



Language(s) and *passee*

Elisabete Thamer

This has been an option of our School since its creation: the *cartels* of the *passee* are international, therefore multilingual. Since the beginning of our common experience of the *passee*, we have never derogated from this option. Innovative compared to Lacan's invention of 1967, this choice raises questions about the *passee* and its relationship to language, to languages, to *lalangue*. What is the transmission in the *passee*? What are the limits? What should a cartel identify? Are the translations a loss or an asset for the *passee*? What are the consequences of this diversity of languages in the *passee* system for the School work?

The *passee* is an experience of transmission, an attempt by the one who ventures it to pass on to the School what led him to take over the analyst's baton. Now, the *passee*, like the cure, has not a *medium* other than speech and, just as in an analysis, it is essential that the *passant* testifies to the *passeeurs* in a language they share. But does sharing a language guarantee in itself a "faithful" transmission? Nothing is less certain: « *Une langue entre autres n'est rien de plus que l'intégrale des équivoques que son histoire y a laissé persister*¹. » [A language, among other languages, is nothing more than the integral of the misunderstandings that its history has allowed to persist.]

Different elaborations by Lacan, all crucial for the *passee*, point towards the limits of language and articulated speech: « *aporie du compte rendu* », [aporia of the report] he said². Aporia as to the desire (incompatible with the speech³ including the one of the analyst), aporia as to the object, as to the act (in which the subject is subverted), as to the real, as to the opaque jouissance of the symptom, as to the saying that ex-sists to the said... Then, how can we grasp in each testimony of a *passee*, in what is said there, what escapes the nets of language? Is it in the end a question of language?

No language by itself could ensure flawless transmission. Lacan's elaborations on *lalangue* make it obvious. Always singular, *lalangue* – which the unconscious is made of⁴ – cannot be reduced to a given language: « *lalangue n'a rien à faire avec le dictionnaire, quel qu'il soit*⁵. » [*lalangue* has nothing to do with the dictionary, whatever it may be]. One can share a language to a greater or lesser extent, but not *lalangue*.

In our School, the *passee* involves its lot of translation. First of all that of the *passant* himself, who has to find the words to say what *he* knows. Then there is the "translation" that the *passeeur* does of what he has heard in order to pass it on to the cartel. And, finally, the translation of the testimony collected in the languages spoken by the members of the cartel. Would this marquetry of languages around a testimony help or hinder the understanding of the logic of the said and its consequences?

The multilingualism in the *passee* system favours, from a practical point of view, greater flexibility in the composition of the cartels and contributes to forge working links at the international level. **Language(s) and the *passee*** is a theme which condenses both the most structural and singular experience of the *passee* and the political dimension of our School. We hope that this meeting will be an opportunity to reflect and share the different aspects of our initial option.

¹ J. Lacan, « L'étourdit », *Scilicet* 4, Paris, Seuil, 1973, p. 47.

² Cf. J. Lacan, « Discours à l'École freudienne de Paris », Paris, Seuil, 2001, p. 263.

³ Cf. J. Lacan, « La direction de la cure et les principes de son pouvoir », *Écrits*, Paris, Seuil, 1966, p. 641.

⁴ Cf. J. Lacan, *Le Séminaire, livre XX, Encore*, Paris, Seuil, 1975, p. 126.

⁵ J. Lacan, *Je parle aux murs* [Le savoir du psychanalyste], Paris, Seuil, « Paradoxes de Lacan », 2011, p.18 (leçon du 4 novembre 1971).