

What Is Satisfied...

Florencia F.C. Shanahan¹

I started this cartel having chosen as my trait the articulation between knowledge and satisfaction. The close reading of Lacan's "*Preface...*"², in particular the work we did as a cartel on the differences between the various translations, was already for me the enactment of a certain aspect of this articulation. I drew a durable and specific satisfaction out of the laborious task of hitting my head (together with others) against the wall of language(s). The knowledge I extracted from it was not durable and not so specific. It was of a more ephemeral nature than the satisfaction derived from its production. This makes me interrogate the link between what flees in meaning (included the meaning of which knowledge is made of) and what persists of what causes its search, or the push for its production. I hope I will advance along this path through my participation in future cartels.

I produced a short text for the Blog of the Congress² which also emerged from our cartel's work. The question of knowledge and satisfaction at the end of analysis was approached there under the perspective of 'punctuation'³.

I tried to convey the difficulty to transmit (in terms of knowledge) something of the order of the inapprehensible, or if I may, the *unpunctuable*. If what is written in the body is that which lacks the words to be said, the lack of a signifier that would say what the subject is and also the lack of an object that will complete it/complement it, then the urgency of the end of the analysis is linked to a writing that becomes possible (something that 'ceases not to be written') even though at the same time it verifies that 'neither speech nor libido have the last word'. The body as a surface for the inscription of jouissance is sustained between two holes: the link between knowledge and satisfaction can also be read in this perspective. The end of analysis supposes the demonstration that the subject has arrived at a different arrangement/ accommodation with regards these two holes (one that is *sinthomatic* and no longer *phantasmatic*). On one side the real hole in the symbolic, on the other the drive which does not let itself be tamed either by the signifier or the objects *a*. 'It's in this border between word and drive that Lacan inscribes the *sinthome*'⁴.

The question that remains for me regarding the theme 'urgency' and our readings of Lacan's text is what new kind(s) of (a)version of the Other (S_2 , knowledge, transferential unconscious, discourse of the Other, etc.) is opened up by the traversing of the fundamental fantasy. In other words, what paths against cynical solipsism, which remains a One which does not make itself Other? Or to put it differently, what kind of pact becomes possible between belief in the symptom and satisfaction?

1. Member of ICLO, the NLS and the WAP. AS of the NLS.

2. The NLS Congress "Urgent!" which was held in Tel-Aviv in June 2019.

3. F.C. Shanahan F., "Urgency: ¡Never the same!", <https://www.nlscongress2019.com/accueil>

4. Argument of the 3rd Clínica Study-Days of the ICF, Seminar of the Freudian Field/Antena Clínica en València. http://www.scf-valencia.es/avada_portfolio/iii_jornadas_clinicas_del_icf/