

The body in analysis

Gabriel Lombardi

The International of the Forums of the Lacanian Field calls for its *Rendezvous 2020* with a repeated theme. The theme is repeated and at the same time different, strange; distant and close, past and current: *Treatments of the body in our times and in psychoanalysis*.

What is it that we call ‘body’? It is not the organism, which the body protects; nor is it the image that duplicates it and elevates it to become a coordinate of the master discourse: ‘I have a body, it is my own’.

The question opens up other questions. Is it the remainder to which we are reduced at the moment of anguish? Is it the set in which the organs assemble, leaving out one or other in the capacity of cause of desire? This is the cause that injects life into the formal systems of language, grammar, logic and the social bond with the Other. How are we to distinguish between the body and what is exterior to it, after the Other has been incorporated into it?

The body is a bag of enigmas, Pascal Quignard says in a concise definition.

The history of psychoanalysis has left us with elements to set the marks of the development of answers that unfold in registers that have already been studied: the symbolic, the imaginary, the real, the name, the myth.

How should we review those coordinates in these years in which *centennials* [English in the original. T.] and even *infans* inhabit a virtual *second life* [English in the original. T.] that replaces the social bond? They ‘communicate’ among themselves through networks that dissociate body, presence and name. A few adults belatedly follow their example and make of Tinder or other sites their place of rendezvous. They bet on an encounter within the current logical conditions, as the sexual non-relation is no longer a secret.

And, in these years of just and unjust feminism, how are we to understand castration *qua* an operation of disjunction between the body and jouissance? The equivalence, always mistaken (and in many cases performative) between penis and phallus, generates more and more fictions that have resonances in the fears and defiances of the male, in the laughter of Medusa and in the lesbian corpus. The social networks now offer not just two sexes but an almost *innumerable* amount of genders – 84 in the English version of the most popular social net, for example. As for castration, capitalism does not help psychoanalysis. It is more interested in guided publicity (*targeted ad* [original languages. T]) that in the analytic care of the body. The analyst is mistaken when he/she responds from a ‘heteronormative’ position: he/she enters the game of that Vatican Sodom described in detail by Frédéric Martel, recently published simultaneously, just in case, in eight different languages.

How can we come to appreciate bodies treated with hormones, surgery, technological appendices and Deleuzian ideologies that promise a normal transit to

the posthuman, a category that has become unavoidable after Turing, and to which *The Cyborg Manifesto* of Haraway provides *sinthomatic* consistency?

And how do we receive and listen to the speaking bodies of autistic subjects who ~~do not~~ speak to us? And those others who obnubilate subjective division through the harmful consumption of substances, of Internet, of digitalized obscenity?

Lacan anticipated the social symptom of our times: we are all proletarians, without a discourse with which to establish a social bond. To that prediction he added the paradox that it is not a mere coincidence, but something based on ‘purely logical reasons’, that capitalism and psychoanalysis – which is a modality of social bond – appear in the same era.

In contrast with the external and abundant offer of treatments of the body, analysis invites to ‘hystorize’ the intimate path that leads from the symptom, real with sense, to a point where ‘the real is stronger than truth’, a mythical real that, under one of its various names, is part of the substance of the *speaking body of equivocal languages*. This real can be deduced from the hysterical marks in the body, those signs that offer the analysand the opportunity to interrogate his/her representative in the System, the decadent S_1 , the patriarch responsible for our misfortunes, but also the unavoidable traditional support of our symptomatic or sublimatory reactions – ‘tradition’ derives from ‘transmission’.

We believe that the analytic clinic may be opened to other marks that indicate, apart from the destabilization of the paternal petroleum, the absence of a question: psychosomatic effects, incisions, piercings, tattoos of a renewed polytheism; subjectivities that evoke the American deviated way filmed in *Easy Rider*, that of those precursors that discover in a cemetery Voltaire’s sentence: *Si Dieu n’existait pas, il faudrait l’inventer* [If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him].

In our times diversity adopts surprising forms and invites us to review the modalities in which our only ‘certain and transmissible’ clinic, that of the hysterical discourse, provides us with the analyzing support so that psychoanalysis find in somatic symptoms an option that diverges from the proleterizing System that dislocates knowledges [*savoirs*] and bodies.

To these coordinates that interpellate us from logic, the clinic and also the more or less social movement, we must add questions of an ethical nature.

Where to locate the tithe that the analyst must pay in order to receive that Other Narcissus, male, female or however want to be identified, and whose cartography Colette Soler has recently drawn? The avoidance of the debate is not an option for us.

How are we to invoke, in the methodical erring of analysis, a desire that revitalize that which the speaking body of equivocal languages carries in excess, that pound of flesh that he/she may use to pay for the access to desire? The System leaves very little room for his/her analytic search; but a chance remains, if that desire is so indestructible as Freud sensed it at the dawn of psychoanalysis. Can we situate it in the versions that currently embody the passion of the symptom, which is suffering, jouissance and protest?

Perhaps from these coordinates we may interrogate once more: what is it that distinguishes the analytic treatment of the body from the others. We wish that our *Rendezvous 2020* enable the opening of questions before they become closed with more doctrine, the participation in the clinical debates of current times and the proposal of interpretations worth of the enigmas that the vertigo of the globalizing digital civilization poses to us.

The *Rendezvous* will take place on July 1 and 2, and will be preceded by the *Encounter of the School* on the 30 of June. Perhaps this is an opportunity for revisiting the Lacanian principle that states that there is no jouissance but is not of the body, and for weighing up the impact of our practice on the fear of the body and of an ending different from that of religion – which promises a body beyond death, the one that the current technology of the image reproduces in the successful figure of the zombie. This is why the pass from analysand to analyst, based on the coordinates of the termination of the analysis, generates fear and distance – or enthusiasm and desire, once it is brought face to face.

Translated by Leonardo S. Rodríguez