

How does supervision affect the construction of a case?

Ines Anderson¹

Supervision was key in the construction of the case “Superwoman Barrée” that I presented at the Clinical Study Days 12.

During the beginning of the treatment, this Superwoman came with her husband mainly because of his lies. The analyst found herself trapped in between the couple, searching for the truth. In supervision, the main orientation was to make clear who the patient was, to assure her that she was going to be listened to and help her not to give up her space. This enabled the subject to appear and unveil the secrets that she had been trying to conceal from everyone.

From there on it was what Americans call ‘the honeymoon’ phase which J.-A. Miller mentions in *Analytic Subtleties*, where the transference is usually in its more positive aspects with therapeutic reliefs².

In supervision, the orientation was to give less relevance to the therapeutic effects and more to the subjective division of the Superwoman. When I overlooked this in the last session of this part of the analysis, the subject stopped coming for almost two months.

I experienced at that time what J.-A. Miller calls the dark jungle in the course of an ongoing analysis, where Lacan accompanies him with the indication: “The truth has the structure of fiction.” In this intermediate period, repetition stagnates and must be endured and traversed. J.-A. Miller calls this experience of the real according to the modality of inertia, the “cage of the sinthome”³.

In the Flash-Cartel, the *plus-one* noticed my lapsus in writing ‘hole’ instead of ‘whole’. In supervision, we reviewed this lapsus as a hole in the omnipotence of the Superwoman, and as my own hole, my own subjective division present in the session. My desire to know about a *particular signifier* made me introduce it, at the very moment of subjective division presented by the patient. My desire to know and present a great case was an obstacle that produced an effect of formation.

Véronique Voruz in “The Effects of Supervision” reminds us that there is no such thing as objective reality; something doesn’t have to be exact in order to be true. Voruz explains that we can use *semblants* as defence against the real. “Supervision can take note of considerable therapeutic effects produced, but if you do not take something into account in the symbolic, it will return in the real. So semblantification is useful, yes, but an orientation on the real remains paramount. The practice of supervision does not aim to verify the adequate use of psychoanalytic knowledge. It is an analytic *dispositif* designed to continue one’s analysis by other means: in other words, to expose the status of the symbolic as fiction”⁴.

1. Member of the NEL-Caracas and of the NLS- Initiative Toronto

2. MILLER, J.A. : *Sutilezas Analíticas*. p. 115. Paidós. 2011

3. MILLER, J.A.: *Ibid*, p. 113-115.

4. VORUZ, V.: “The Effects of Supervision” *Hurly-Burly*, Issue 11 May 2016, p 207