

Charles Melman:

Phobia

Ephep Seminar

March 20th 2014

	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Lack</u>	<u>Object</u>
Symbollic	Real father	Symbolic Castration	Imaginary Phallus
Father	Symbolic Mother	Imaginary Frustration	Real Breast
	Imaginary Father	Real Privation	Symbollic Phallus

We are going to take up again, in a very precise way, the elements which for Lacan are the organisers of a phobia. We are going to do this by a demonstration, a series of assertions which are really unique to Lacan and which will among other things put into practice this chart which we have already seen, a chart which is comprised of the permutations of the real, the symbolic and the imaginary,

The citations from Charles Melman are from the seminar of Jacques Lacan: La relation d'objet et les structures freudiennes (object relations and Freudian structures). Editions of the Association Lacanienne Internationale, text reviewed and corrected in 1994

Is it not because of a permanent search for meaning to which Freud submitted himself that Lacan will substitute for this a pure combinatorial between symbolic father, real father, symbolic mother, imaginary father, a pure combinatorial which will make phenomena subjective, by an automatic permutation of these terms? To put this in a different way: Lacan, with this substitution, in going beyond the story, beyond the narrative, beyond its Romanesque character, given as an explanation of the putting into place of little Hans' phobia, simply takes structure into account. It is obvious that from a methodological point of view, this is not only original but also, I would say gives us an idea of how Lacan will deal with the "knots" later. In any case, the thought that a symptom could be determined independently of the story and the will of the subject, by a pure combinatorial is of such originality, that it has to be underlined.

I'm going to take up again lesson¹ XIII. I will begin a few pages before the end where the central point of the lesson is presented.

Lacan tells us "We are in a pre-oedipal relationship in which, phobia is determined". (p221) Phobia therefore, has a pre-oedipal determinant, whereas neurosis, you will immediately notice the difference, has an oedipal causality. Neurosis is a refusal, contrary to paternal law – a challenge. Phobia is linked to the pre-oedipal stage. To say this differently, we can say that phobia is independent of what could be called a structuring intervention. We cannot say that daddy is not there but phobia is independent of what could be the structuring intervention of the father.

¹Lesson XIII (13th March 1957)

Now – what strikes us immediately in what Lacan says is this: “I shall first remind you of the fundamental situation which prevails regarding the phallus in the pre-oedipal relation of the child to the mother”. (p221) The situation of the child concerning the phallus with regard to the mother – pre-oedipally. Lacan continues “The mother here is the object of love, the object desired for its presence. The reaction, the sensitivity of the child to the presence of the mother is very precociously manifested in his behaviour. This presence is very quickly articulated in the pair presence – absence with which we begin. That is a relation as simple as you can imagine”. (p 221) Even though Lacan does not say it, by the immediate introduction of the child to the dimension of absence, we can easily deduce that presence is going to be effective only by the possibility of this absence: in other words, that the mother may absent herself. It is very obvious if this (absence) has not begun: let us suppose that the mother is glued to her child, then it is obvious that absence itself cannot even be thought about. I will not dwell on this notion too much.

But, Lacan adds, “you know what we will begin with (the pair presence - absence). If difficulties have been raised concerning the early object world of the child it is because of an inadequate distinction in the term object itself”. (p 221) I think that on previous occasions, it has been necessary for us to reflect on the very strangeness of the term, and, I would say, of the difficulty in even defining it. We’ve often spoken about this before. What is it to recognize an object? And, because I know that we were very wise, we were able to observe the following: In the same way that the presence of the mother is envisaged only by her possible absence, in the same way the notion of an object is capable of being made present only because it is missing. It is because it is missing that we are led to ask, what is the presence of an object? Now, this presence is normally spared to us except in this relation which is in some way primordial, and which is

marked by the pair presence-absence. In this relation, the dimension of the object whether that has to do with the mother as an object for the child or the child as an object for the mother, this object is not put into the picture because of the possible reciprocity of absence. This has a clinical consequence, which although I dare not say it, I find amusing and certainly I am the only one to find it so. This accounts for what happens to mothers frequently: the fear that the baby will disappear, in other words will die because that is in some way the condition upon which his presence would be fully confirmed.

The baby's disappearance is necessary, so that his presence can be confirmed and here we have this dimension to which as we know, the baby will be very sensitive and will respond in his own way. Lacan adds "There is for the child, a primordial object which we can in no case consider as ideally contributed, that is to say in our idea. That the world of the child is made only of a pure state of suspension, with indeterminate limits, from the organ which satisfies him, that is to say the organ of nourishment, I am not the first to contradict." (p221)

Lacan here speaks of Alice Balint and so on. ²This "primordial object", I will explain this sentence, which risks appearing obscure to you despite the very advanced state of your work on this

²Micheal Balint has included in his book *Primary Love and Psychoanalytic Technique* (1965) a collection of papers written between the years 1930-1952 a chapter by his wife, Alice Balint, entitled "*Love for the Mother and Mother love*" (1939). She writes. "There exists an archaic form of love of which the essential determinant is the lack of reality sense toward the love object" (pp105-107). Lacan says: "This theory would reconcile the notion of auto-erotism as it is given in Freud with what seems to be imposed by the reality of the object with which the child is confronted at a very primitive stage of his development. It ends with an articulate and striking conception that Mr. & Mrs. Balint call *Primary Love*." Lacan also refers to this in the session of March 13th 1957. He says "in fact the notion of a love so strictly complementary and seemingly destined of itself to find its reciprocal, constitutes an evasion so little compatible with a correct theorization that the authors end by admitting that this position is ideal, if not ideactive." Lacan's specific reference is as follows: "The work of Alice Balint for example is there to spell out in a way that is certainly different, and I think less tenable than what I am in the process of telling you, which is that the mother exists which does not for all that suppose that there are already an I and a not I".

Ideactive condenses the words idea, ideal, and active.

question. And, so let me explain. It is really very simple. We cannot constitute this primordial object, as an idea, that is to say we cannot name it, because it exists only by its absence. And, so, this questions the notion of a world of fusion between the baby and his mother, because it lacks this representation, a kind of reciprocal confinement of mother and child, constituting a shapeless mass which cannot be seen, cannot be observed. Of course the mother exists but that does not for all that suppose that there is something already there which is called ego and non-ego. The mother exists because of the fact of this absence which founds her existence. But, this fact alone is not enough to mark the distinction, the separation from her. It is not enough to mark the distinction between ego and non-ego between who she is and who the baby is even if we take into account this shapeless mass which could make the mother exist as a symbolic object and as an object of love. This is not sufficient either. This epoch founded on the pair presence – absence, this system will not suffice to make a distinction between the maternal ego and the ego of the baby or indeed the non-ego represented by the mother. Neither will the fact that the mother exists as a symbolic object and as an object of love. This is not enough to make this distinction. Because a symbolic object, that is to say a representative of this absence, the symbol is always only the representative of absence. We are going to have to get used to this idea more and more.

That is why, I think that the symbolic order is becoming more and more uncertain because we function in a world that is very dense, limitless. Access to the symbolic has become really problematic. So also has the thought of absence which will be lived only in the register of privation and frustration.

Therefore, this does not mean that at this time the mother exists as a symbolic object, symbolic of this absence and as an object of love, that is to say as being invested in, in place of this absence and as a support therefore, of love. This is confirmed not only by experience but also by what I'm trying to formulate regarding the position which I give here to the mother, on this chart, this astounding chart which I mentioned at the beginning in so far as the mother is firstly we are told a symbolic mother, and that is only in the crisis of frustration, via a certain number of shocks, and with the particularity which arises in the relationship between mother and child, that she begins to be fulfilled, or that things begin to come true for her. This mother as an object of love may become at any given moment the real mother, because she frustrates this love. Because she is an object of love she is capable of not being up to the mark. That which founds her is frustration itself. The relationship the child has with the mother, the mother-child relationship is a relationship of love where there is in fact something which can open the door to what is called the first undifferentiated relationship. This is what I told you, because if (the child) has not got the ability to recognise it, he refutes it. He questions this notion of a first undifferentiated relationship, the entire fusion between mother and child.

Lacan adds: "In fact, what fundamentally happens in the first stage of the love relation which is the basis on which the child's satisfaction occurs or does not occur, with all the signification that this carries? What is it? It is that the child takes this relationship by including himself as an object of love for the mother, that is to say that the child learns that he brings pleasure to the mother. This is one of the fundamental experiences of the child that if his presence commands even just a little of the maternal presence that is necessary to him, it is because he introduces something very important. This is a sort of light, a brightness which ensures that

the presence of the mother surrounds him. This relationship is one which the child will bring her a satisfaction of love” (p222).

This is a pretty sentence but a very confused one, but which tells us exactly what it means. To put this differently, it is in this of kind of reciprocity that (the child) learns about his love for his mother to the extent that he himself is taken as a love object. But Lacan does not mention what I said earlier. This is to say, that essentially the child himself will be the object of love only in so far as he risks disappearing – as he risks being absent. I will not mention it here, it might be too arbitrary, but there is, as you know, what is called Sudden Infant Death Syndrome. This is a strange situation about which the media understand nothing, because it has to do with children who is general from an organic point of view are excellent. But it happens that the infant disappears brutally.

Lacan continues “The phrase to be loved” in inverted commas is fundamental. (Each one of us is a little aware of this). It’s the basis on which everything that will develop between mother and child, it’s precisely in so far as something is articulated little by little, in the experience of the child, which indicates to him that in the presence of the mother to him, he is not alone”. (p222)

We are in the pre-oedipal phase. There is something which is going to teach him that in this presence of the mother he is not alone. Lacan adds “It’s around this point that the whole dialectic of the relation of the child with the mother will develop (....). If he is not alone and if everything centres around that, this of course opens up for us one of the most common experiences, that he is not alone, because there are other children. (Of course this is not obligatory). But we have put forward as a basic hypothesis that there is another term, constant and radical, independent of the contingencies and the particularities of history - for example the

presence or absence of another child. It is the fact that the mother retains to a degree, which differs among subjects, a penis-neid which will have something to do with this". (p222-223).

This is the third term and before any intervention of daddy. The child will come to be inscribed in this relationship with a third term which is manifested by penis-neid. Lacan continues "The child fills this or he doesn't do so, but the question is asked. The discovery of the phallic mother for the child and also of penis-neid for the mother are strictly coextensive with the problem that we are trying to deal with at the moment". (p223)

What does penis-neid and the phallic mother mean?

Well, it means something entirely simple. It's because of the fact of her motherhood – it's something, I am in the habit of repeating that by the fact of her motherhood a woman will find herself finally decorated with the phallic medal. In the field of honour. On the front. In the trenches, if I may I dare say it like this? Well – indeed – she really has the medal now. And, therefore it's because of this instrument which the baby represents which responds to her penis-neid, she now finds herself marked by this phallic index. It's therefore good that the baby is able to be assimilated to the instrument.

There is a Freudian text that I cannot recommend highly enough – the title³ of which I have forgotten for the moment, but it will come back to me, but, anyhow you can find it yourselves.

³The Freudian text to which reference is made is a 1917 Paper entitled On Transformations of Instinct As Exemplified in Anal Erotism. S.E. XVII. There Freud writes "Thus, the interest in faeces is continued partly as interest in money, partly as a wish for a baby, in which later an anal erotic and a genital impulse (envy for a penis) converge" p131.

It's about the equivalence of a certain number of objects. There are four. There is the penis, money, faeces and child. It's audacious of Freud to have been able to establish such an equivalence. I will have to get this article for you if you don't already know it. I will have to get these coordinates for you. Now let us return to Lacan's text.

"One can see that it's in relation to the mother that the child experiences the phallus". (p223)

Essentially, the child has value for her only in so far as he responds to this instance which is "the centre of desire of (for) the mother and where he situates himself in differing positions, by which he is lead to maintain and very precisely to lure this desire of the mother". (p233).

This is to say to be the semblance of the penis which gives him this phallic value. "In some way, the child presents himself to the mother as being this something which offers to her the phallus in itself, to differing degrees, and in different positions" (p223). And, listen to the rest of this absolutely fabulous story. Lacan says: "here, he (the child) can identify himself, with the mother, identity himself with the phallus, identity himself with the mother as bearer of the phallus, or, he may present himself as bearer of the phallus. There is here a high degree, not of abstraction, but of generalisation, at this level of an imaginary relation, (To say this in another way of a mirror relation) – of a relation which I call luring by which the child in some way attests to the mother that he is able to fulfil her, not only as a child, but in her desire and if all be said, in what she is lacking" (p223)

I have to say that to my surprise that moment which is so finely described and detailed is assuredly decisive. When it cannot happen it is determinant of autism. Infantile autism is what happens when a mother is not able to register her child as a response to this penis need, that would give her the phallic medal. I am really surprised how each time I have to put this into the equation and every time I have to insist on emphasizing it. I am astonished by the radical desexualisation, which our colleagues who are interested in autism introduce into the question of infantile autism. It's really an operation which is outside the question of sex for her (for the mother) but that's precisely the reason why the child becomes autistic. If we do not want a child to become autistic, it is necessary that he is caught up in this anti-oedipal sexual dialectic, and, we know that there are mothers, who for different reasons, are not interested, or who are not able to put to good use this kind of economy, at this time. It's not complicated, it's really easy, as easy as ABC.

And yet it's strange. I would recommend heartily to you a book which has just been published by Erès, entitled *Autism and Psychoanalysis*⁴. This comprises a series of articles written by different practitioners on infantile autism. Read this book, and, you will ask yourselves where are the pages that deal with psychoanalysis, because it's not because these people are psychoanalysts and they work with babies – this does not mean that they are doing psychoanalysis. It's very disturbing. I'm personally disturbed to see how these practitioners deal with cases which they study in an imaginary way, the fact that sex is not involved and therefore they do not have to take into account some sexual determinants. Indeed, nothing to do with sex, but that is what infantile autism is about.

A strange state of affairs.

So I have made a clinical digression and why not! Let us say that the fact that this child can

⁴Amy: Marie Dominique. *Autisme et Psychoanalyse, Evolution des pratiques, Recherches et articulations*. Edition Erès. Paris. 2014

fulfil the mother not only as a child but also for what she desires and for what she lacks.

Lacan adds “The situation is certainly structuring, and fundamental because it’s around that and uniquely around it that the relation of the fetishist to his object is articulated”. (p223).

It’s amazing to link the genesis of fetishism with this early (precocious) stage. Lacan continues “for example, all the intermediate ranges which link him (the child) to such a complex and elaborated relationship, and which only psychoanalysis can give it its importance, and its accent, in speaking of transvestism, homosexuality being here reserved, since it concerns the need for the object and the penis in the other”. (p223). Therefore, in this work on the genesis of fetishism, of transvestism and of homosexuality, at this pre-oedipal stage, which is very primitive, very precocious, this need for the presence of the real penis in the other or of the object in female homosexuality – (is referenced). Lacan asks “At what moment will we see that something is going to put an end to this kind of relationship”? (p223). Ah – you will say that we will have to wait until big daddy arrives and take out his even bigger stick.⁵ Well – indeed – let us see if it is Guignol we are dealing with. Lacan continues: “that which puts an end to it in the case of little Hans, which we see at the beginning of the observation, by a kind of fortuitous illumination, by that happy miracle which is produced each time that we make a discovery, we see the child completely engaged in a relationship, in which the phallus plays the most evident role. The father’s notes on what he has observed of the child’s development up to the final hour when the phobia begins, testify to that. They teach us that little Hans is always phantasing about the phallus, asking his mother about the presence of the phallus in the mother, then in the father, then in animals. There is talk only of the phallus.

⁵The text in the French is the following: “Il faut attendre Guignol qui sorte des coulisses avec son gros baton”.

Guignol is a children’s puppet character, who fights against bad people, symbolising a battle against authority. It dates from the 18th Century.

If we are to trust the words that come down to us, the phallus is truly the pivotal object, the central object, of the organisation of his world. We are here with Freud's text before us and we are trying to give it its meaning." (pp223-244) What has therefore changed during this happy time while he is in a relationship of lure with his mother? Lacan asks – "what is it that changes when nothing critical occurs in the life of little Hans?" (p224) What has changed for him to now enter into a phobia? Well – it's not the cudgel⁶ that we were expecting. It's not big daddy. According to Lacan "what changes is that his own penis begins to become something absolutely real – (yes – no more imaginary) – his penis begins to move, and the child begins to masturbate. The important element is not so much that the mother intervenes at this moment, but that the penis has become real." (p224)

As you will remember, because he is thinking only of this, his mother said to him "If you touch yourself, I will cut it off" or something like that. Lacan adds "The massive fact of the observation is that the penis has already become something real. After that, it is very obvious that we have to ask ourselves if there is not a relation between this fact and what then appears at this time, that is to say anxiety" (p224).

We are not yet in phobia. It's anxiety. There is an imaginary luring relationship. It's his real penis which begins to move. He begins to masturbate and then anxiety begins. Lacan continues "I will not take up again the problem of anxiety here because we have to take things in their order. How we are to think about anxiety, which as you know, remains a permanent

⁶Trique in French also has a sexual meaning. It means to have an erection.

question throughout Freud's work" (p224), I draw your attention to Freud's, "Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety⁷" which is very difficult. Lacan adds "I will not give you in a sentence, a resumé of the ground covered by Freud, but I will say to you that as a mechanism, anxiety is always there in the stages of this observation, the doctrine comes along afterwards". (p224)

Freud's doctrine is that anxiety is linked to an excess of libido, of which an insufficiency of outlet provokes this effect. Anxiety is the building up of libido which is not satisfied, and that is why as a good hygienist against anxiety, dear father Freud refused that which surely Martha Freud would have wished, coitus interruptus, because she had enough of playing the good mother all the time. Freud tells us that coitus interruptus is a removal of libido satisfaction, which leads to a source of anxiety. We are here in a relatively simple mechanism which is that of Freud. Lacan continues "How are we to conceive this anxiety which occurs here? As closely as possible to the phenomenon. I ask you for a moment, to have recourse to that mode which consists in using a little bit of imagination, and you, will perceive that this anxiety (listen carefully), by this so extraordinarily evanescent relation in which it appears to us, surges up each time that the subject, as imperceptibly as may be, unglued from his existence, where he then perceives himself as being on the point of being recaptured by something that you will call, depending on the circumstances, an image of the Other, with a big O (image de l'Autre), temptation etc. In short, anxiety is correlative with the moment when the subject is suspended between a time by which he no longer knows where he is, and near a time in which he is going to be something in which he will no longer be able to find himself again. That is

⁷ Freud. S. Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety in S.E. Vol. XX pp77-174

anxiety" (p224). That is to say, this time of vacillation between a time when he no longer knows where he is, and near a time when he will be something that he can never refind again. A pivotal moment. Lacan continues "Do you not see that at the moment when there appears for little Hans, in the form of a drive, in the most elementary sense of the term, something which moves, the real penis." (p224)

Here, we have the new moment! He (the child) begins with the time which was that of the imaginary which he has to renounce, to enter into a time where he will be something. Lacan continues "it's at this time when, what had for a long time been paradise for him, even happiness, begins to seem like a trap – namely, the game in which one is, or one is not, or, in which one is for the mother everything that the mother wants. Of course, I cannot speak of everything at once, and I am contenting myself here with indicating that all this depends, after all, on what the child really is for the mother. We shall introduce a difference in a moment, and we shall try to approach more closely what Hans was for his mother. But for the moment, we remain at this crucial point which gives us the general schema of things. Until now, the child in a satisfying or non-satisfying way is in this paradise of the lure with a little bit of happiness and indeed, very little, to sanction this relationship, so delicate to manoeuvre. (But there is no reason not to see that he has been able to play this game for a very long time, in a satisfying way). On the contrary, the child tries to flow, to integrate himself into what he is for his mother's love. But, from the moment, his own drive intervenes, his real penis, there occurs this ungluing about which I spoke earlier. He is caught by his own snare, dupe of his own game, prey to every discord, confronted by the immense gap there is between satisfying an image, and having something real to present – to present

in cash⁸, if I may say so. So, what does not fail to occur is not simply that the child fails in his attempts at seduction, for one reason or another, or that he is for example, refused by his mother. What then plays the decisive role, is that what he has to present in the end, appears to him (and we have a thousand examples of this, in analytic literature) as being something miserable". (pp224-225)

A catastrophe! He was in this imaginary lure and happiness with his mother and ready to assure her of all the images which she wished for. Now this real penis is moving and suddenly there is this image which falls and there is a gap between what was this ideal image and the miserable affair which he has to present to her. Why call it miserable? Lacan should really have been asked this question.

But he is not here! So we can't ask him! But, in any case, we are always in the preoedipal phase. Lacan thinks that the child will take up this feeling of what he has to give to his mother as being miserable because of the fact that he compares what he is able to see elsewhere, and not only with the horse, or even with his mother, because as you will remember he says: "you must have a big one, as big as the horse", and, therefore, with that, comes the feeling of the miserable character of what he has to offer. Of course, he tries. All that is marvellously delicate.

⁸In English in the original

Lacan continues: “at this moment the fact that the child is placed before this opening – this gap, this dilemma where he is becoming captive” (p225). This sentence will become clearer. But this doesn’t matter – let us go on. Let us make progress. We will see very clearly what happens. Lacan continues: “(the child becomes), the passive element of a game in which from then on he becomes the prey of the significations of the other”⁹ (p225).

I think that, this sentence contains errors in either the transcript or the stenography. But in any case, it hits at something totally unexpected. I am sure that none of us expected this just now. So-it says the following. “It’s very precisely on this point” – that is to say, when he becomes the captive, the victim, or the pacifying element in a game where he becomes from then on the prey of the significations of the other. I am certain that this sentence is surely wrong. I don’t know how Lacan would express it now. “This is linked to something which I indicated last year”.¹⁰ We did not hear him say this. “This is linked to the origin of paranoia, from the moment the game of luring becomes serious, and at the same time, it’s still only a game of luring, the child is entirely suspended from what the partner indicates to him. All these manifestations for him, all these manifestations of the partner, become for him a sanction of his sufficiency or of his insufficiency” (p225) It’s strange that Lacan situates paranoia here, in this preoedipal period as I say – entirely suspended on what would be the status of a moment, where in the relationship with the mother, the child will find the model of a relationship with the other, on which he will be entirely and permanently dependent, with regard to his sufficiency or insufficiency. Lacan notes: “to the extent that this situation is

⁹ On the Ephep site the other is written with a small o. In the French text it is with a large O. (l’Autre)

¹⁰ This is a reference to Lacan’s Seminar of the previous year (1955-56) entitled “The Psychoses”

continued that is to say, where the Verwefung (foreclosure) does not intervene, thereby leaving outside this term symbolic father, which we will see just how necessary in fact he is” (p225). Here, again the sentence is wrong, because it is to be read by leaving out the negation. It should read: “to the extent that this situation is continued, that is to say where the Verwefung (foreclosure) intervenes, leaving outside this term symbolic father, which we will see just how necessary, in fact he is” (p225).

There is every reason to believe that for Lacan himself, the elaboration of these points were not necessary – otherwise his sentences would not have been so convoluted. Lacan continues “But let us leave the symbolic father to the side, for the other child” (p225). For he who is not in this very particular situation of seeing and being delivered up, from this moment onward to the eye and the look of the Other – that is to say the future paranoiac” (p225). It’s funny how Lacan himself trips over himself in his own sentences: “For the other, the situation is literally without a solution by itself. That is to say the paranoiac delivered up to the capriciousness of the Other. Of course it has a solution, because if I am here, it’s to show you how the castration complex is the solution.” (pp225-226)

You see how I take this line by line because it’s really important. Lacan continues: “The castration complex takes up on the imaginary plane everything that is at stake concerning the phallus. It is precisely for this reason that it is convenient for the real phallus to be outside the field” (p226). Now, are you taking heed of this? Lacan again notes: “It’s by the intervention of an order which the father introduces with his prohibitions, with the fact that he introduces the reign of the law, namely, this something which means that the affair passes out of the child’s hands, but, is all the same, settled elsewhere. The father ensures that there

is no chance of winning, other than by accepting the distribution of parts as they are. It's because of this that the symbolic order intervenes precisely on the imaginary plane." (p226)

You don't understand a thing for the moment. That's very good! Wait just a little bit longer.

Lacan continues: "It's not for nothing that castration bears upon the imaginary phallus, but is in some way outside the real couple. An order is thus established where the child will be able to refind something with which he will be able to wait out the evolution of events". (p226)

To put this differently, the child enters into a period of latency – (but, I add this). Lacan

continues "This may seem to you a rather simple solution. It is not the solution, it is a rapid indication, a bridge to throw across. If it were so easy, if there were only one bridge to throw

across, there would be no need to throw it across. What is interesting is the point that we

have reached namely, that little Hans has reached, at the moment when precisely nothing of the sort is produced for him. With what is little Hans confronted? He is at the point of

encounter with the real drive and the imaginary game of phallic lure, and this with regard to his mother"(p226). So what does all this mean? It means that the complex intervenes firstly

by effacing the representation of the penis in the imaginary field, on the one hand, and on the other (and this is even more amusing) affirming the real character of the penis, that is to say,

putting it outside the field, because the real is outside the symbolic. To say this differently,

the real penis nourishes, in some way, the phallic instance which is present in the real. Does

all this astound you? It's completely scatty and therefore it is necessary that you take it up again attentively. I will say it again for you: the symbolic order intervenes on the imaginary

plane precisely, with this cutting of the image of the penis, in the image of the body. Cutting of the image of the penis in the image of the body. It's not for nothing that castration is the

imaginary phallus, that is to say that it bears on the imaginary phallus. But it is some way

outside the real couple that an order can be established, where the child can refind something through which he can attend the evolution of events.

Good! And so for little Hans the fact is symbolic castration did not happen. And what happened (for him) at that time? Well, what happened is a regression. Yes, a regression. This is an amusing part of the text. Very amusing indeed. Regression is a very important element of Freudian topology. To say this a little differently, for Freud, when a stage cannot be satisfied, a return to an earlier stage is produced.

Lacan takes up again in this Seminar this process and its questions by saying: "I would prefer that you are astonished for I am giving this term regression, the strict weight that I gave it in the last session before the break when we spoke about frustration. I said then, that in the presence of the mothers default, (when she is absent) the child collapses into the satisfaction of nursing. It is the same here where it is the child who is the centre, - he finds that what he has to give is not enough. He finds himself in this total disarray of no longer sufficing (p226). At this time, with the intervention of the real penis, he finds he is not sufficient. Lacan continues: "at this time regression is produced, which imitates the same short-circuit as that with which primitive frustration is satisfied, which leads the child to take possession of the breast to end all his problems. The only thing which opens up before him as a gap and this is exactly what is happening and this is the fear of being devoured by the mother. This is the first garb that the phobia takes, as you see in the case of our good little man. Whatever horse may be the object of a phobia it is really a question of a horse that bites. The theme of devoration is always somewhere to be found in the structure of phobia"

(p 226). To put this differently, if he is not able to satisfy his mother in this imaginary phallic lure, there is a return to an earlier stage. He will try and respond to the possibility of his mother's absence by trying to destroy her in the satisfaction of nursing. In the same way, he will imagine that if he is no longer able to satisfy her (his mother) she too will try to destroy her dissatisfaction by devouring him, which is not very nice!

What suspense! If you want to know who is the guilty one, wait a little longer! We are not too far away. But, as you can see, we can't wait. I should have thought more about the way in which the Lacanian sentences could be corrected especially where there are errors in the transcript. But you see, we can't just leave things here. Try to imagine what an audience could remember as there was no text. Notes had to be taken. It's not easy to take notes with sentences like these. Remember the state of disarray in which the students found themselves, and, think about how lucky you are! You will not be able to assess it.

Is that everything? Well of course not. As Lacan says: "It is not just anything that bites or that devours. We are confronted with the problem of phobia every time a certain number of fundamental relations are encountered with an object. It is better to leave some of these issues aside, so that we can articulate something clearly.

One thing is certain and it's this: the objects of phobia which are animals in particular, are immediately marked even to the eye of the most superficial observer, by this something which belongs essentially to the symbolic order.

If the object of a phobia is a lion, especially if a child does not live in a country where lions are to be found, then the lion, the wolf, even the giraffe are just these strange objects among which the horse shows a very precise boundary. This well shows that these objects are borrowed from a category of signifiers of the same nature, of the same family as those which one finds in coats of arms" (p227). To say this differently, they are emblematic not only of a totemic filiation, but, emblematic of certain properties assigned to the animal, which are assuredly, energy, courage, strength, agility, quickness, whatever you want.

Lacan continues: "those objects motivate Freud in the analogy between the father and the totem, in the construction of Totem and Taboo. Those objects have in fact a very special function, which is that of a stand in (for the signifier) of the symbolic father." (p227) (Here there is a mistake in French. *Il s'agit de suppléer à* means to make up for – to compensate for as well as to stand in for but it is not a pretty phrase). Lacan continues: "we do not see what the final term of this signifier is and one can wonder why it dons one form or another. There really must be in what we encounter something that belongs to the order of fact or of positive experience and to the irreducible" (p277).

From where does this symbolic father emerge? And, why is it here that he takes such a form?

Lacan continues: "I am not presenting you a deduction but something which is an apparatus made necessary by what we find in experience. Besides, we are not here to resolve the problem of why phobia takes the form of some particular animal. That is not the question" (p227). Well, it is clear that if the animal is present it's a testimony, a presentification (making presence) of a structural absence, - of an instance in the real. It's symbolic of that which is sometimes represented as that which bites because it is representative of that which

castrates. Of course this paternal instance honourably comes to represent it. Lacan tries to explain why there is something irreducible by stating: “There really must be in what we encounter, something that belongs to the order of fact or of positive experience and to the irreducible” (p227). To put this in a different way, we cannot explain it otherwise. Lacan adds: “This is not a deduction but it is something that is an apparatus made necessary by what we find in experience” (p227)

Therefore, this animal which bites, is in any case menacing. And, we are not quite going to say this – (it’s funny) – that the child cannot imagine some relation, some filiation with this animal because of course firstly, the giraffe-well-he himself is called Graff. This is not so far away and then as far as the horse is concerned, we know that he will play horse at home as if he were a little horse and also as I remarked earlier – it’s Freud – Professor Freud who is the true symbolic father of this family. From one day to the next Freud became a member of this family and that is what cured little Hans. It’s funny is it not? Good. We are going to finish in three minutes and thirty seconds and so let us finish this chapter. The storm is over, - the sea is calming, Lacan tells us about Freud’s phobia: “It’s a phobia on the march” (p227). That is to say we can see the evolution of how little Hans will develop. Lacan continues: “at the outset you see little Hans developing full steam ahead with all sorts of extraordinarily romantic imaginings concerning his relations with all those whom he adopts as his children” (p227). That is to say that he takes up a position of which we don’t really know if it’s a maternal or a paternal one, but in any case it’s a position. We can put forward this in a neutral way to give a term like the genitor or the parent. As Lacan notes: “this is a position which blends in an identification with the mother and the adoption of children (p228)”.

(Hans) takes “a whole series of amorous forms” (p228). But at the same time – look how interesting this is, at the same time an identification with the mother but also with little girls of whom he is the genitor. I would say he has amorous fixations on them. That is to say at the same time they are sexually involved. Lacan comments: “this episode is in contrast with what happens after the father’s interventions. Under pressure of analytic interrogation, more or less directed, made by the father at his side, he gives himself up to a sort of fantastic novel in which he reconstructs the presence of his little sister in a chest, in the carriage, on horses, a good many years before her birth. In short, a coherence is massively marked between what I shall call the imaginary orgy during the course of the analysis, and the intervention of the real father” (p228).

The intervention of the real father, Lacan tells us, at this time, is that the real father therefore, becomes a castrator. Lacan attributes this imaginary danger of little Hans equally to his parental identifications and his prolific omnipotence as well as his love attachments to little girls. The intervention of the real father, as Lacan says (has consequences): “If the phobia ends in the most satisfactory of cures, we shall see what *satisfactory cure* means in regard to his phobia – it is in so far as the real father has intervened, who had intervened, so little until then, and, who, moreover has been able to do so only because he has behind him the symbolic father, who is Freud. But to the whole extent that he intervenes, everything that was tending to be crystallised on the plane of a sort of premature real, takes off again into a radical imaginary, so radical that one no longer even knows very well where one is. One wonders at every instant if little Hans is not there to mock at the world. He incontestably proves to have a refined sense of humour, since it is a matter of an imaginary which plays in order to reorganize the symbolic world.

One thing is certain and it is that the cure occurs at the moment where castration as such is expressed in the clearest way, in the form of an articulated story. It is when the installation man, named as such, comes, unscrews it for him and gives him another. It is just there that the observation stops. The solution to the phobia is linked to the constellation of this triad, (and) the intervention of the real father. We will come back to this next time. He (the real father) is carried and supported by the symbolic father. The real father enters into this as a sorry type..... Freud is forced to say continually: *"it is better than nothing you must let him talk. But above all, do not understand too quickly"* (p228).

Lacan continues: "the result scans around his intervention on two points – Hans' imaginary orgy and the advent of castration, fully articulated, under the form of the replacement of what is real by something bigger and better" (pp228-229). This is of the order of the imaginary, but, this time I would say it is referred to the symbolic, that is to say it is referred because it's about the inscription of little Hans into a line of descent, into a genealogy.

Lacan adds: "the bringing to light of castration ends the phobia and also very well shows, I would not say its finality, but what it was there to replace" (p229).

Here we are. It's a road which I wanted to walk step by step and which is fully Lacanian with its three dimensions and the added implication of Freud's observation. To tell the truth, it's from a reading of this study, of the observation of little Hans that Lacan was able to construct these three categories of the real, the symbolic and the imaginary. It did not spring forth

from his head like Athena coming out of the head of Zeus. It did not arrive like that. It's by confronting ourselves with how little Hans could appear to us at any given moment while we are reading the text (that will help sort this out). Otherwise (the text) is a total mess. It really has to be said. Well – it was more than likely during his study of little Hans that Lacan came to forge these three categories as necessary. These three categories give to the castration complex a new and evidently original process. As we have noted, it is the symbolic, in taking hold of the imaginary and the real and the sanctioning by it of the imaginary of phallic representation and the real of his little willy that enabled Hans to dolefully propose to his mother.

This has to be said. This must be said.

Translator: Helen Sheehan
6 Annsbrook
Clonskeagh
Dublin 14

August 2015