

Note on Construction An Bulkens¹

Freud's text on Construction is marked by a tension². On the one hand, he seems to imply that based on the fragmented bits and pieces of the analysand's speech the All of the memory lost can be re-constructed - along the lines of classical epistemology, understanding truth as *adequatio*. On the other hand, what is clear from Freud's text is that what truly emerges in the process of construction is not a truth mirroring a lost memory but rather an absence, a hole – that of the primary repressed. It is precisely this absence, which in Lacanian terms can be written as S Barred A, $S(\bar{A})$ that makes construction necessary, as J.-A. Miller states in *Marginalia*³.

The unconscious 'full' of memories, lost knowledge objects with which the subject can be reunited through analysis, resonates with Lacan's unconscious as Subject Supposed to Know. One attributes knowledge to someone in whom one has faith, who is 'supposed to' know. This 'full' unconscious of the Subject Supposed to know contrasts with Lacan's understanding of the unconscious as empty, only emerging in the speech act.

Even if 'it is All written,' this All emerges as soon as it is put into speech in analysis as not-all, as a stumbling. The analytic situation opens up the construction site of the Broken Other which can produce fictions, just like an archaeological reconstruction site can, but can also open up to something else.

Like Lucretius' atoms that fall along straight lines through a void, minimal swerves cause turbulences that make the atoms collide, creating something where before there was nothing. Similarly, as long as 'All that is written' falls in a straight line, what is written stays silent in the mute movement of the repetition compulsion. However, in the stumbling of analytic speech acts swerves occur, equivocations happen, impacting the body, allowing the creation of something new. E. Laurent states that on the one hand these stumblings which the analyst 'makes true' allow the analysand to construct, through 'self-elaboration,' a new 'non-standard fiction.'⁴ But rather than constructing a fiction that covers up the void in a new way, putting the analysand back to sleep, the swerve can also have a real sense effect, an awakening effect, opening up to the 'subjective realization of a void.'

Could we say that the swerve, as contingency inscribed in the All, reveals itself in this awakening moment? Does it make sense to speak of the 'construction' of contingency? If we take the notion of a *Broken Other* seriously, we cannot but admit that psychoanalysis operates in a construction site of possible contingencies. They can lay dormant in their habits of meaning, serving as ready building blocks for a fictional re-construction. Or, they can wake up as contingency - as a 'writing' or better as 'what stops not writing itself': a writing that touches on the impossible, the real, rather than covering it up with fiction or fantasy.

1. Member of the Lacanian Compass (Chico, CA)

2. FREUD S. : "Constructions in Analysis" (1937).SE 23:255-269

3. MILLER J.-A. : "Marginalia to Construction in Analysis" (1994), *Psychoanalytical Notebooks*, No 22, March 2011, pp. 47-74.

4. LAURENT E.: "Disruption of Jouissance in the Madnesses Under Transference" (2018). *The Lacanian Review*, no. 6, Fall 2018, pp. 169-181.