

PSYCHOANALYTICAL NOTEBOOKS No 19

A REVIEW OF THE LONDON SOCIETY OF THE NEW LACANIAN SCHOOL

CONTENTS

Editorial

ORDINARY PSYCHOSIS

- Marie-Hélène Brousse *Ordinary Psychosis In The Light Of Lacan's
Theory Of Discourse* 7

DEVELOPING THE THEORY

- Jean-Pierre Klotz *Ordinary Psychosis And Modern Symptoms* 21
Russell Grigg *Language As Sinthome In Ordinary Psychosis* 33
Pierre Skriabine *Ordinary Psychosis With A Borromean
Approach* 45
Alexandre Stevens *Mono-Symptoms And Hints Of Ordinary
Psychosis* 57
Jean-Luc Monnier *Ordinary Psychosis And Liquid Life* 67
Thomas Svolos *'Ordinary Psychosis'* 79

THEORY AND PRACTICE

- Pierre Naveau *Precariousness And Social Disinsertion* 85
Antoni Vicens *Some Cases Of Ordinary Psychosis In The
CPCT Of Barcelona* 89
Gil Caroz *Some Remarks on the Direction of the
Treatment in Ordinary Psychosis* 99
Jean-Louis Gault *City Full Of Ghosts* 115
Gustavo Dessal *The Strange And Mysterious Disappearance
Of Mr. K.'s Voice* 127
Hervé Castanet *Violaine Or "It Happened At The Smurfs Club"* 135

LACANIAN ORIENTATION

- Jacques-Alain Miller *Ordinary Psychosis Revisited* 139

CLINICAL CASES

Franck Rollier	<i>Looking For 'Fine Tuning'</i>	169
Catherine Meut	<i>No Man's Land, A Case Not Exactly Ordinary</i>	183
Natalie Wülfing	<i>"I Am Genetically Dead"</i>	189
Maria J. Lopez	<i>The Case Of Armand</i>	195
Julia Richards	<i>A Capitalist Dialect In A Case Of Ordinary Psychosis</i>	203
Adrian Price	<i>Lethal Weapon</i>	211

ORDINARY PSYCHOSIS In The Light Of Other Disciplines

Véronique Voruz	<i>Democracy and Ordinary Psychosis</i>	219
Wilfried Ver Eecke	<i>Philosophical Questions about the Theory of Psychosis in Early Lacan</i>	233
Maire Jaanus	<i>Ordinary Happiness in Lispector's Stream of Life</i>	241

CONCLUSION

Éric Laurent	<i>Ordinary Interpretation</i>	277
--------------	--------------------------------	-----

CPCT again. I agreed with her and said that if ever she felt like coming again, we were there.

Translated by the author

SOME REMARKS ON THE DIRECTION OF THE TREATMENT IN ORDINARY PSYCHOSIS

Gil Caroz

Treatment By Re-Connection

Unlike neurosis and paranoia, where the symptom that functions as a tie is strong and stable, unlike schizophrenia where we can see a fragmentation *in vivo*, and where instead of a knotting we have a fusion of the real and the symbolic (in schizophrenia the symbolic *is* real), in ordinary psychosis we are faced with an oscillating clinic, which Jacques-Alain Miller described as the dialectical movement between *connection*, periods of stabilisation, and *disconnection*, moments of breakdown.

If we add to *connection* and *disconnection* the term *reconnection*, we have a first orientation for the direction of the treatment in ordinary psychosis. I am drawing the idea from the text of Philippe De Georges and Hervé Castanet in *La convention d'Antibes*, in which they highlight the succession 'Connection - disconnection - reconnection'. Indeed, in this text the authors indicate that we 'single out what at a certain moment constitutes a 'disconnection' for the subject with respect to the Other. This clarifies, retrospectively, the element that formerly constituted the subject's way of being 'connected', and permits of directing the treatment toward a possible 'reconnecting'.¹ Thus, the direction of the treatment in ordinary psychosis can be oriented by what was disconnected or by what is likely to be disconnected in a subject, making it possible to determine what may allow him to be reconnected.

¹ Castanet, H. et De Georges, P., 'Branchement, débranchement, rebranchement', in *La psychose ordinaire, La convention d'Antibes*, Agalma-Seuil, Paris, 1999, p.14

A Democratic Conversation

Jacques-Alain Miller has described a kind of democratisation of the Other inherent in ordinary psychosis. The Name-of-the-Father is one symptom among others. This leads us to new considerations regarding the transferential link in the treatment. The subject-supposed-to-know can no longer be our reference, because it involves a belief in the unconscious, a belief in the effects of truth inherent to the articulation between the signifiers. This articulation depends on the Name-of the Father. So we don't expect the ordinarily psychotic subject to believe that what happens to him 'means something' in the sense of the unconscious. This, however, does not mean that he does not have access to and use of an exposed knowledge, a knowledge which would be above the bar of repression. The 'half-saying', the equivocation, the silence of the analyst and any other operations which lead to the opening towards a knowledge in the place of truth in the unconscious merely enhance the subject's disconnection. The democratisation of the Name-of- the-Father and the pluralisation of *sinthomes* which insure the RSI knotting, encounter a democratisation of the analyst-analysand relationship, often giving the analytic session the democratic aspect of a conversation, an exchange. This conversation unfolds in accordance with different modes. Depending on where the point of disconnection has occurred, this conversation will assume different patterns, with emphasis being given to the knotting of either the real, the symbolic or the imaginary. I suggest organising these modes of conversation according to the emphasis they place on each of these orders, in accordance with the following titles: 'Translation and Nomination', 'Imaginary Clothing' and 'Isolation of the Real'.

Translation and Nomination

The previous idea we had of the direction of the cure in psychosis took the Name-of-the-Father as its reference. For example, we used to say that one must avoid the psychotic's encounter with A-Father (*Un père*), that we have to protect him from the jouissance of the Other, that we have to bar the Other. If we take another example, in paranoia, we used to encourage a diffracted transference to a number of practitioners (analyst, psychiatrist, social worker, etc.) in order to impede the development of persecution and erotomania centred on one person. On the contrary, in

schizophrenia, which is already fragmented enough, we used to encourage a gathering of the transference in one person. We still use these guidelines, but we have new ones.

The research concerning ordinary psychosis resulted in new elaborations on the direction of the treatment with psychotics. Among the most important are the elaborations, essentially by Éric Laurent, concerning the work of nomination and translation of jouissance that suit the treatment of the psychotic subject.² Let us note that this work of translation and nomination is the enterprise of any human being. The paternal metaphor developed by Lacan is in itself an apparatus of nomination and translation of the jouissance as the unknown, the *x* that escapes the signifier. As we can see in the matheme of the paternal metaphor, this operation has two stages: first the Desire of the mother (DM) nominates the *x* to be the subject. Then the Name-the-Father (NF) gives his version, his translation of this *x*. Thus, in neurosis, the subject is somehow exempt from this work of nomination and translation, because the paternal metaphor does it for him. Similarly, in the paradigmatic version of psychosis described by Lacan in 'A Question Prior to...', Schreberian psychosis, where the Name-of the-Father is foreclosed, the construction of delusional metaphor ensures the work of nomination and translation. In ordinary psychosis, the subject has the task of naming the jouissance without recourse to these apparatuses. He has recourse to neither the Name-of-the-Father nor the delusional metaphor. It is rather the *sinthome*, through its operation in the dimension of the letter in the signifier, which will permit of treating jouissance. However, the *sinthome* is not given to everyone, and it is not always already there. Often, it needs work in order to be developed. And as long as the *sinthome* is not there, the subject can find support in the analyst for a work of naming and translating which never stops. Because as Éric Laurent says, 'jouissance is missing in the ocean of proper names'³, in other words, the signifier will never cover the jouissance exhaustively. That's why the work of

²Laurent, É., (*Ibid*) and in 'Le traitement psychanalytique des psychoses', in *Les feuillets du Courtil*, Issue 20, pp. 7-24

³ Laurent, É., *Ibid.*, p. 19

translation needs to be repeated to infinity, which does not mean that the analysis has to be infinite.

Thus, the democratic conversion that I mentioned earlier becomes a conversion on language itself. It can be an exchange on the dialectic between codes and messages, an attempt to understand and define the 'personal meaning' of an expression, of an enigmatic word, or of a word invested with *jouissance* for the subject. In short, it is a translation of the more intimate use of language, the *lalangue*, towards the common meaning of the social bond.

We have an example of such a conversation in the following case. This subject that I have been seeing for ten years is an elderly man. An only child, and a Jew, during the war he was put in a Catholic institution when he was nine years old, in order not to be deported and exterminated by the Nazis along with his parents. He suddenly found himself with a priest whom he was asked to call 'father'. That was very puzzling for him: why should he call this man who is not his father 'father'? This event put him in a state of perplexity, but no brake-down came afterwards. Rather, it was a starting point for a fundamental misunderstanding between the subject and Other. As he says, he cannot understand what is being said around him at the first degree, there are always some hidden intentions. This misunderstanding is also reflected in his body since he is hard of hearing (in French, *malentendu* resonates with *malentendant*). For this subject, the whole area of *jouissance* is named: 'misunderstanding'. As a result, the misunderstanding has been realized repeatedly throughout his life, and the subject has again and again brought his relation to the Other to a stop. He maintained some relation to religion, but it was a labile one, since he could never decide after the war if he was Jewish or Catholic. The sessions allow one to measure the difficulty of having a dialogue with him. His discourse floats on the *Thing*. There is no trace of reference to sexuality. He makes long detours before saying what he means. This style is without any doubt one of the reasons for his deep isolation which has lasted many years. He used to live in the margins of society, and for a long time couldn't integrate himself into a social structure. He didn't hold down any work for a long time, living in total solitude.

In the direction of this treatment, the analyst seeks actively, with the subject, some points of understanding, in which the *jouissance* of the Other is emptied out. This allows a punctuation of the meetings by a 'got it' (in French *entendu*). For example, one session was devoted to the decryption of the word 'So?' (*alors*) that analyst uttered at the beginning of the session: What did the analyst mean? Did he mean 'how are you?' – in that case the subject would feel insulted, because it must be clear that a man like him couldn't be feeling very well. Did he mean that what he says has no consequences? And so on. He finishes by relating a *Witz* that his parents made with the word '*alors*', and which reduces it to nonsense. When somebody said '*alors*' they responded: '*alors, alors...in a-lor gist mein eissik*' which means in Yiddish 'in the hole one pours vinegar'. The session ends with an agreement that the '*alors*' of the analyst was empty speech. It is an agreement not on a common meaning, but on the absence of any sense, in other words, the absence of *jouissance* in the Other.

Thus, during sessions which end on this kind of agreement (*entente*), the real of this subject, namely his disconnection from discourse, is hooked onto the Other for a certain time, by means of the letter. But this implies a permanent link to the analyst, who operates this hooking again and again. The encounter with the analyst in itself allows him to maintain a bond with the world.

Imaginary Clothing

Joyce compensated the lack of the imaginary ring of the knot by his writing which allowed him to make a name for himself, an '*ego*'. His solution is elegant: it is the nomination of *jouissance* by the symbolic in itself which produces the imaginary tying by means of the *ego*. This *sinthomatic* solution makes of him someone who does not need to meet an analyst. But in our everyday clinic, such a *sinthomatic* solution is not always observed. Most often, the disconnected subject is faced with the real of *jouissance* which he does not manage to treat otherwise than by covering it with an imaginary veil. The appeasing effect of such a process during the treatment sometimes allows the subject to be open to the construction of a symptom. In these cases, it would be a kind of equivalent of the anaesthetic in the field of medical care.

I shall give three examples of three modalities of such a covering of the Real with an imaginary veil, under the following three titles: displacement, normalisation, and imaginary identification.

Displacement

The psychotic subject is prey to the Real of *jouissance* which forces itself upon him in a non-veiled manner. Because of this, we have to help him to put the Real at a distance. This can be done by a displacement from speaking about *jouissance* towards the public scene of common meaning. Unconscious truth points towards the real. Therefore we would rather tend to develop a knowledge that 'has cancelled its subscription to unconscious truth.'⁴

In the following case, the conversation with the subject takes the form of a discourse on discontent in civilization. This everyday banal conversation locates in an acceptable field a discussion on a point of the subject's *jouissance*, which includes a risk of *passage à l'acte*. Thus, it permits of putting a veil over this *jouissance* and maintaining the risk of a *passage à l'acte* at a distance.

A young man comes to the analyst fearing he has AIDS or another serious disease. He also fears contaminating his wife or his children with these diseases. This fear is part of a more general one that 'something bad might soon occur'. The history of this subject is marked by a sexual molestation inflicted upon him regularly in his childhood by a close friend of his parents, a father-figure. During the analysis, the fear that 'something bad might soon occur' becomes more specific. The analysand delivers to the analyst his fear that he himself might be led to sexually abuse his own children. Afterwards, a kind of conversation is set up in the sessions which treat this question at a distance, through a displacement. The analyst and the analysand speak about alarming facts and events in the world which give us an impression that 'something bad will soon occur': wars, massacres, violence of any kind, the capitalist market, etc.

Thus, through these conversations centred on concerns belonging to the public domain, the private concerns of this subject are treated. For the subject, this conversation traces a limit to the *jouissance* that risks resulting in sexual *passage à l'acte* towards his children. This limit is not the effect of a prohibition coming from the highway of the Name-of-the-Father, nor is it the effect of an interpretation of the unconscious. Rather, it is an operation of 'furrowing' (*ravinement*) which digs out borders to *jouissance* by means of the simple repetitive use in the discussion, over and over, of the expression 'something bad might soon occur'.

Normalisation

In some of the cases of ordinary psychosis we meet a rigorous normality. The subject is submitted to the Other. In others, the disconnection comes from a major feeling of not having a *jouissance* 'like the others'. The work of normalisation is then a form of reconnection to the Other as a place of the standard, of the norm.

In the following example, a woman subject suffers from an invasion of the body by an 'incestuous' *jouissance* that is not limited by castration. However, in other aspects of her life, this woman presents a hysteriform clinical picture. This is precisely what the analyst will support by conversing with the subject on the imaginary dimensions of her 'Oedipus'. Thus, a non-regulated *jouissance* will be placed behind the veil of the Oedipal standard.

A woman of African origin, an artist, comes to the analyst because she is not managing to stabilize her couple. At the beginning of the analysis she raises questions in a conventional psycho-social way: 'I'm not able to engage myself in a relationship', 'do I want him to be the father of my children?', 'how come I'm not married like all the women of my age', etc. In addition, her love for her father who died a few years ago invades her relation with her boyfriend and extinguishes her desire for him. This happens in the most concrete way since often, when she makes love with him, she has the impression that her father is the one she is making love with.

⁴ Laurent É., In *La psychose ordinaire*, p.369.

Interpretations which aim to produce the truth of unconscious do not produce any effect on this analysand. On the other hand, she asks for explanations from the analyst about what is happening to her, saying: 'when you explain things to me, I feel much better'. And so a mode of conversation between her and the analyst comes to settle around the pseudo Oedipal coordinates of her life. She speaks about her competition with her mother, of her guilt after the divorce of her parents, of the still un-accomplished mourning of her father, of a scene of seduction by her father which she is not sure about. This conversation about her 'Oedipus' makes her much less anxious, because it confirms and solidifies the hysteriform veiling of the jouissance which intrudes into her body without the mediation of the phallus.

As time passes, this conversation which translates jouissance into acceptable terms, allows a localization of the incestuous jouissance which invades her body. I shall return to this later.

Imaginary Identification

Imaginary identification is a more classic solution that we often see in traditional psychoses. I am speaking of an imaginary identification from the register of megalomania and which avoids the disconnected subject from incarnating a 'Being of scrap' (*être de déchet*), rejected from the Other.

Thus, the subject who suffers from 'misunderstanding' whom I mentioned above, testified very discreetly to elements of such a megalomaniac identification that comes to respond to a feeling of being a bad man because he was spared the massacre. He confesses to the analyst that sometimes he wonders whether he was not saved because he has a mission to accomplish in this world, that he could be the Messiah. This discrete and imaginary identification with the Messiah is also a veiling of the subject's 'Being of scrap' (*être de déchet*). It appears only once in the analysis, and it is not accompanied by any development of a consistent delusion. The analyst receives this testimony and does nothing more.

Isolation Of The Real

Because of the lack of the fundamental fantasy that locates the object in the Other, the ordinarily psychotic subject stays with 'the object in his pocket'

as Lacan says.⁵ The jouissance being on his side, it can invade the body, which will result in body phenomena. Jouissance can also invade the signifier, which will result in language and thought disorders.

Now, let's try to say this by making use of Lacan's theory of the Borromean knot. So that the three registers, real, symbolic and imaginary may be tied to one other, they must first be detached, separate, independent, and isolated. However, the body and language disorders in ordinary psychosis sometimes confront us not with a tying of the real as a distinct register to the two other registers, but with a real that intrudes and invades the two other registers. On the other hand, there exist cases in which the real risks being completely detached from the two other registers. In these cases, when the real cannot be named and translated by the symbolic system or covered by an imaginary veil, we are faced with a risk of *passage à l'acte*.

I shall put forward three cases to illustrate three possible operations relating to these manifestations of the real: 'The extraction of jouissance', 'The localisation of jouissance', and the 'Savoir-faire with jouissance'.

The Extraction Of Jouissance

In the following case, the signifier is invested with jouissance, while the imaginary of the body remains outside of any alliance. The conversation tears off from the subject an autistic jouissance, which would not be extracted without the encounter with the analyst.

He is a man well-integrated into society, with a wife, four children and a conventional job. He complains about an excessive tendency to eat which makes him overweight, but especially about words which 'occupy his mind' and which he doesn't know what to do with. During the first session, the analyst only asks one question: 'which words?'. Since then, he has been coming every week to meet this analyst and seems to be answering this initial question. Each session starts in the same way. He

⁵ This was mentioned by Jean-Claude Malval, in a seminar he gave under the title: 'Éléments pour une appréhension clinique de la psychose ordinaire', January 18-19, 2003.

Psychosis

says: 'I going to speak about word *x*'. And starting from this, a true free association is developed. When I say a *true free association*, I mean that the point of enunciation is reduced to zero. The subject is lead from one word to another by the laws of the language, metonymy in particular, without this being quilted or oriented by the subject, without any identified repetition of certain signifiers, without there being a call for a meaning, and without truth settling through an effect of an retroaction. The session can be cut at any moment, because in any event the cut does not make for any effect of interpretation.

This work has lasted for years. The sessions relieve him of these words agitating his head. Moreover, outside of the analysis, he continues his ordinary life. Let's note that these nonsensical words are not hallucinations. They do not plunge into the real like a voice coming from outside. But by pronouncing them, and articulating them with all their linguistic connections, the subject is able to exteriorize the *jouissance* conveyed by these words and locate it in the Other. Thus the subject uses the analyst as an outlet (*déversoir*), as an additional organ (*organe supplémentaire*), outside the body, which enables him to empty this *jouissance* which invades his head. The treatment does not go further. Moreover, if the analyst strives to go further after all, for example by asking simply 'how are you?' the response is disastrous. The subject will describe then how his body is being decomposed, thus testifying to the disconnection of the imaginary register. Apart from this function of being the depository of the *jouissance* linked to the words, the analyst should not answer or be interested in the subject act of saying. There is nothing to understand in it, because meaning calls upon the imaginary which fails for this subject, and so it has a harmful effect on him.

Localisation Of Jouissance

For the artist of African origin referred to above in relation to a direction of the cure oriented towards a standardisation through a pseudo-hysteria, the analytical work has allowed a localisation of the 'incestuous' *jouissance* which had been invading her body. This woman's complaint, I remind you, was that her relationship with her boyfriend was being

invested by her relation to her father to such a degree that when she made love with him, she had a feeling of her father's presence.

After a long work in analysis, she managed to isolate what she cannot bear in her boyfriend: a certain vibration in the voice. She linked this difficulty to her childhood. Her parents separated when she was still a small child. She remembers the noise of her step father's breathing, which she heard through the wall during the sexual relationships between him and her mother. She remembers the breathing of her father when she slept with him in the same room of his small apartment. But this truth does not have any appeasing effect on the subject. On the contrary, in the sessions, when she speaks about her unfinished mourning of her father, she suddenly feels a sexual excitation in her body which she says is related to the father. An incestuous *jouissance*. This is unbearable for her.

As time went on, the conversation that I described, which clothes the *jouissance*, which translates the *jouissance* into acceptable terms, allows for a localisation of this *jouissance* that was invading the body, in the object voice, which appears to her with a strangeness that verges on the dissociative. She starts to think that her voice is husky and that everyone is aware of this. She develops a hostility towards this 'witch's voice that comes out of my throat'. She thinks about it ceaselessly.

From then on, she lives a double life. The analysis is the place of a painful debate that she maintains with the certainty of her husky voice. A voice which she regards as an shameful mark, a monument that indicates the presence of a father always too much alive. But, apart from the analysis, she conducts a hysteriform life with her partner. The life of a couple, with its ups and downs. After some long months of discussion around this voice, she decides to stop the analysis. When leaving, she is lucid. She knows that her voice will continue to haunt her, that there will be ups and downs, but she considers that she can live with this localised *jouissance*, and that she cannot do better than that.

Development Of A Savoir-Faire

Let's recall that the *passage à l'acte*, contrary to acting out, is a kind of fall of the social bond, a fall of discourse, and so, it is not interpretable. From this

point of view, it should be considered that in ordinary psychosis, where from the beginning there is a weak relation to discourse, there is sometimes a big risk of *passage à l'acte*. However, if the *passage à l'acte* is not interpretable, Éric Laurent tells us that it can in itself be an interpretation of jouissance. Let's say that because of the fragile relation to the discourse, the subject is likely to translate his 'Being of scrap' into a *passage à l'acte* that will make him fall from discourse.

On the side of the 'ordinary' murderer, the runaway youth, those who find themselves without any residence, consumers in prison, we have subjects with a regular and discrete tendency to the *passage à l'acte*, which lead them to a dead-end. We have already shown how the *passage à l'acte* is maintained at a distance by an operation of displacement that consists in speaking about 'what might occur' a little bit 'aside' of the thing itself. Another way of avoiding the *passage à l'acte* would be to reconcile the subject with the Other.

For example, our elderly man who wandered for many years after the war, ended up landing on his feet in an association in Brussels which offers him free housing in exchange for simple work. When he meets the analyst for the first time he is in a moment of crisis, he wants to leave this association because of some misunderstanding with some of the other members. The analyst dissuades him, with the result that for the first time in his life he stays in one place. This has already lasted ten years. But from time to time, when the misunderstanding with the other members of the association where he lives reaches a certain high point, he still plans to leave the association, thus risking finding himself in the street. At these moments, the analyst approaches, with the subject, the point of misunderstanding he was faced with in his relation with the Other, and tries to find a possible reconciliation with this Other. Very practical questions are then treated: Does such and such a remark from someone really mean he is being insulted? And if so, is this a reason to sacrifice the association that is currently his home? Is the telephone operator who forgot to pass him messages really malicious? And how might one go about telling her not to forget? In short, it is a conversation which decipherers the Other and deals with an exposed knowledge about the

pragmatic relation to the Other. Until now, this elaboration of a *savoir-faire* has allowed the subject to remain connected to the association, and to avoid a *passage à l'acte* that would make him fall from the scene of the social bond.

A Sinthome Not To Be Cured

The series 'connection - disconnection - reconnection' belongs to the clinic of the Borromean knot. Let's note that we are not speaking here about the neurotic symptom like the one that conveys a message of truth from the unconscious as in the other unconscious formations (slips of the tongue, dreams, etc.). We are speaking about the sinthome such as it ensures that the Real, the Symbolic and Imaginary hold together. Indeed, if we refer to Lacan's indications on the Borromean knot, it is towards the sinthome as what ties the three registers together that we must lead the treatments of these disconnected subjects. In this sense, the orientation of the treatment is somehow opposite to the neurotic's treatment. With the neurotic, the treatment is directed towards a purification of the existing symptom. In psychosis, it is rather a question of constructing a sinthome where it is missing, and of avoiding curing it, or even of consolidating it when there is a sinthome.

In the case of the woman who succeeded in locating the jouissance that invaded her body in the husky voice, we can see the result of the constructing work of the sinthome. The voice has the status of a letter, a dimension of the signifier, which ties the 'incestuous jouissance' related to the father to the dimension of the subject's body.

We have an example of a sinthome not to be cured with the man we mentioned earlier, who suffers from a fear that 'something bad might soon occur' and from the memory of sexual molestation by his uncle in his childhood. I remind you that when he came to the analyst, he complained of a fear of having AIDS or another serious disease. In the account of his history, he isolated one decisive moment that triggered his anxiety when he was seven years old. One evening, he told his parents he had the feeling his mind was detached from his body. They did not take him seriously. Guilty for not having opposed the molestation by his parents' friend, he explains the fact of being able to bear it through this capacity of

his mind to leave his body. He was not there in his body when it happened. In addition, his hypochondriac fears of contracting AIDS, although cumbersome, enable him as he says 'to tie the mind to the body'. So this rumination is a *sinthome* that ties the mind as thought to the body and its *jouissance*. Since he said this to the analyst, his anxiety has strongly decreased. He has found a certain joy in his life, sexual pleasure with his wife and satisfaction in his work. All that, without being cured from the fear of being contaminated.

There is a striking analogy between his absence of his body when touched by his uncle, and the episode related by Joyce in *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* where, once beaten by his friends, he did not feel anger, which is a body affect. In both cases, Joyce and our subject, damage is done to narcissism which results in a body image detached from 'the idea of oneself as a body.'⁶ For Joyce, the image disappears and with it the affect of anger. For our subject, the body image is detached from the mind, so that he cannot feel the *jouissance* which is forced upon him. It is through the fear of contracting a disease that the subject can restore a relationship with his body. In this sense, the fear of disease is the equivalent of writing for Joyce. In other words, it is what compensates for the knot's defect. As we have already said, for Lacan, Joyce does not need analysis. In the same way, we could say that our subject's *sinthome* is a *sinthome* not to be analysed and not to be cured. In this case, it is rather a question of trying to reconcile the subject with this *sinthome*. That is what we do. In the conversations with the analyst, the subject wonders whether this residue of suffering is only his destiny, or if it is a human condition not to be able to be happy without suffering. He chooses rather the second alternative. The analyst supports this in order to help him to register his suffering in the destiny of the human as such.

The Presence Of The Analyst

I began my paper with remarks relating to transference in ordinary psychosis, with some indications as to a mode of bond we should have with the ordinarily psychotic subject, a bond based on a democratic conversation rather than on the Subject-supposed-to know. I also

⁶ Lacan J., *Le séminaire livre XXIII, Le sinthome*, Paris, Seuil, 2005, p.150

mentioned the need to develop an exposed knowledge rather than an unconscious knowledge in the place of truth. These remarks belong to the dimension of the transference which relates to knowledge. But we know that when we speak about transference, there is a second dimension not to be neglected: the presence of the analyst. I shall close my paper on this point.

As we know, in neurosis, the presence of the analyst comes to incarnate for the subject what cannot be said, the dimension of the drive.⁷ From there comes the requirement of a presence of the bodies of the two partners in the analytic session. In the cases of ordinary psychosis, this requirement does not lose anything of its relevance. We can deduce, from the cases which I have mentioned and other cases, a series of functions which the presence of the analyst can have for the subject of ordinary psychosis.

For the subject disconnected from discourse, the presence of the analyst can be the only social bond that binds him to humanity. For the subject whose body is breaking up or does not exist, the analyst's presence would be a mirror, a means of gathering his body together. For the subject who suffers from an excess of *jouissance* because of the object 'in his pocket', the presence of the analyst ensures a depository, a kind of additional organ which permits of condensing the *jouissance* outside the body.

The list can undoubtedly be lengthened further still. It is possible that in the clinic of ordinary psychosis, more than in any other clinic, the role of the analyst as a multifunctional object⁸ has to be applied. Can we accept the fact that in some cases what is said during the session has much less importance with regard to the presence in the session? That

⁷ Lysy, A., 'Transference and Psychosis', in *Psychoanalytical Notebooks*, Review of the London Society of the NLS, No.17, ed: P. Dravers, London, 2008. 'Transfert et Psychose', in *Mental*, Issue 19, May 2007, pp. 183-200.

⁸ Miller, J.-A., 'Contra-Indications to Psychoanalytical Treatment', in *Psychoanalytical Notebooks*, Review of the London Society of the NLS, No.4, ed: B. Wolf, London, 1999. 'Les contre-indications au traitement psychanalytique', in *Mental* Issue 5, July 1998, pp. 9-17.

sometimes, what really operates is the simple fact of the encounter with the analyst, the simple fact that the point of address is incarnated as a presence? Can we let the subject use us in this way?

With these questions I will end my talk.

Translated from the French by Adrian Price

CITY FULL OF GHOSTS

Jean-Louis Gault

Our patient is a student in language skills. I met him for the first time in 1998. He had been having difficulties for several years. Six years before, he had been hospitalised for an anxious and depressive phase, and had been in psychotherapy and psychoanalysis for four years. He contacted me because he had moved, and wanted to continue his analysis. He had therefore developed a great interest in psychoanalysis and had started studying Freudian theory at university.

When he came for the first meeting, he looked in very bad shape. He was still medicated with neuroleptics. He looked puffed up, apathetic and a-pragmatic. He had dropped out of university and as he had no means of support he went back to his parents' place, where he had board and lodging. Things had started nine years before. At the end of his two-years of study in language skills, he had been involved in several homosexual relations lasting three months. Sexual experiences were limited but he was uplifted by feelings of love that led him from one boy to another within his circle of friends. During that short period of time, he shared days and nights with these boys. After this period, he was totally disoriented. Then he stopped all homosexual relations for good, and until now he has never had any other homosexual experiences. After that time, he became stable, but he still felt bad, so he consulted a psychiatrist who practiced psychoanalysis. He only saw him for a few weeks because he moved abroad for his studies.

He stayed one year in the country, studying literature and language. There he met a girl and fell in love with her. During several months, they turned around each other. He loved her, she loved him, but he had no desire in the sexual act. Twice they tried to have sex, each time he was impotent. He was distraught after this setback. He was very anxious and was sent to a hospital for a few days. When he got out he consulted a