

Interpretation Beyond Meaning

Alan Rowan¹

The scandal of the unconscious can be stated in terms of an irreducible subjective disturbance in what we know about ourselves. Here one encounters a knowing without knowing that one knows, a believing without believing that one believes, or as Lacan succinctly put it, “*I am thinking where I am not, therefore I am where I am not thinking*”².

However, it is a mistake to conclude that this unconscious contains a treasure trove of mysteries, that once unlocked, gives access to some ultimate truth, whereby, one would be in command of the “deep truth” of oneself - the idea that - after all, there really is a (*supposed*) *subject of knowing*.

It is why, in his discussion of Glover, as Eric Laurent notes³, Lacan highlights that the opposition between the true and the false is insufficient to capture what is at stake in the praxis of an analysis. Of course, as Miller indicates⁴, there does exist a necessary work of construction in analysis, precisely from the fragments of the (neurotic) unconscious to the construction of the fantasy, via an editing of what is said, in order to make manifest what, for the subject, does not cease to be written. Thus there is, one can say, a necessary work of *historisation*.

However, one paradoxical element here is that this *jouis sens* resonates in a re-ciphering *in order that* the subject may separate from it, in other terms, no longer believe in it. It is not a question of arriving at a new or liberating understanding (e.g. concerning one’s suffering – though something of this occurs) but rather, one can say, to put in question the semblant nature of meaning itself. As such, it entails an encounter with the void of meaning and purpose, something to which all religions answer to. A second paradoxical element relates to how the real unconscious (in contrast to signifying repression) emerges at the limits of the signifying chain - as irruption or discontinuity, and one can add, as anguishing. In other words, here interpretation must lead the analysand to the contingency of a “new saying”, of saying what s/he has never before said, namely a “half-truth-saying” that is not a de-ciphering, but instead speaks to the irreducible of the *sinthome* as mode of enjoyment.

In a stunning way, but true to the logic of his teaching, Lacan extended this “there is no Other of the Other” to psychoanalysis itself, insisting that analysts themselves not take its “chatter”⁵ as a “père-version”⁶ that, for example, might in some form lead to enactments on the side of saving the Name-of-the Father.

1. NLS member, Berlin.

2. Lacan J. : *Ecrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. [trans. B. Fink]. W. W. Norton & Company.

3. Laurent, E. : “Interpretation: From Truth to Event” *The Lacanian Review*, No. 8, p. 115-132

4. Miller, J-A.: Marginalia to “Constructions in Analysis”. *Psychoanalytical Notebooks*. Issue 22, p.47-74.

5. Lacan J.: « The moment to conclude », 1977 November 15th

6. Lacan J.: « RSI », 1975 January 21st