. [My italics.]

¹¹ Chiriaco, S., “The Joke”, *Psychoanalytical Notebooks*, Issue 22, 2011, p. 39. [My italics.]

¹² Brousse, M.-H., “The Love of the Sinthome Versus the Hatred of Difference”, *Lacanian Ink*, Issue 50, 2017, p. 90. [My italics.]

¹³ Miller, J.-A., *op. cit.*, p. 57. [My italics.]

¹⁴ Miller, J.-A., “*Vue de la sortie*”, *op.cit.*, p. 78. [My italics.]

I will conclude with an excerpt from Anna Aromi's testimony of the Pass where she refers to libido that made the Sinthome resonate, causing the percussion of language on the body, enunciated to others.

Something was at work! Something I identified as a rejection [...] a rejection of knowledge when it fails to touch, to scratch a real. The knowledge that concerns us gets worked out in the margins of the Pass [...] the Pass was constituted out of fresh signifiers. They seeped out and let libido flow from signifiers freshly cut from the drive [...]. This Libido which is transmitted [passe] through the testimony also resounds in other bodies.¹⁵

¹⁵ Aromi, A., "A Silent Storm", *The Lacanian Review*, Issue 1, 2016, p. 173.

A LETTER
Florencia F.C. Shanahan

*There is not such a consubstantial problem
with letters and their modest mystery
than the one posed by translation.
J.L. Borges*

I would like to introduce three remarks to this *Knottings Seminar* and the reference text that we will be working on.

The Question of Translation

The transmission of psychoanalysis has the issue of translation in its core. Every generation faces this. Unlike Freud who learnt Spanish to be able to read Cervantes, or Lacan himself who threw light on many of the deviations produced in psychoanalysis, particularly in anglophone countries, most of us do not read Freud's work in German or Lacan's work in French on a daily basis.

We rely on translations that are – if we allow them – mobile and unstable things, to be questioned, to be explored, criticized and re-done. We work in cartels where we can look closely at each word, expression, various versions of texts translated differently at different times. We find mistakes, inaccuracies, omissions, blunders, all accounting for the subjectivity of the translator and his own relation to language and to psychoanalysis.

As Antoine Berman stated: “reading-in-translation is a fundamental mode of relating-to-translation. We cannot even think of experiencing translation if we do not read in translation. [...] Reading translations is not simply a matter of comparing them to their originals. It is an act *sui generis*.”¹

In Ireland, and perhaps everywhere else and for each of us, the question of translation is also the question of the so-called mother tongue, of colonisation, and of migration. It is the

¹ Berman, A., *L'âge de la traduction*, trans. Chantal Wright, 2008, p. 31. [Cf. also “The experience of the foreign”.]

question of an origin always mythical, and of what is foreign in us and for us in our relation to language.

The establishment and publishing of Lacan's Seminars by Jacques-Alain Miller constitute the foundations on which we build a way to conceive the formation of the psychoanalyst and the transmission of psychoanalysis. These are not separate.

Moreover, in the Lacanian Orientation - the name of JAM's elucidation of Lacan's teaching - translation is not an accessory task, it is an ongoing working through of the impossible at stake in the teaching of psychoanalysis itself. The embodiment of it is the World Association of Psychoanalysis.

This has occupied me for a long time, it is not new and this because, according to what I could transmit of the end of my analysis after the Pass, it is at the heart of the case I believed I was and of my own relation to the analytic cause.

The Question of the Title

"Vue de la sortie" is an equivocal title, at least equivocal enough to make us rack our brains a little with its translation. "View from the exit", "view of the exit", "exit view", "seen from the exit", "exit in sight." In any case, two terms are involved: view and exit. Or we could also say, the gaze and the end.

Why did we choose this text from Jacques-Alain Miller's book? Firstly, because something of it seemed crucial for our work towards the next NLS Congress "Clinic of the Gaze."² But also because, in our orientation, to speak about psychoanalysis is to speak about the end of analysis. About what an analysis aims at and about how it produces an analyst when brought to its logical end. In that sense, psychoanalysis is not "a theory of the clinic."

But we gave this encounter today a slightly different title. The indefinite article was added. This is not just any addition. In English it is "used before nouns and noun phrases that denote a single but unspecified person or thing." It is at the same singular, "one", and unspecified.

Moreover, it is the letter with which Lacan named and wrote his invention: the object a . He insisted, when he went to speak *in English* to the US, that this letter was not to be translated, because it is not about the word it refers to, or its meaning, but about its algebraic function in the use of the matheme as part of the formalisation of the analytic experience.

² Cf. Roy, D., Presentation of the theme of the NLS Congress Dublin 2024, <https://www.amp-nls.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/ARGUMENT-ENG.-CONGRES-NLS-2024.pdf>

The Question of the End

Precisely, this “a”, “one”, is what Lacan’s invention of the Pass allows to verify, through a demonstration that, however, includes others, Lacan’s School. Because, it has to be said, this one is only valid within this other invention of Lacan that the School is. This is to say that the principle according to which “a psychoanalyst is only authorised by himself” is not one of self-determination. Far from that.

In other psychoanalytic institutions (notably the one founded by Freud) the starting point is to begin “from those who act as psychoanalysts. They are thus defined by the institution. But who are they? How are they defined? The response of standards is precise and forthcoming: they are defined as conforming to the others. [...] To the question ‘What is a psychoanalyst?’, one could answer: ‘It is whoever is with the others’. But Lacan proceeded in the other direction and chose to centre entirely upon the question what is a psychoanalyst, departing from what no-one knows or ever knew, even Freud: what a psychoanalyst was. To examine this, it is necessary to examine the result produced on a subject by an analysis pushed to its final term without any *a priori* except for the conviction that the end has been reached. It is from there that one will be able to understand what exactly is it that functions as a psychoanalyst...”³

So what is necessary for the analytic experience not to remain in the domain of the esoteric, the religious, the authoritative, or the narcissistic recognition? I quote J.-A. Miller’s text: “With his proposition of the Pass, Lacan attempted [...] to grasp, fix and arouse that which the analysand, in the moment of exiting the analysis, could see if he turned round. The pass is, if I may say so, the geometral point of a psychoanalysis, the point that cannot be reached by going from beginning to end, from entry to exit, except by turning round in leaving. This is the definition of this final state of the analysand, whom Lacan called the *passant*: *the one who turns round when exiting*.”⁴

Questioning

Questioning what is it that we do when we read, mistrusting what we read – in the good way-including the translations we read, is also -I believe - a modality of looking back. As I said before, the issue of translation is not an accessory one. For some time now, I have been trying to formalise what the impact of how Lacan’s seminars and *Écrits* have been translated into English has been, both clinically and politically.

I will finish with something that Anne Lysy said to us some years ago, and which still moves me today. We were in Tel Aviv, and it was a matter of discussing the disparate dimension of the NLS, this School characterised by a plurality of languages, of geographies, of incredibly

³ Laurent, E., “The Pass and the Guarantee in the School”, *Psychoanalytical Notebooks*, Issue 2, 1999, p. 131.

⁴ Miller, J.-A., “Vue de la sortie”, *op. cit.*, p. 71. My Italics.

diverse histories in the transmission of psychoanalysis and of Lacan's teaching. She spoke of how to translate is to transmit, to make something pass, to interpret.

At the AGM Anne Lysy quoted the poet Hayim Bialik, who wrote: "the act of translation is like kissing through a handkerchief."

Well, analysis teaches us that what we kiss is never the Thing, the real. Nor is it what we hear, or what we see. Even after the end of analysis. Does this make it less worth our effort?

The challenge is how the new alliance with desire and jouissance that an analysis allows for, lets us go beyond the mirage of finding the "right" way, thus opening up each one's own way.

The Irish Circle of the Lacanian Orientation Society of the New Lacanian School

Bureau (2023-2024)

Chair: Caroline Heanue

Vice-Chair: Sheila Power

Secretary: Claire Hawkes

Treasurer: Florencia F.C. Shanahan

NLS New Lacanian School

Executive Committee (2022-2024)

President: Daniel Roy

Vice-President: Patricia Bosquin-Caroz

Secretary: Els Van Compernelle - Eleni Koukouli - Philip Dravers

Treasurer: Jean Luc Monnier

SCRÍOBH: the a-periodic newsletter of ICLO-NLS

Editorial Board

Eva Sophie Reinhofer - Lorna Kernan – Caroline Heanue – Tom Ryan – Claire Hawkes -
Raphael Montague (Editor)

Special Dossier Knottings Seminar of the NLS December 2023 “A View from the Exit”

Editor: Raphael Montague

Cover Image: Detail of Holbein’s *The Ambassadors*. Public Domain.

Copyright © by Author/s

This text is from SCRÍOBH, Irish Circle of the Lacanian Orientation Society of the New
Lacanian School.

Permission to use material from this publication must be sought from the ICLO-NLS. All
rights reserved. Please include this portion of the text in any printed version. All

correspondence to scriobh@iclo-nls.org

ICLO-NLS: www.iclo-nls.org

New Lacanian School: www.amp-nls.org

World Association of Psychoanalysis: www.wapol.org