

THE BODY ENIGMA IN PSYCHOANALYTIC CLINIC

Maria Leonor Sampaio Bicalho

Leonor Bicalho

Centro

Universitário de
Brasília (UnICEUB),
Programa de
Pós-Graduação em
Teoria Psicanalítica,
Brasília/DF, Brasil.

English version

Doris Dana

Pontifícia

Universidade

Católica do Rio de

Janeiro (PUC-

Rio), Programa

de Pós-Graduação

em Língua Inglesa,

Rio de Janeiro/RJ,

Brasil. Universidade

Estácio de Sá

(Unesa-RJ),

Programa de

Pós-Graduação em

Educação, Rio de

Janeiro/RJ, Brasil.

ABSTRACT: This article objective is to debate about the challenge that represent the work with the body in a psychoanalytical contemporary clinic. This is based on body enigm, wich can express the unspeakable, showing reality with all consequences. The subject situated in the interface between the language and the enjoyment, search for giving a meaning to body enigm. In this context, the knowloge built on subject analysis shows an articulation wich put togheter a men way of language, enjoyment and body.

Keywords: Clinic, body, language, enjoyment.

RESUMO: Pretende-se mostrar o desafio que consiste o trabalho com o corpo na clínica psicanalítica contemporânea. O enigma corporal expressa o indizível, colocando o real em foco, com todas as suas consequências. O sujeito por estar na interface entre o campo da linguagem e o campo do gozo, além das implicações subjetivas aí presentes, busca dar sentido ao enigma corporal. Assim, o saber que é construído na análise pelo sujeito corresponde a uma articulação que enlaça de um modo novo a linguagem, o gozo e o real do corpo.

Palavras-chave: Clínica, corpo, linguagem, gozo.

DOI - <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1516-14982016003007>

In contemporary times, with the advent of globalization and the new social bond in its multiple expressions, built by the fragmentation of the values, ideals and the family paradigm, one can witness the occurrence of many social changes that influence the construction of the process of subjectivation. In addition, the marks inscribed in the body of the subject due to his life story are also in evidence, as well as the influence of the linguistic knowledge on the body, pointing to a subject who is not interested anymore in knowledge, but in jouissance.

In this context, the contemporary subject in face of an immeasurable amount of information that must be processed quickly in everyday life, is also faced with the undeniable fragility of the Name-of-the-Father in present time, which does not build law and limits anymore. Such fact leads the subject to be held hostage of a helpless anguish and eventually turn it into a subject without reference, who tries to find jouissance at any price. In addition, in an attempt to find immediate gratification, he does not measure the consequences of his actions. In this sense, we agree with Forbes when he states:

in these new terrifying and anxiogenic times, creative invention of this new social bond that brings a new love is necessary, besides the parental hierarchy established by modernity (FORBES, 2006, p. 4).

The effects of these transformations make the contemporary subject build new clinical symptoms and a new psychic economy, as Melman (2003) would say. These facts produce new forms to express subjectivation, in which the subject looks for a more direct relationship with jouissance, to express a connotation of a contingent encounter, in a given context, between a subject and the emergence of jouissance. This means that in postmodernity, when all kinds of jouissance come in through this incessant production-consumption machine and, in an attempt to homogenize the practices with the body, surplus jouissance shows up and is placed beyond the discourse, introducing a no-knowledge located in the body.

In this scenario, the body image arises as a unique construct, leading the subject to consider relevant the transformation of his *meat-body* (the organism which is genetically given to him and that needs to be recognized) into something sculptural, in a constant pursuit for perfection and satisfaction once lost. This body takes the lead in the social scene, expressing frustration, dissatisfaction, pain and suffering, in an attempt to express a saying that remains forgotten. This fact shows that very frequently when the subject becomes alienated of his *language-body* (erogenous body, built by the significant articulation), he forgets that it is the language, through *lalangue*, that the body is named and receives a role. Thus, it is still possible to observe the contemporary subject's efforts in

building a *window-body*, which presents an erotic character, as an appeal to a unique listening, seeking a look that makes it recognized. In this sense, it turns out to be a stage where the unfolding of a complex web of possible articulations between the somatic and the psychic can be seen, depicting the need to find a gap between discourse, jouissance and body.

On the assumption that the language-body is built through the movements of the subject in the discourses, the jouissance and the writing, this paper will examine the *body* in the contemporary psychoanalytic clinic, trying to place the *body puzzle*, by showing that many analytical demands undergo body issues. To this end, we will start with an epistemosomal discussion, and bring the body as the place of jouissance in the clinical work. While investigating the body that suffers and somatizes, the analyst will contact the paradoxes experienced by the subject through the unsaid and the misunderstandings, trying to investigate the different ways of meaning which are present here, that is, from the meaningless to the constructions of meaning, focused on how the subject will manage to find himself in the discourse during the analytical work.

When considering the body language as the impossible to say, in the clinic, the contemporary subject presents the way he experiences his body, when quite often it is articulated with the suffering that he builds without knowing it, while the analyst is seen as an alleged knowledge. In this sense, Melman's contribution (2008) is important to discuss the theme, in presenting the subject building individual beliefs and myths in the history of his life, which will have to be deconstructed in the analysis, so that the subject can leave the subjective position of a *mute body* and build a *talking body*, according to Lacan's teachings.

Following this form of argument, it is important to note, in contemporary times, the action taking the place of emotion, showing the subject dominated by compulsion, in search of immediate pleasures. This fact will make the subject present himself as a CDD-C (consumes), D (destroys himself or the other) and then D (dejetcs). This is the quest to find the limit of knowledge about jouissance, as something that we live in the body, outside the standards, beyond biology. In contemporary times, it seems that the axis pursued by the subject is focused on the various modes of jouissance that are at his disposal and, in the face of messy social ties, he turns into a subject without reference, showing a passive position in front of the ex-ist.

In this context, the Lacanian theory presents the need to rethink the psychoanalytic theory and practice, with a reading of the clinic that goes through the articulation of language, discourse, jouissance, and writing. Previously, during the analysis, the work was focused on the movements of the subject and his position occupied in the various *discourses* (the master's, the hysterical's, the University's and the analyst's), showing the subject changing positions according

to the discourse in use. Nowadays, it is necessary to consider the contemporary subject who is often imbricated to injunctions that harness the *capitalist discourse*, which makes no social bonds, leading the subject to a rampant narcissism. In addition, it presents the subject's relationship with consumption and *jouissance* at any price, also showing that knowledge is reduced to a market value

In the clinic, you can infer that the subject tries to make himself understood using the expression of the plurality of *jouissance* that are at his disposal. Thus, it's possible to work the new forms of manifestation of subjectivity in the contemporary world, emphasizing among them, the presence of the body, sometimes coupled to the psychosomatic phenomenon and its appeal to the real. This fact may induce the subject, through repetition, to make that *aggression or boredom* take the place of the subject's affiliation to the father by moving this affiliation to the body, where an injunction with the organ damage can happen, an idea we share with Nasio, like this:

where there is local suffering, the object dominates the body and makes the subject disappear, who incorporates in the lesion and it is this cut that the analyst should make so the subject is able to resume his life, which was paralyzed, frozen in injury (NASIO, 2003, p. 41).

The Freudian theory previously presented a theoretical proposal about the existence of a *body ego*. In 1914, in the text — Introduction to narcissism, Freud stated that the whole body could become erogenous, that is, with the passage of the self-erotic body to the narcissistic body, the subject takes his own body as an object of love. In 1923, in the text — The id and the ego, the author stated that the ego is first and foremost a body ego and, only in 1926, in the text — Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety — is that Freud emphasizes the body pain that brings a narcissistic investment, showing that the ego is responsible for the relationship between perception and reality. In this sense, since Freud, the first body sensations inscribed in the children's psyche could bring throughout the history of the subject's life a very big influence, noting that the future love and professional choices, besides the intellectual production of the subject, could express remains of these inscriptions.

The evidence of subjective implications in the body express the body damages with the power to change the destinations of a lifetime; the subject can build a *body puzzle* without knowing it. In fact, this topic has been neglected by psychoanalysis, sometimes identified only with the discourse of a sick body. In this sense, it is necessary to bring the psychoanalytic knowledge to the debate on the axes of *ethics* and *aesthetics*, which are in evidence in contemporary times, for it will be through these arguments and questions that the study of the body in

the clinic will support new opportunities for reflection on the analytic listening. Thus, the analysis will allow an innovative construction of what's going on in the relationship between language, discourse, body and modalization of jouissance.

BODY PUZZLE: A SEARCH OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT JOUISSANCE

This invention built by the subject to display the injunctions that are articulated in the unconscious (real) web of the body, presents the unutterable which is not yet organized in words. Consequently, this can leave marks on the body, causing the subject to alienate, at the same time that a new possibility of jouissance is introduced. It is relevant to note that when Lacan developed his theory, he emphasized in his Seminars (7, 11, 16, 17, 18) the question of the body, often articulated to psychosomatic reactions, stating that they are found under the real. So, the formulation of the real as something that erupts with violence in the psyche begins, making the subject to act. In this way, the work in the clinic will be focused on the *meaningless* that brings injunctions to the body in an attempt to abolish imaginary certainties, as well as enabling new articulations of jouissance.

Lacan, in the first moments of his theoretical studies, stated that the body exists due to the mirror experience, presenting the work with the body articulated to the image that the subject has built during his life story, without knowing it. He believed at this time that the impact of the mirror on the child brought rejoicing, manifestation of happiness, because it marked the assumption of the self-image. In the text *Radiophony* (1974), the author articulates the assumption based on the idea that the reason for the existence of the body is the act of jouissance; this fact is based on the theoretical framework of Seminar 7 — Ethics in Psychoanalysis, in which he introduces the discussion of the concept of the act of jouissance at any price.

In this sense, it will be necessary to abandon a finished discourse and enter a constituent discourse, which will make the revelation of the discontinuance of all possible discourses, when stating that something is not working well. This means that the development of clinical work requires the subject to be distant from his suffering (of the body) so that he can understand the logic of self-reference contained here, and only afterwards, based on a production of knowledge, have access to the unknown, to the unconscious.

Following the development of Lacan's theory in order to understand the clinic of the real articulated to the question of the body, it is important to emphasize the notion of the unconscious, which has undergone several modifications during the teaching of Lacan, since it corresponds to a knowledge that doesn't speak. Since the time of the famous phrase — *the unconscious is structured as language* — until the moment the unconscious can be considered *a knowledge at the level of the substance*

body (SOLER, 2010), an articulation is unveiled due to the deciphering of the symptom in psychoanalysis. The same author says "of the speech of intersubjectivity" in the 1950's to "I speak with my body" of the 1970's, there's a world that launches a new definition of the unconscious itself (SOLER, 2010, p. 11).

This also means that in the analytical context, it is necessary to build a possible articulation between the subject and time, in which it is observed that the subject will attempt to make up for the lost time, and in many cases, will attempt to run against time, throwing himself into an uncertain future, which may bring consequences for the body. Later, Lacan recasts the logical modalities, including time: the time of what ceases to the contingent and the possible, or the time of what does not stop for the necessary and the impossible. As a result, the subject may end up compromising his body, revealing at this point, the inability to think, say and do. Therefore, this body, which is no longer just an image, but that also brings the marks of a life story and can, through experienced dilemmas, get to build an organ damage.

In this scenario, Wartel (2003) gives a contribution which deserves to be considered, in saying that a significant no longer refers to another, because a gelation of the significant chain has occurred here. He also shows that there is no more consistency in the significant system, because the real erupted with violence, bringing the stranger, the injunction, a fact which can be manifested by an organ damage.

In addition, Dolto (2000) had earlier stated, that the body image builds itself and at the same time, can become *meaningless*, for as it results from a subjective deviation, the subject sees himself facing this knowledge that is subscribed in the flesh, trying to bring sense and meaning to the not-known, preventing the movement between the letter and the position of the subject. In this context, the body disease can replace it as a way to support the subject facing the unbearable pain of ex-isting. Thus, the author also claims that the mirror image, the unconscious body image, begins to mean pain and not rejoicing, as master Lacan previously theorized.

At this moment of the discussion, Nasio's contributions (2003) will help in the study of the topic, when he says that the real is the non-physical, the absolute, the one that doesn't change and that can be represented in the place of the meaningless, where the body broadens out, takes place, changing the position of the subject. So, it can turn the language-body into suffering, in an attempt to portray its relationship with the ex-isting. In addition, the author reveals that somewhere there is a significant appeal, which can bring the sick body in response.

So it is relevant to consider the look that goes into the scene of the body, from the assumption that the look of the subject to his own body reveals the

need of *the wish to be looked at*, because he needs the look of the other in order to be himself. However, it also reveals the presence of a demand for recognition, and in some cases, for the absence of that recognition, the subject accepts to have only the rejection expressed by the look of the other, who will be the forming agent influencing the image to be built of his body and of himself. Thus, this plot will develop on the subject from the body he claims to have and the constructions that he managed to build for the ex-sistence which should be worked on the analysis. That's why we talk about the presence of a new consistency and not of the lack of consistency, thus showing that something creative has been incorporated to the subject.

Furthermore, in order to understand the question of the body in the clinic, it is necessary to introduce the following questioning: what is the place of *jouissance* in the body? With the contributions of Guir (2001), it is possible to understand that in the case of an organ damage, it primarily connects to desire, by means of the appeal, not only to be said, but also for the lesion to become a word and set as a writing. In fact, it is not a significant appeal and, more precisely, it refers to a cry of pain, as it comes to the subject when he is not ready to receive it, revealing another real, a spoken knowledge that eludes the word.

So, to further the study about the theme, it will be relevant to consider the contribution of Nasio (2003), which clarifies how it is possible to work with the body in the clinic, indicating that it is necessary to invent the grammar of the lesion and the relationship with the analyst's position: what to say, what to do? This paper proposes the introduction of a way of working with the *language-body* expressed by the discourse, always attentive to the real of the body which also manifests itself through the *meaningless*, but not forgetting the *meat-body*, for indeed this is what shows up, gets sick, disfigures, and in the latter case, dies.

Before the ambiguous articulation of *jouissance* expressed by the body when approaching the body as a theoretical construct, Lacan considers it subsidized by three aspects, namely: the *imaginary body* is presented as a mirror image that embodies the world, representing the human silhouette. The *symbolic body*, as an articulator of the significant chain, of the position of the subject before desire and the lack-of-being, and finally, referring to the *real body*, as the place of sensations and *jouissance*, made up of microimages, from which feelings or *jouissance* emanate, therefore known as a *jouissance body*, apparently meaningless. At this moment he points out that: "There where the meaning is lost, something real comes up", which means that the real is not unified, but plural. At this point, it is necessary to elicit the real of the contingency of saying, showing that the real makes no sense, but resonates, pointing to an injunction that allows the subject to escape the authoritarianism of the signifier.

Nasio, based on Lacanian assumptions, develops some aspects that contribute to an articulation between body and jouissance, by emphasizing that "the body image shows a privileged path in order to gain access to the unconscious of the patient" (NASIO, 2008, p. 71). Therefore, the author considers the *imaginary body* a mirror image (the image we see), that fascinates, and besides that, also shows that everything can be seen in the mirror, except what you feel. First, it was thought that the identity was built through the mirror image, so the presence of the other would be necessary (alterity) in order to be ourselves. The *symbolic body* corresponds to the body that I name, the body-significant, featuring metaphors that have the power to produce effects in the history of life. And, finally, he refers to the *real body*, as the body of the sensations, the one that you can never seize, for only its movements and articulations are perceived, producing injunctions so that something will happen.

In this scenario, the construction of the *body puzzle* is initiated by revealing a subject who is divided, alienated. This alienation corresponds to the beginning of the logical path, which allows the subject to move from the speech (saying- which corresponds to a position of the truth) to the talk (act- it reflects a relationship with the truth). We know that in analysis, the saying is not interpreted, just the talking. This means that in contemporary times, there will be a symbolic sterility to the significant, targeting the subject to a general narcissism. Before this, we raise the following question: how to work with the body in the contemporary clinic?

PSYCHOANALYTIC CLINIC: THE REAL OF THE BODY

In the clinic, it will be necessary to work the subject's position in face of the injunctions with the body, which involve not only an injunction that portrays the alienation of the subject, but also his neglect towards his paradoxes, ambivalence and impasses. Before this fact, it is necessary to be attentive to the marks inscribed in the body associated to the needs, demands, desires and, mainly, to the modalization of manifest jouissance, portrayed by the writing that allows to show that the real resonates the effects in the body. This may seem nowadays a new challenge to the psychoanalytic clinic, in which it is possible to develop researches on the uneasiness that permeates the clinical experience in the analysis: is jouissance a real dimension of the body?

We set out from the contributions of Braunstein (2003), who emphasizes as the first property of the subject, the relationship with his body and the body of the other. In this case, it is possible to infer that jouissance corresponds to a connection with the need, as it can demonstrate some sort of impossibility. This happens because of the presence of an excessive jouissance, a jouissance

that triumphs over desire in search for satisfaction. It turns out that this time, subjective disorders are expressed, pointing to the subject's relationship with his body, by showing the ex-istence of a support that borders dissatisfaction.

In the context of the contemporary clinic, in which the work is carried out with the real of the body, we observe an emptying of *jouissance* and consequently, of meaning. It is possible to infer that in this case, the meaningless resonates effects, providing an indeterminacy that presents itself as a form of impossibility, with which the subject will have to deal with. Faced with this fact, the relationship analyst-analysant can no longer be necessary, but based on contingency, and the analyst should handle this invention of the subject, by investigating what led him to build a story for this inscription. It also happens that this inscription marks the body of the subject with a *jouissance* that can be excessive, violent and even deadly in some cases.

In addition, the analysand will have to resume a word that brings him something consistent about himself, imbricated in the relationship with his body, in which the Lacanian teachings refer to an epistemomatic articulation (relationship between what is spoken, what is articulated) instead of working just the psychosomatic (injury), in which there is reference to a body that alternates suffering and *jouissance*.

From Nasio's position, in addition to "everything is built by the body and from the balance of the body" (NASIO, 2008, p. 82), it is possible to infer that, nowadays, in the psychoanalytic clinic, working with the body issue is based on two axes, namely: the *ethical* (desire), in which Lacan shows that the subject is ethical, and the *aesthetic*, in which the body takes the lead in the social scene and responds as an only-afterwards. Thus, in contemporary times, in which the image is prioritized, the aesthetic actions will occupy a prominent place, while in the field of ethics, an attempt to restore the desired condition of the subject persists.

In contemporary times, numerous body ailments take the center of subjectivity at the same time that they are apparently meaningless. This happens because a deformed body image is seen, when constructing an imaginary anatomy. In this sense, we agree with the teaching of Lacan, in saying that the images lure the subject, and thus, forge reality. In this context, it will be necessary to go further in the clinic, when working the possible articulations between necessity and the real of the body.

The contributions of Fernandes assist in the analysis of the theme, in stating that "we violate the boundaries of the body, which corresponds to the source of frustration and suffering, because it expresses the contemporary discontent" (FERNANDES .2008, p. 14). In addition, the author poses an interesting ques-

tion for our reflection: what body is this that shows itself and can be received by the analyst in his listening?

In response, we should consider, in the clinic, the importance of the analyst to be attentive to the imaginary of the era with its ethical and aesthetic references, which contribute to the construction of new ways of expressing the symptoms in contemporary times. Thus, the body in evidence shows to be invested with *jouissance* when it is presented full of *jouissance*, revealing anxieties, desires, uncertainties, impossibilities, besides joy or frustration, disappointments or failures. This demonstrates that the subject builds a *body puzzle* without knowing it, a provoking fact to the advancement of our theoretical structure, revealing the possible relationship between the psychic and the somatic that distracts our mind.

To theorize about the contemporary psychoanalytic clinic, one cannot forget to introduce the logic of self-reference, which will allow the inscription in the body of marks of inscriptions carried out by the subject who run through the existence. To this end, the contributions of Lombardi (2008) help in the study of the topic, because they express the ambiguity of the signifier when making castration out of *jouissance*. In this sense, it is also possible to understand Lacan's observation that the symptom is the stabilizer of the subjective structure, because it brings a crystallized knowledge of the subject about himself. In addition, it brings the revelation that there's *jouissance* that doesn't move in the same rhythm of the discourse, thus committing the order of the established discourses because it is expressed through the writing, in order to orient itself towards the real.

It is worth mentioning that the clinical work with the *body puzzle* refers to the time of Lacan's teaching, in which the influence of logic (mathematics) is present, in showing the articulation of the body with the *partêtre*, with a deepening in the study of the theories of Cantor, Gödel and Turing, who studied the issue of the real scar of the subject, showing that this goes beyond the order of the language. At this point, it is essential to refer to the contributions of Soler, who states: "this subject who not only makes a hole in the chain, who is not just mentality, but presents body substance, namely, the *partêtre*" (SOLER .2012, p. 29). Such contribution refers to Lacan's teaching in presenting the clinic of the real, in which it will be possible to perform the articulations between the *partêtre* with the real of the body. The author still explains the presence between the real characteristic of the symbolic and the real outside the symbolic (to which knowledge is added) in which only the borromean knot is allowed to be inscribed.

It is clear to note that Lacan also retrieves Aristotle's concepts of *automaton* and *túrke*, in order to better develop the concept of recursion (automatic unconscious repetition). Given this scenario, it is possible to theorize that the body can express the impossible to say, putting the real in focus when the subject doesn't want to know or can't talk, because due to his own division, he is alienated and

just claiming its plurality of *jouissance*. At this point, he seems to be dominated by constructed individual myths and beliefs that have been crystallized by his life story, for not realizing his recursion. He seems to feel powerless in the face of an unhappy destination, in which the body reveals a significant self-applied misunderstanding, referring to a writing that insists on being inscribed. In this sense, psychoanalysis is committed to explain the contradiction and not to delete it, because by eliminating the contradiction, it could also eliminate the subject.

Therefore, we can observe that Lacan in Seminar 18 – On a discourse that might not be a semblance — presents the *partêtre* not as an agent of the act anymore, but as an effect of the act performed by the subject, from the repetition. In this context, it is possible to raise the following question: what is the theoretical articulation with the clinic from the body? With the contributions of Lombardi (2008) it is possible to understand that the *act* corresponds to the only moment when the signifier can signify himself, i.e. the significant is self-applied, bringing significance. This aspect shows the change in Lacan's thinking on the theme, and at the same time, offers a better understanding of what Wartel (2003) did not well explain in his book, when he presented the occurrence of the *gelation* in the significant chain, at the moment the body disease is produced.

Soler contributes to deepen the theme in presenting that “the mystery of the talking body corresponds to the body marked and affected by the knowledge of the subject's *lalangue*, always singular, never completely understandable” (SOLER .2010, p. 27). This means that Lacan introduces a new word (*lalangue*), which will allow new articulations between the unconscious, the language and the real. In addition, *lalangue* (*alingua*) expresses the core, it brings the function of an excess of *jouissance*. It is possible to infer that this fact also establishes a possible articulation between the unconscious and the body, in which the unconscious corresponds to the Lacanian theory at this moment, to an evidence of the knowledge that escapes the talking being.

So, to show a subject with his unique and excessive *jouissance*, Soler (2010) presents the unconscious which is no longer connected to the language but to *lalangue*, and that does not correspond to a structure, because there is still no order there. In this context, the author (2012) reveals that the body is marked, originally, by *lalangue*, in which the child handles grammatical things, meaning a story started prematurely, in early childhood, but that is hidden because of contingencies. She also stresses that *lalangue* has *jouissance* and so conveys something besides the language.

Because of the work of analysis, the subject starts to build a new knowledge that makes him recognize his subjective configuration, and with that, starts to perform an act. Such deed will put him in front of this automatic unconscious repetition (*automaton*, unrelated to desire). It is observed that from here the subject

may choose (*túrke*) an aspect elucidated in analytical practice, which consists of a logical effort to try to elucidate the automatic repetition. Continuing this logic of thinking, it is possible to notice a hole that borders the impossibility to understand in the body language, which can be expressed through dissatisfaction, indetermination and injunctions that insist in being written, although the subject doesn't want to know anything about it.

In the analytical context, the subject will have the possibility to move between the body image and the real of the body, discovering the clinic as a stage where he can show his concerns, by means of language or of the effects in the body. This fact has prompted scholars to continue their researches, aiming to get the meaningless of the *body puzzle*. Thus, it is possible to say that from the body he claims to have and the constructions that the analysand managed to do during the analysis, there are changes in the relationship of the *partêtre* with knowledge and this is because the knowledge one knows, but that it can't be known, can bring various effects, and among them, the body itself can weaken and express a body disease. In this sense, the analysis consists of a logical effort to try to elucidate the automatic repetition (recursive), leading the analysand to stop being a victim of an automatic repetition, a fact manifested in the Lacanian theory, from Seminar 17 — The reverse of psychoanalysis, in which the author shows the act, from repetition.

Continuing with this logic of thought, another of Soler's contributions is relevant, when he presents "a body with an emptiness of jouissance (...), mainly in the psychosomatic phenomena", the author also states that "psychoanalysis is a technique of the body, to the extent that through the work of speech, the surplus jouissance is highlighted, present in everything the subject says and does" (SOLER .2010, p. 85). So, it is possible to place this object with a particular status, because it involves a certain coefficient of jouissance due to the signifier, in which something lost will not be refunded, but partly, only compensated. This is an attempt to rid him of the injunctions that triggered in his meat-body (biological) the sickening, the scourge, as well as the apparently meaningless alienation.

Therefore, the analysis will be the place where the unfolding of this plot will be developed, in which the subjective position change will occur as an effect of the act. It is in this scenario that the patient will want to know what's going on with himself, what to do with the repetition, because the signifier is repeated, trying to achieve the impossible. On this quest, he will be able to express another kind of knowledge that ties the language in a new way, the *lalanguage*, the jouissance and the real of the body.

Finally, we emphasize that in the contemporary psychoanalytic clinic, the research path will certainly go through the *lalanguage* scar, which will have pos-

sible articulations with the subject of the unconscious. In the dimension of the real, it is possible to realize a number of movements of the significant towards *lalangue*, towards the real. This will be due to the misconception of the discourse, articulated with the body reference, in which an epistemosomal injunction will be possible, showing the *partêtre* building a new articulation between the somatic and the psychic. Therefore, among the deeds we encounter in the analysis, such as fantasizing, hallucinating and, especially, the presence of body issues, show that the active element is not the subject, but an autonomous and bounded region in the body.

In the analysis, the analysand's meaningless speech is a focus, allowing him to escape the authoritarianism of the signifier; on the analyst's side, through his interventions, we will observe that his listening evokes the real resonating effects in the body, showing that there is a spoken knowledge that escapes the word. This fact reveals the presence of a new configuration, a knowledge that places the *partêtre* at the interface between the field of language, of *lalangue* and of *jouissance*, in an attempt to construct a meaning for the meaningless expressed by the *body puzzle*.

Received: November 14, 2012. Accepted: July 18, 2013.

REFERENCES

- BIRMAN, Joel. *O mal-estar da atualidade*. Rio de Janeiro : Ed. Vozes, 2005.
- BRAUSTEIN, A. *Goce*. México: Siglo Vintiuno, 1990.
- DOLTO, F. *A imagem inconsciente do corpo*. São Paulo: Ed. Perspectiva, 2001.
- FORBES, J. *O futuro de uma ilusão*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Companhia de Freud, 2009.
- FREUD, Sigmund – *Obras Completas*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago Editora Ltda, 1970.
- _____. *Textos – Introdução ao narcisismo*, 1914.
- _____. *O id e o ego*, 1923.
- _____. *Inibição, sintoma, angústia*, 1926.
- GUIR, R. *A psicossomática na Clínica Lacaniana*. Rio de Janeiro: Joge Zahar Ed, 2001.
- LACAN, Jacques – *Seminário 7: a ética da psicanálise (1959-1960)*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 1991.
- LACAN, Jacques – *Seminário 11: os quatro conceitos fundamentais da psicanálise (1964-1965)*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 1998.

- LACAN, Jacques – Seminário 16: de um outro ao Outro (1968). Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 2008.
- LACAN, Jacques – Seminário 17: o avesso da psicanálise (1969-1970). Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 1992.
- LACAN, Jacques – Seminário 18: de um discurso que não fosse semblante (1971). Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 2009.
- LACAN, Jacques. *Radiofonia* (1974) Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 2003.
- LOMBARDI, Gabriel. *Clínica y Lógica da Autorreferência*. Argentina: Letra VIVA, Librería y Editorial, 2008.
- MELMAN, Charles. *O homem sem gravidade: gozar a qualquer preço*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 2003.
- MELMAN, Charles. *A prática psicanalítica hoje*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 2008.
- NASIO, J.D. *Psicossomática: As formações do objeto a*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 2003.
- NASIO, J. D. *Meu corpo e suas imagens*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed, 2008.
- PORGE, Erik. *Jacques Lacan, um psicanalista: percurso de um ensino*. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília, 2006.
- SOLER, Colette. *O corpo falante — Caderno de STYLUS*. Rio de Janeiro: Fórum do Campo Lacaniano, 2010.
- SOLER, Colette. *Lacan: O inconsciente reinventado*. Rio de Janeiro: Cia. de Freud, 2012.
- WARTEL, L. *Psicossomática*. São Paulo: Ed. Perspectiva, 2003.

Leonor Bicalho
leonor.bicalho@gmail.com

Doris Dana
dorisdana@uol.com.br