

XII « RENDEZ-VOUS » OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL OF THE FORUMS  
VIII INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF THE  
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOANALYSIS OF THE  
FORUMS OF THE LACANIAN FIELD

1 - 5 MAY 2024

AN  
XIETY

HOW  
TO MAKE  
IT SPEAK?



MAISON DE LA CHIMIE  
28 BIS RUE SAINT-DOMINIQUE  
75007 PARIS - FRANCE

## VIII° MEETING

### OF THE SCHOOL OF PSYCHOANALYSIS OF THE FORUMS OF THE LACANIAN FIELD – EPFCL

MAY, 2, 2024

Maison de la Chimie – PARIS

### KNOWLEDGE AND IGNORANCE IN THE PASSAGE TO THE ANALYST

Opening N°9

Armando Cote - SPFLF France

### Psychoanalysts are savants of a knowledge of which they cannot speak

Lacan said these words in December 1967, shortly after his Proposition on the Pass. He completes this sentence by saying that psychoanalysis is not, for all that, a matter of mystagogie,<sup>[1]</sup> that is, of mystical initiation; in other words, there is no mystery or secret to be transmitted in analytic discourse. Psychoanalysts know [savent] many things, they have a certain erudition, but the structure of analytic discourse means that this knowledge [savoir] cannot be kept, maintained, sustained, between analysts, otherwise we are no longer in analytic discourse. There must be silence, *motus*, as Lacan puts it: "we know something about it, but on that, *motus*, that's settled between us [...] So we keep silent both with those who know and with those who don't know, because those who don't know can't know".<sup>[2]</sup> Indeed, those who think they know miss the singular truth of the *parlêtre*. To gain access to the knowledge [savoir] that interests psychoanalysis, we need a silence that is an act, that is to say, it refuses to serve a knowledge that is already established, in order to summon an unknown [insu] knowledge. It is in this place that Lacan makes a correspondence between this silence and the analyst who is embodied as semblant of the waste object [déchet],<sup>[3]</sup> object a.

It seems to me that this ignorance, in the form of silence, is linked to the act of being silent [se taire], an act that allows the turning point at the end of an analysis, but this is not just any silence, it is a silence that questions and opens onto the real.

Lacan delineates the boundary between *tacere* and *silere*.<sup>[4]</sup> He took this distinction from grammarians, who have been using it for a very long time. *Silere* is a type of silence associated with tranquillity, the absence of movement and especially of noise, with no remnant, no trace of an encounter, an exchange. *Tacere*, on the other hand, is a kind of silence that has a relation to something that cannot be silenced and that requires an act. Despite the act of being silent, an echo remains in the body. Freud called this phenomenon the drive. In the logic of *tacere*, to speak is to emerge from silence, to 'break the silence', to emerge from reticence (*re-tacere*). The silence of *tacere* is an act, because there is the possibility of choice on the part of the subject. Whereas the silence of *silere* reproduces no remainder, so there is nothing to be silent about.

The analyst-savant that Lacan evokes remains silent, not because he has nothing to say, but in order to summon unknown knowledge from the analysand. The demand for the Pass, it seems to me, is that moment in which the analysand decides to break the silence, *tacere*, in order to retrace and transmit what remains of the experience. *Tacere* then becomes *silere*, that is, a silence without remainder, because it is transmitted to the School. Lacan links this turning point between silences to ethics, and in particular to an affect that marks the passage from *tacere* to *silere*: "An ethics arises, which is converted into silence, not by way of fear, but of desire".<sup>[5]</sup> We find the desire to know as a relay in the face of dread, the horror of knowing. An ethics that converts the silence at the beginning of the experience, the silence of fear, *motus*, into a desire, a desire that is linked to knowledge [*savoir*] in progress [In English in the original].

Faced with the real, the psychoanalyst is a naïve [*ingénu*] savant, and this naïvety of which Lacan speaks in his Proposition requires a silencing of meaning in order to maintain the wonder of each case. As Borges says in his poem, 'El Ingenuo': "A mí sólo me inquietan las sorpresas sencillas".<sup>[6]</sup>

Translated by Susan Schwartz

---

[1] The mystagogue, is the catechist who teaches the neophyte, who has the mission of leading the person he accompanies to the heart of the Christian mystery.

[2] Lacan, J. 'Place, origin and end of my teaching' in *My Teaching*, trans., D. Macey, London, Verso, 2008. This text is available as a PDF on line.

[3] Lacan, J. Conférence au Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2 décembre 1975, *Scilicet*, n° 6-7, Paris, Seuil, p. 59-60.

[4] Lacan, J. Seminar XIV, The Logic of Fantasy, lesson of April 12, 1967. Unpublished.

[5] Lacan, J. Remarks on Daniel Lagache's Presentation: "Psychoanalysis and Personality Structure", in *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*, trans. B. Fink, New York and London, Norton & Company, p. 573.

[6] "I am only worried by simple surprises". This poem, translated as "The naïve", can be