

## Urgency and its relationship with the place of the analyst in the transference

Karina Tenenbaum<sup>1</sup>

Transference at the beginning of the analysis has to do with the installation of the Subject Supposed to Know, a place the analyst occupies in the transferential neurosis. It is important to understand the reason that brings a person to analysis. The first interviews allow us to listen to the urgency of the drive when the fantasy cannot veil the real pushing behind it.

Urgency in analysis is what pushes the drive to get satisfaction, its agent is the object *a*.

The position of the analyst at the beginning of the analysis as a SsS is necessary. This is a logical time of construction of the Other through the transferential unconscious in its link between the S1-S2, the formation of the unconscious.

Alexander Stevens<sup>2</sup> talks about a “transgression”: the subject is not the agent, it is the object little *a*, which is not under the law of the signifier, but a new alliance is formed with the object *a* and its relationship with *Jouissance* needs to be created at the end of a person’s analysis. This new alliance is then related to a vivid object *a* instead of a mortified one related to the subject in the fantasy.

The transference at the end of the analysis has its logical time with the moment of deconstruction of the fantasy where the veil of the real already lost its function. It is in the work with the real unconscious where the analyst is no longer in the position of the Other as the one who knows about the object; now it is the one incarnating the object in its function.

When the analyst incarnates the object *a*, it gives life to the object. However, the object loses its agalma once the fantasy is traversed, producing the emptying through the work in one’s analysis losing its function of veiling the lack of being.

### **The position of the analyst at the end of the analysis as a *Partenaire-sinthome***

Eric Laurent says: “Patriarchy to partner of *Jouissance*...The handling of transference in psychoses can tell us something about the approach of transference in the last period of Lacan’s teaching”<sup>3</sup>; referring to Schreber he added “God is a whore, in other words a partner of *Jouissance*. This reformulation is a reduction, which is the key to handling transference with a partner of *Jouissance* without the guarantee of the Name Of the Father”.

1. NLS Member – Miami.

2. Stevens, A : “*The subjective urgency is seized in this double movement.*”

3. Laurent, E: “*Disruption of Jouissance in the Madnnesses under Transference*”



The concept of transference is absent in the last teaching of Lacan, says Miller. “Lacan leaves transference aside, because transference supposes a big Other...Transference is when ...one has already supposed the knowledge that would mean something”<sup>4</sup>. I would like to draw a parallel between the work in one’s analysis with the development of Lacan’s teachings in the sense of going from the transferential unconscious to the real unconscious, from the Other to the One, from the subject’s Supposed to Know to the *partenaire-sinthome*.

The analyst as a *partenaire-sinthome* is in a new dimension with the most important sounds, words without meaning, and the urgency to get satisfaction in this new alliance of *Jouissance*.

4. Miller, J.-A.: “*The very last Lacan*”. Paidós