What exists by not being

Bernardino Horne

It is at the moment of incarnation that the body of the human being is made a speaking body, and it makes it through the incorporation of the signifier.

In ...Ou Pire (1971-1972/2012), Lacan opens the chapter of the l’Unien affirming that what is at play is: “That which only exists by not being”. Thus, it inaugurates a field of pure jouissance, because the signifier is not a signifier, it is not anymore, and only exists. Nevertheless, we can say that the signifier which is not, is, exists. It does it in the form of a jouissance-body. We deal with an instant prior to the jouissance proper of Lalangue, which is the jouissance of the One on its own. The S1 of incarnation, of the event in the body, is not a signifier. It materializes itself in the body, and thus, it is jouissance. At the same time, by existing and materializing itself (Miller, 1998-1999/2003), as it turns into a body, it affects it, and this way, the body is jouissance and the body is signifier. This moment, which Miller called incarnation, figures the original Troumatisme (the hole of trauma).

The intimate interlace of the flesh with the signifier will be responsible for the relation between knowledge and knowing how to do with, the same way speech implicates the body as speaking. Miller (2011) says that the unconscious is a place of being, however, with Freud we designate the Id as the place of jouissance that we incarnate in the body, and Miller adds that “what Lacan calls body is the incarnation of the Freudian Id, that is, the body as much as it enjoys.”.

In Troumatism presents itself at the same time the absolute negativity, that is, death and also life, jouissance, of a positive signal. It coexists in the experience of total helplessness,
which appears in discourse as being Nothing, which either falls into the infinite void sucked into an endless whirlpool, or the $S_1$ succeeds to inject itself in the matter, and to incorporate itself. At this moment, signifier and object are One. Only later each of them will have its own place. The negative experience of death coexists in time with the experience of the production of life, as a jouissance with a Positive (+) signal. A volcano of jouissance in active production. Nevertheless, jouissance is fleeting, happens during moments which we can imagine as sudden electric currents, concentrated orgasms, lightening, or the resonance of OM of a meditation with the Dalai Lama, which all go on writing themselves in borromean letters. They could be compared in their writing function, with the facilitations from Freud's Project, which Lacan considers mostly as fixations in the signifier’s trajectory. It is the signifier that, with the name of Sinthome, will act on this only string of jouissance separating $RSI$, to mark the existence of the three registers.

In Piezas sueltas (Detached Pieces), Miller (2013, p. 57) affirms categorically the initial value of the Sinthome as the function of undoing the knot, of disuniting. Only later the Sinthome assumes the function of keeping together $R$, $S$, and $I$, which have the tendency to separate. It is by means of the $S_1$, of Lalangue, that the signifier manages both positions: existing and being.

The desire of the analyst is precisely a desire to approach the inapproachable.

The text of Bernard Porcheret (2013), in the journal Colofón, n.o 33, seems to me very interesting in this perspective.
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