

Grupo de Trabajo: Inscripción del significante en lo real

Autor: Dora Gómez – Escuela de Psicoanálisis Sigmund Freud-Rosario

Título: Palabras <sup>1</sup>

Dispositivo: Mesas de Grupos de Trabajo de Convergencia

---

In a supervision practice <sup>2</sup> I hear the following: a mother comes to the office because her three and a half year old son has problems with speech-language (according to his preschool teacher).

The phonoaudiologist says: "He has trouble expressing himself"

The father says: "We are not very communicative"

The mother says: "We keep things to ourselves. I talk to him like an adult"

The analyst says: "Describe"

What happened to those words that were – are – pronounced "like an adult"? I ask myself.

In *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis* (59-60) Lacan links two columns: that of the Unconscious and the Preconscious and presents the interlinking of the Pleasure Principle and the Reality Principle.

Thus, the origin of thought is Unconscious, but the Unconscious seeks the Perception Identity.

Perception is on the side of the Preconscious, but the Preconscious seeks the Thought Identity, which is on the side of the Unconscious.

Therefore, these are thoughts located in the Unconscious column that are intertwined with words in the Preconscious.

Fifteen years later, in *The Third Part* (1974) Lacan introduces a new concept: the word is in the Real.

The word of the Other is in principle Real. In the argument of *The Third Part*<sup>3</sup> Lacan writes about the Preconscious and the preconscious representation in the Real.

---

<sup>1</sup> This presentation is part - among others - of the Working Group *Inscription of the signifier in the Real*.

<sup>2</sup> I would like to thank Verónica Morelli for allowing me to use this fragment taken from her professional practice.

<sup>3</sup> LACAN, Jacques: *Actas de la Escuela Freudiana de París. VII Congreso. Roma 1974*. Edic Petrel, España 1980, pág. 183.

Alienation or how the subject becomes the Other: In the *Logic of the Ghost* (1967)<sup>4</sup> Lacan states that alienation is the elimination of the Other and that this means that the Other is eliminated as a closed and unified field. Alienation is then to eliminate the Other as a whole, as the Real, thus the Other becomes Symbolic.

*Either I do not think or I am not...* that is the question.

I do not think. About what? About *that* (it)<sup>5</sup> What is *that* that I do not think about? *That* which I am to the Other.

Children perceive, "during instants", what they are to the Other, but *that* shuts them down (so this brings about sublimation).

This primitive turning point, essential, which makes life possible, is located in the foundation of the structure.

That first Symbolic Other is in the body. The life of the body is based on drives and this shall organize perception.

We can say that drives are the bodily response to what the Other says.

As to the radical *I am not*, we can situate there the birth point of the Unconscious. We defend ourselves from reaching the point where "I am nothing more than that that I think". The *I am not*, basis of the Unconscious, is a thought to which we do not have access, therefore it will be an enunciation act of the Unconscious<sup>6</sup>

The subject of the Unconscious shall take the words that exist in the Real and shall own them turning them Symbolic, to then lose this nature (Symbolic) through the separation between the word and *jouissance*<sup>7</sup>.

Why does somebody incorporate the Other's word? Because it generates enjoyment (*jouissance*)

---

<sup>4</sup> LACAN, Jacques: *Lógica del Fantasma*. Clase XI -22 de febrero de 1967 Seminar XI - February 22, 1967. Unpublished

<sup>5</sup> *No pienso ¿qué?, eso (ello)* *eso* neuter pronoun in Spanish. In German, the reflexive pronoun as *se* in Spanish. Example: *Se hace tal cosa* (*That is being done*). *Se* marks an act that belongs to nobody.

<sup>6</sup> LACAN, Jacques: *Identification* Seminar. Classes dated January 10 and 17, 1962. Unpublished.

<sup>7</sup> YANKELEVICH, Héctor: Article *The body, the incorporeous, the unreal*. *Reading notes, between Radiophony, "The Third Part" and some others* (in French) "...What Lacan aims at with the word incorporeous ... becoming a body within the biological body, language becomes symbolic, therefore corporeous, losing at the same time part of the enjoyment (*jouissance*) that he introduces in the soma. Once the body speaks, language turns incorporeous again for the speaker. Because what provided all its substance, went somewhere else"

Author's note: The dialectization of "the first Symbolic other: the body" used here and Lacan's "the body of the Symbolic" in *Psychoanalysis. Radiophony and Television*. Published by Anagrama, Barcelona, 1997, page 18, shall be discussed in another paper.

What causes a word to be taken or not as a thing? Whether it carries libidinal drive or not (libidinal drive equals enjoyment). In the Unconscious there shall be, at certain moments, words that are loaded with enjoyment (jouissance), thus... the symptom (understood as the treatment of something that is beyond the ability to reduce enjoyment) The word addressed at the future subject, merely by naming and being said with love, produces the erogenous.

How is the body's erogenization produced? In psychoanalysis, this is a postulate (to be read a posteriori)<sup>8</sup> "...For Lacan, we can only find the modalities of libido – that is to say of Jouissance. We find them in the enunciation of a subject, in what the subject does with his/her body and in where the object is located within its structure", says Héctor Yankelevich<sup>9</sup>

However, not always do the Other's words produce *something to be said*.

In today's "case", what are *those things said* that we can read?

Initially, the parents do not recognize that there is something wrong with what is happening to the child. They take it as a personality trait ("we are not very communicative", "we keep things to ourselves")

As to talking to the child "as an adult", it is like talking without pouring "your soul, heart and life" into those words<sup>10</sup> – as the popular song says.

It is not that she is a bad mother. She is *soul-less*, without a soul.

There are still some words left to be said, but we will leave that for another time.

---

<sup>8</sup> YANKELEVICH, Héctor: Working Group: *The Inscription of the signifier in the Real*. May 6, 2009.  
"We can say that the word libido is descriptive and not false. But there is no hypothesis (where does it come from?)

<sup>9</sup> Ditto above

<sup>10</sup> As Schreber said, "*it is the murdering of the soul*"

FREUD, Sigmund. OC *Psychoanalytic notes on an autobiographical account of a case of paranoia*. 1911