

## The desire of the analyst in the construction of a case

Lorena Hojman Davis<sup>1</sup>

“Here we are, talking to each other et *tout le reste est littérature*,  
as Verlaine wrote with excellent literature”<sup>2</sup>. Jorge Luis Borges

What is the relationship between the desire of the analyst and the construction of a case?

We started the cartel with a reading of Eric Laurent's text, *The case, from unease to the lie* where he quotes Gennie Lemoines's book, which lends itself to questioning the status of the case in psychoanalysis: How, or when, does the analyst take the story and turn the narrative into a case? “The moment when the analyst turns the story into a case is always grasped from a point of encounter, from an event that is proper to the treatment” (...) “the analyst does not know, for the good reason that he is in the position of *little a* as agent, in its capacity as object cause of desire (...). The false start does not prevent the encounter of the two desires”<sup>3</sup>.

Are these separate desires, the desire of the analysand and the desire of the analyst? Is there a difference between them? In one way one could say no; there is no difference because desire is the desire of the Other. But one can specify that the desire of the analysand, in cases of neurosis, is unsatisfied, prevented, impossible, while the desire of the analyst is desire as cause.

The cause is - from the beginning of Lacan's teaching - a void, since his early text: *Presentation of Psychological Causality* where he said: “the original cause is the cause as such of a trace that presents itself as empty, which wants to be taken as a false trace”<sup>4</sup>.

The cause, as an object cause of desire, is also an emptiness, a void. The desire of the analyst as an operator of the treatment, as an object *a*, allows the construction between the analyst and the analysand<sup>5</sup>.

If the construction of a case “is organized around an encounter”<sup>6</sup>, it is the encounter with the analyst as an object cause of desire that could produce the subjective division to create the condition for the treatment. That is to say, the desire of the analyst verifies itself by its manifestations.

The analyst, as object *a*, introduces for the analysand the movement of presence/absence that allows the division of the subject and creates the condition for assuming symbolic castration.

The concept of the desire of the analyst changes during Lacan's teaching. The analyst is always at least two. Namely, the one who operates and the one who writes. If there is no construction of the case without the desire of the analyst, then the desire of the analyst is also transmission, the transmission of what psychoanalysis is, and what it is able to be used for.

1. Member of the Lacanian Compass (Houston, TX)

2. Dedicatory in the prologue of Jorge Luis BORGES. *Obras Completas*, Emecé Editores, 1974, Buenos Aires.

3. LAURENT E.: “The case, from Unease to the lie”, [www.amp.nls.org/nlsmessanger/2010/017.html](http://www.amp.nls.org/nlsmessanger/2010/017.html)

4. LACAN, J.: “Presentation on Psychological Causality”, *Écrits*, WW Norton & Company, 2006, USA

5. Jorge ASSEF Lacanian Compass Video Conference “The construction of an analysis: Unconscious, Interpretation and Time”. October 14th, 2018.

6. LAURENT E.: *Ibid.*