

## **Misunderstood Love, Challenges in the Analytic Cure**

Natatxa Carreras

For some years now, in Mexico we have been receiving more and more patients with difficulties in constructing an analytic symptom and thus sustaining a demand for work. Patients who fluctuate between inhibition and anguish, in the face of the impossibility of processing affects hand-in-hand with almost delirious obsessive thoughts — a situation that has led us at GRITA to ask ourselves how to work with these patients, whom we have named patients of the clinic of the extreme, and what challenges the work and the direction of the cure reveal to us.

In this regard, how can we make the symptom once again acquire its character of otherness, leading the analysand to the enigma, so that they recognize that what they say does not have a single meaning? How can we potentiate the levorotatory movement of the borromean knot necessary for analytic action, faced with the dextrorotatory movement that shows us the resistance of character traits in these patients?

We understand this fluctuation between inhibition and anguish from what Lacan proposes in the Seminar on The Anguish, where the inhibited subject, in order to reach anguish, must pass through the symptom. But insofar as these are patients in whom acting out and passage to the act predominate, the symptom cannot be touched, as it is found "in the museum."

This does not mean that there is no desire in inhibition, but rather that it implies a different desire, alien to the subject's own desire, as an effect of an egoic function, insofar as inhibition is produced over a remainder of libido that touches the drive, marked by another desire.

Thus, they exhibit an overwhelming — pre-castrative — anguish, in response to the fact that these patients are seized in their desire by the desire of the Other, fixed to the desire, as a unique desire toward the desire of the Other.

Seeking some light on these considerations, I want to share the following vignette. Irene and Bernardo — a married couple — come for a consultation with me. As a result of the first interview, I decide to see only Irene at that moment.

Since learning that her husband was unfaithful, Irene has spent four years surveilling him; they argue every day. When Bernardo asks her to stop, she tries to hold him back, standing in front of him, hugging him, trying to kiss him; if she fails, she threatens to kill herself with a pistol.

Two certainties torment Irene: that her partner has lovers and that he is going to leave her.

We draw upon the movements of the borromean knot proposed by Lacan to think about the progress in Irene's analysis. The movement of the knot toward the levorotatory is the analytic action oriented toward the enigma.

If the Imaginary, which has consistency, moves toward the Real, it constitutes what ex-sists, bringing about a change in meaning, which implies articulating with a Symbolic that is not repetitive, allowing for the production of a new signifier, accounting for an impossible, that which cannot say it all.

We can note that Irene's discourse, in her search for the verification of her certainties, shows us a dextrorotatory movement from the Imaginary toward the Symbolic, where the Imaginary invades the field of the Symbolic, sealing the hole, saturating it with meaning along with an ignored impossible of the sexual, which produced inhibition.

Now, the fact that the dextrorotatory movement occurs does not mean that the levorotatory movement does not also take place simultaneously — counter-times in the analysis, coexisting movements.

After several turns in Irene's analysis — during which any intervention is reassembled in an attempt to demonstrate to me that in all her investigations her husband is lying to her and her distrust is justified — I can locate some interventions that manage to move her, allowing something of the order of the enigma to appear, something of the order of the cause, of the operation of love in its structural misunderstanding that sustains desire:

"If you can hire a detective to corroborate whether Bernardo is being unfaithful, why are you the one who surveils him?"

"It seems that this surveilling drive involves the wish to destroy your relationship with Bernardo."

"It seems that in this wish to know, there is something you do not want to find out."

We consider that the levorotatory movement of the knot, from the Symbolic toward the Imaginary, manages to unsettle Irene's certainties, opening up the inhibitory sense, thus allowing access to the ciphered.

On the other hand, the three interventions that emerge in Irene's discourse can be thought of as three points of the phantasm, which are at the same time paradoxical, insofar as through the analyst's abstinence — which does not have a single meaning — the coagulated identifications are perforated.

In these three interventions, three paths are posed which, when articulated, produce a paradox.

Interventions that allude to a knowledge not known, making possible the unfolding of other jouissances beyond the semantic phallic jouissance.

From the analyst's abstinence, Irene confronts the enigma that inhabits her, thereby potentiating the levorotatory movement of the knot, the direction of the cure around the emptying of meaning produced by the sayings.

A point of moebian cut, where the letters that become entangled in the symptom must be made to turn out of the "correct" sense, producing a change in meaning that opposes following the effects of the language established by the structure of the said. Instead, it must be guided by the resonances in the speaking body, which are reproduced not by the misunderstanding of joys, but by the orientation towards the Real and not towards the Real.

Similarly, we can locate the first act in Irene's analysis, when it is established, from the first interview, that she and her husband cannot attend together. This cut of difference limited a parasitic enjoyment in which both were trapped. To have seen them together implied that the analyst would be caught in the staging of the scene they were coming to enact, copulating from their ghost with theirs.

The copulation that we can understand at a certain point in Irene's analysis, when Bernardo requests to see me as well because the situation in their marriage is unbearable. From that moment, Irene tries to inquire about what happens in her husband's sessions. From the abstinence of the analyst, there is no answer to her questions, but one day, at the end of Irene's session, she asked me on which day she would see Bernardo; a question I responded to. We can think of this as an analyst's passage to the act, where I found myself caught in her surveillant enjoyment, copulating my ghost with that of my analysant. Hence the importance of displacing the meanings that seem unique, coagulated and closed senses, towards the creation of the enigma, which, as something that cannot be fully understood, shifts towards a question, generating movement in the analysis and thus pluralizing the enjoyment.

The last session I had with Irene, before concluding this presentation, was after her husband left the house, a situation that we can locate as an analytic act, occurring in Bernardo's analysis. Irene, for the first time, speaks of the responsibility she had in making her husband leave. This twist in her analysis gave rise to Irene asking herself, "Why couldn't I stop?" Finally, something of the transference appears, from the "I know" to the "you know." Contrary to the previous sessions, a signifier appears that enables another enjoyment to unfold: "to remain outside" of her husband and her children's activities. At this point, I remind her that she also remained outside of her mother's business, an inheritance left by her father upon his death, now managed by her sisters. This enabled her to associate this with her childhood and adolescence, in which she was completely dependent on her mother until she married Bernardo. I ask her if the supposed lovers of her husband, whom she had so wanted to investigate, had anything to do with her sisters. This intervention surprises her. We can see in this small excerpt another enjoyment unfold: the enjoyment with the mother,

which allowed us to begin loosening the fixation on the previous one, since almost the entire session was about her parents and sisters. We can say that another enigma emerged at the end of the session: "How to learn to live alone?" Detached from the mother's breast and from Bernardo's breast.

We can conclude that what an analysis is about is to sustain that there is no other birth trauma than that which speaks through the being; that misunderstanding of joys is what makes love the potency of the speaking being. Lacan is clear in his intervention *Words on Hysteria* (1977), where he states that the analyst's practice, starting from the void of meaning, produces words that astonish, without knowing what they say, noting that "This is much more important than knowing what the unconscious means or does not mean" structured as a language, since it is also a body given by the words that do not know what they say, from which nothing is understood. Therefore, the analytic act involves emptying meaning, from the paradoxical, from love as impossible.