

## Cartel Une-Bévue / One (Un) Case

Shlomo Lieber<sup>1</sup> (Tel-Aviv)

The central theme of the cartel – the presentation of “one (un) case” throughout, came to us as surprise, like a sudden illumination from the very first meeting of the cartel. Right after, the name “one case” connected for us to the phrase *une-bévue* or *one blunder*, a term that we met previously in Lilia Mahjoub’s argument before the 2017 NLS congress.

Nevertheless, we were far from genuinely knowing what we were seeking in this unanticipated connection – our formulations tended to change throughout our discourse and throughout the *what* is that was discovered in each case. However, the choice of “one case” enabled a compass-navigated-tracking of the case in light of the central theme of the cartel, while addressing the personal and specific questions that cropped up from this theme for each participant in the cartel deriving from the case he chose. Our topic hypothesizes a relation of some sort between “one case” and “une- bévue”. What premise do we have for such a comparison?

Une-bévue is the manner in which Lacan translates the Freudian unconscious *Unbewusste*. Lacan moves from the ‘Un’, which in German as in English means ‘not’, to the ‘one’ (*un* in French), to “the one of the split, of the stroke”, i.e. he shifts the notion of *negation* to *lack*. This enables Lacan to progress beyond the Freudian unconscious, with the help of the concept of *sinthome* which is situated in relation to the real. However, as Lilia Mahjoub comments in the argument mentioned previously, Lacan adds that the unconscious “takes part in the ambiguity between the real and the imaginary”.

The *blunder*, therefore, is forever a blunder in relation to the real, and the symptom is none other than an expression of this blunder or

this failure. However, at the same time the symptom will be the answer to this blunder, an attempt to correct or rehabilitate it in relation to the real; a real that will always remain in lack. Here the symbolic with its chains of signifiers and the imaginary with its deceptive displays play a central role. They create meanings and visions, always remaining unadoptable to the real itself. In there the hole is established which is the real unconscious, the “true hole”.

So already we stand at the threshold to “Joyce the Syntome”. In a nutshell I’ll say that Lacan places in Joyce’s case one basic and constitutive “mistake” or “fault” in the intricacies of the Borromean knot. The result, in Joyce’s particular case, is that the circle of the imaginary “slides” and the “imaginary relationship has no locus”. For these lacking relations there is a particular answer in Joyce: The *Ego* which comes to correct this mistake and compensate for it. But Joyce, despite his uniqueness and together with it, is the most extreme embodiment of the symptom itself; the archetype of the symptom. Lacan says: “It is in so far as the unconscious is knotted to the *sinthome*, which is what is singular to each individual, that we may say that Joyce... identifies with the individual”. Lacan names L.O.M, which is homophonic with *L’homme*, the basic structure that Joyce exemplifies.

Returning to our cartel – like Diogenes we also tried to unearth this L.O.M, this “man” in each case. We fumbled to find the one blunder, the fatal one, sometimes heroic and crying out, but most of the time hidden, subdued within the case itself. We searched for the shadows of the one of the hole which pulsates and for the house of cards that creates its recesses. We looked for a piece of human jouissance.

1. Member of the GIEP- NLS (Israel) and member of the NLS.