



Hélène Cixous' Portrait of Dora: contemporary versions of hysteria



MARIA JOSEFINA SOTA FUENTES

The LC EXPRESS delivers the Lacanian Compass in a new format. Its aim is to deliver relevant texts in a dynamic timeframe for use in the clinic and in advance of study days and conference meetings. The LC EXPRESS publishes works of theory and clinical practice and emphasizes both longstanding concepts of the Lacanian tradition as well as new cutting edge formulations.

PRÉCIS

On Sunday, January 14, Maria Josefina Sota Fuentes (member of the EBP and WAP) presented a text: Hélène Cixous' *Portrait of Dora*: contemporary versions of hysteria. This presentation belongs to a series of conferences towards the next Lacanian Compass Clinical Study Days 16, *Singularities in Neurosis*. From the get-go, this speaker denotes the incongruence between neurosis and singularity. She argues that neurosis refers to the particular, as a defense against singularity. That, has to do with symptoms and identifications, and the work in analysis from this perspective would be to reveal meanings related to these phenomena. Maria-Josefina makes reference to the play *Portrait of Dora*, by Cixous where she went beyond Freudian meaning and introduced ideas that Lacan used in his Seminar XXIII, related to James Joyce and the *sinthome*. This approach invites us to work beyond the notion of the name-of-the father, beyond Freud and creation of meanings. According to Maria Josefina, this author was trying to create a "*feminine writing*", giving emphasis to the letter and the real unconscious. In this reading of Dora, and inspired by the Brazilian author Clarice Lispector, this analysis is no longer the victim of a family drama but a *sinthomatic* subject that tries to capture her modes of *jouissance*. From the symptom to the *sinthome*, Maria Josefina invites us to read Dora's adoration of Mrs. K as a woman that can reveal the mysteries of feminine *jouissance*. Nevertheless, the author remarks that this adoration is a defense against Dora's own femininity. Mrs. K embodies "The Woman", covering its non-existence and keeping Dora alienated from her singularity.

Renata Teixeira

English review by Stefany Daltra Teixeira

Maria Josefina Sota Fuentes

Maria Josefina Sota Fuentes is a practicing psychoanalyst in Sao Paulo (Brazil), AME of the *Escola Brasileira de Psicanálise* (EBP) and of the World Association of Psychoanalysis (WAP), being appointed as Analyst of the School (AE) in 2017, and having participated in several directing bodies, including the Presidency of the EBP. In 1991, she graduated in Psychology from the Institute of Psychology at the University of Sao Paulo, where she defended her doctoral dissertation (2009), which was the basis of the book, *Women and Their Names: Lacan and the Feminine* (Ed. Scriptum, 2012).

Hélène Cixous' Portrait of Dora: contemporary versions of hysteria

by Maria Josefina Sota Fuentes

I would like to thank you very much for this invitation. It is always an honor and a pleasure to work with you, and a challenge as well, because it demands from me the effort of delving into the English language, while trying to develop some aspects of this interesting theme that you have chosen for the next Clinical Study Days: "Singularities in Neurosis: Transference and Interpretation".

Before getting into the subject of this conference, I would like to say some words about singularity and neurosis, to introduce the fundamental review that Lacan made of hysteria after Joyce's studies.

1. Singularity and neurosis

First, it's important to underline that *Singularities* is already a huge and complex theme! In your argument, there is an important reference to Lacan's intervention in 1975, when he says that, I quote, "It is only worth sweating for the singular... But you have to sweat through a lot of particulars to get to the singular"¹. Miller, in his Course of 2008², reveals the difficulties to sustain the singularity in psychoanalytical clinic. He even dares to say that psychoanalysts defend themselves from the singularity!

As clinicians, we practice the art of classifying phenomena based on signs previously catalogued, and we are always creating categories, ways to frame the experience. We establish a routine using the sedimented discourse to capture the encounter with the patient that, in counterpart, is incomparable, and unexpected. That is why Miller says that clinical knowledge protects us from the "abysm of the singular"³, protects us paradoxically from what a case is in psychoanalysis. A case as something that always falls and should remain as

impossible to classify and even to know. That is the reason why every time we understand too much of a case, when we present it from the knowledge we have, we end up mistrusting our own constructions. And what falls is, in this case, the psychoanalysis itself.

As you know, the Singular is not the Particular. The Particular is an example of a category, which belongs to a specific group. For instance, when we say that Dora is hysterical, we are looking for some elements in common with other cases and including her in a set. We define "relative differences" between the set A element and set B element, with the oppositions established by the language's law.

But the Singular is something so unique, so original, that we cannot compare as we do with the classificatory categories. We can't even give a name to define which is the difference between the set A and the set B, because the set B doesn't exist as a closed group with a specific law of formation. The idea of the "absolute difference" evoked by Lacan, especially referring to the feminine, is not so simple, because what is "absolute" here? What does it mean? It is something so different from everything that I have ever seen, so incomparable, that I can't even say what it is using the words that we have – the words that came from the Other of the linguistic code, but also the place of the Freudian Unconscious formed by "representation", by "signifiers", as Lacan developed, returning to Freud with structural linguistics. Therefore, when we are in the *Unconscious structured like a language*, we are still on the land of what is common to others, transindividual, the field of what we inherited from the social Other. That is the reason why the Freudian Unconscious, as Miller⁴ sustains, represents the particularity, the common meaning, but not yet the singularity that can be achieved in a psychoanalytical experience.

1 Lacan, Jacques. "On Pleasure and the Fundamental Rule". *The Lacanian Review*. 11, November 2021. Referenced in the CSD 16 argument, lacaniancompass.com/about-csd/

2 Miller, Jacques-Alain. *Sutilezas analíticas*. Buenos Aires, Paidós. 2011: 103.

3 *Ibid.*

4 *Ibid.*: 106.

When we are dealing with the “absolute difference”, we have no words to represent what is there, precisely because it is outside meaning and unspeakable. As we know, Freud made a great effort to catch it and finally named it as *dark continent*, using a common metaphor at that time, which was Africa to the European men, to indicate that it is impossible to know and speak something related to the feminine, which can be impossible to bear as well.

However, Lacan prefers another metaphor to indicate the “absolute difference”, the uniqueness of the place for the feminine. In Seminar XVIII he evokes the littoral in *Lituraterre*. Besides everything that we say and know in the field of language, our beliefs, our Egos, our castles, there is always an open and wild sea in each one of us, a place where a foreigner as an intruder lives within us, the dark side of us. But this place is not a continent with borders where a man could see women in the distance, protecting himself from the danger of the feminine, as if it could be possible to join women on a group placed far away.

Precisely, it is impossible to classify the feminine with an identity specific for women in the Unconscious and universalize something about “The Woman” that doesn’t exist. So, we can’t compare one woman to another without falling into the masculine logic, which is based on the law of language and phallogocentric generalizations. About that, paradigmatic is the structure of the word of Little Hans’ phobia around the premise that “everyone has a phallus”, and once they have it, everyone can lose it as an effect of castration.

However, Lacan established a different logic for the feminine, saying that each woman is singular, because women exist in a set that remains open, inconsistent, resulting in an infinite series. In philosophy we can also find this thesis, for example, *In Vino Veritas* by Kierkegaard, where he says that in men, I quote, “the essential is essential, and, therefore, it is always the same: in women what is casual is what is essential, and the result is endless diversity.”⁵ And he continues: “To be a woman is something so strange, so mixed, so complex, that no predicate expresses it, and the many predicates one might use contradict one another so sharply that only a woman can endure it, and, still worse, can enjoy it”.⁶

However, Lacan’s approach to female sexuality in the 70s is unprecedented due to his construction of the

formulas of sexuation and feminine jouissance, unspeakable and without limits, not-whole, different from the phallic jouissance which is whole fitted out with language. As Miller affirms, Lacan made a traversal and “tear something out of himself”⁷ to generalize the feminine jouissance as a condition of the speaking being.

Finally, he locates this jouissance in the heart of the *sinthome*, regardless of the intended identification, male, female, gay, lesbian, etc. This jouissance, out of meaning, crazy, enigmatic, related to a body event, even disturbs the identification convictions, tears out the Ego from its place. Then, psychoanalytical experience can give access to this foreigner, the best and worst part of us, the place where the singularity emerges in each one, which is, precisely, the *sinthome*, as Miller sustains.

So, what is important to say when we think specifically about the theme of *Singularity in Neurosis* is that neurosis is not only a case of the Particular at the diagnostic clinic, but its symptomatology as a product of Freudian Unconscious can be considered a defense against singularity.

As Miller says, in Lacan’s very last teaching, a great change in psychoanalysis’ basis was necessary for Lacan, critical of Freud and of himself, when he finally abandoned Freud’s doctrine to follow Joyce’s practice of writing. Even before that, Lacan homages Marguerite Duras calling the attention to a certain “use of letter”⁸ converging with the use of the Unconscious which he was already formalizing, different from Freudian Unconscious and the work of deciphering signifiers. The letter doesn’t carry any meaning, but it can be a shelter to locate jouissance and to establish a littoral between the knowledge and the real jouissance.

And if Joyce is paradigmatic to think about one who incarnates what is the most singular in a person, as Miller sustains, is because he was able to manage his *sinthomatical* jouissance, outside meaning and incommunicable, and build a literature without sacrificing his singularity.

His art, not readable, was a disruption on literature’s tradition. He attacks the place of the Other, makes a hole in common meaning, interested in the material side of the signifier, which is precisely the letter, playing with the equivocations of languages and joying in it. And it doesn’t matter if nobody understands anything! That is why Lacan says that Joyce has “a cancelled

5 Kierkegaard, Soren. *In Vino Veritas*. Lisbon, Antígona. 2005: 155 (English translation from Portuguese taken from the article: Fuentes, Maria Josefina S. “Lacan, the feminine, and feminists”, in *Literature and Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Jeremy Tambling. London, Bloomsbury Academic. 2023: 353-366.

6 *Ibid*.

7 Miller, J.-A. « L’Un est lettre », *La Cause du Désir : revue de psychanalyse*, n. 107, Navarin. 202: 34.

8 Lacan, Jacques. “Homage Done to Marguerite Dumas, for the Ravishment of Lol V. Stein” (1965). In *The Lacanian Review* 13. 2023: 17.

subscription to the Unconscious”⁹, differentiating his *sinthome* from Freudian’s symptom, which is a response of the Other built like a metaphor, full of meaning, and which can disappear with the work of interpretation.

But the problem is that the path of deciphering neurotic symptoms with meaning, doesn’t necessarily give access to the *sinthomatical* jouissance, which, however, doesn’t disappear. On the contrary, it can be a way to avoid it and misplace the subject of his singularity, increasing the anxiety as an effect of segregation of the *sinthomatical* jouissance which concerns the subject.

So, how should Transference and Interpretation be conceived in the clinic of the *sinthome*, which is different from the Freudian symptom clinic? Should the analyst discredit the deciphering way of the Unconscious? Or, more than that, how to manage when Freudian Unconscious is not available, even in neurosis, to be opened in psychoanalytical practice? How to manage when contemporary symptoms are not built anymore as a metaphor sustained from the Name-of-the-Father, as Lacan developed in the beginning of his teaching? These are important questions to be developed in your next Clinical Studies Days.

Lacan indicates another reference of someone who doesn’t care about interpretations, doesn’t believe in it, but even so talks a lot in analysis with Freud. That is why I thought that it could be interesting to bring here Dora’s case portrayed in an unmatched way, by the psychoanalyst, feminist, and writer Hélène Cixous. She was mentioned by Lacan in Seminar XXIII, on page 87-88 in the English version¹⁰, which provides elements to address contemporary versions of hysteria and allows us to locate in Lacan’s teaching the fundamental review of hysteria neurosis after Joyce.

2. Hélène Cixous’ Portrait of Dora

So, in the context of the spirit of knots and *sinthome*’s elaboration, Lacan comments on the theatrical play *Portrait of Dora*, written by his friend Cixous, telling her just after the performance in 1976 that he would refer to it in his Seminar.

She and other psychoanalysts were part of the feminist movement in France and took as inspiration

Lacan’s thesis about the feminine jouissance to create the concept of “feminine writing”, which could capture what Cixous calls “the libidinal economy of femininity”¹¹. In an interview, she explains that above all women can write texts in a fluid style, different from men, outside rules, without frame or linearity, which can even be, quote, “jubilatory and distressing, as everything that starts incessantly”¹².

However, even though Lacan mentioned some work of these feminists and was interested in her theatrical play, he didn’t embrace the concept of “feminine writing”, which finally promotes an essence for femininity intrinsic to women, self-referential, rejecting the impossibility of universalizing woman. In fact, he couldn’t agree with the idea of making a “whole” with the “not-whole” which is the feminine. Anyway, we can find this “feminine style” in *Portrait of Dora*, which is based on her sessions with Freud.

Éric Laurent, in a conference titled “The *sinthome*”¹³, develops Lacan’s only comment about hysteria at that time, when he mentions Cixous’ play in Seminar XXIII. After a year, Lacan gave a conference in Brussels precisely to review Freud’s and his own thesis about hysteria, interested in a different conception of the Unconscious.

Laurent affirms that Lacan’s study of Joyce can be taken as a rewrite of Freud’s *Studies on hysteria*, which means it is a way to turn hysteria inside out, without her classical partnership with the Other as an interpreter for her symptoms. Lacan had even defined hysteria as a social bond from the hysterical discourse, which establishes a relationship between the subject affected by the enigma of his symptoms, and the Other where the meaning could be found.

In Seminar XXIII, Lacan names this classical hysteria as *incomplete*, saying, quote: “I mean that hysteria has always been in twos, since Freud anyway. [...] That I could call *incomplete*”¹⁴. In opposition, referring to *Portrait of Dora*, Lacan continues: “Here we can see it reduced in some way to what I might call a material state”¹⁵. So, Lacan is regarding hysteria without meaning’s apparatus, which is a huge revision of it. And Cixous’ Dora is what Lacan calls “rigid”¹⁶, because the subject here sustains alone, without the fourth ring which is the Name-of-the-Father in classical neurosis.

At that time, Lacan was interested on real Unconscious, the materiality of words which doesn’t mean

9 Lacan, Jacques. “Joyce, the Symptom”. In *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXII: The Sinthome*. Polity. 2016: 144.

10 Lacan, Jacques. *The sinthome*. Op. cit.: 87-88.

11 Cixous, Hélène. “A arte de Clarice Lispector”. In <https://www.bettymilan.com.br/helene-cixous-a-artede-clarice-lispector/>.

12 Ibid.

13 Laurent, Eric. “Conferencia ‘El sinthome’”. *Consecuencias. Revista Digital de Psicoanálisis*, n.13/14, nov.2014.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

anything but insists on an endless repetition of jouissance. The problem was that Freud, as Lacan says during his conference in Brussels, quote, “made of this Unconscious which he didn’t understand strictly anything about, the place of the representations”¹⁷.

So, on Cixous’s Dora, what matters is the repetition of “a material state” out of and separated from meaning, as it is the real Unconscious, which can or not be articulated with the Other as an interpreter. In Seminar XXII, Lacan had already defined the symptom not anymore as a metaphor or an answer from the Other, but as an answer from the real. I quote, “what of the Unconscious can be translated by a letter”¹⁸, which fix and repeat a jouissance alone, without meaning or connections – a traumatic and “unforgettable jouissance experience that will be celebrated in repetition”¹⁹ related to a body event.

So, Cixous’ play is made “in a real fashion”, as Lacan says. I quote: “I mean that the reality of the rehearsals, for example, is ultimately what dominated the actors.”²⁰ Laurent, commenting, says that: “This helps to get rid of the idea that the signifier organizes the text and the actors. Here, it is rather the actors who perform the text.”²¹

Therefore, if Freud in 1900 was Dora’s interpreter who connected her main symptoms to sexuality with the Oedipal meaning, Freud in 1976 at Cixous’ play doesn’t have such a power anymore. Anyway, after 76 years, neither Freud nor the Unconscious nor the civilization would be the same. In the play, Freud is represented, I quote Lacan, “in a right pickle. He looks rather bothered and you can hear it in his delivery. Well, he goes at it with great caution.”²²

We can read it in Cixous’ play, translated from French by Anita Barrows. For example, at the end of the play:

Dora saying: You don’t understand anything. That won’t stop you from existing! Here is my revenge: I’ll go alone. I’ll cure myself. And I’ve made up my mind to leave on a date I’ve set myself. The first of January 1900.

Freud (with great difficulty): I would have taught you what I’ve learned from you. I would have liked to do something for you.

Dora: No one can do anything.

Freud: Let me know what I’m doing. Write to me.

Dora: Write? ... That’s not my affair.²³

And, along the play, Freud tries to inject sexuality with Oedipal meaning to explain her symptoms, but she doesn’t care about it:

Freud: The secret lies with your mother. What role does your mother play here? She was once your rival for your father’s love.

Dora: I knew that you were going to say that...

Freud: So now you know who stands for whom.

Dora: (tired) To know. To know. But no one knows anything. What does it mean, to know? Do I know what I know? [...] Everything means nothing. If there were a god...²⁴

And there is another example, when Dora is talking about the famous traumatic scene on the lake, when she was 18 and tried to escape Mr. K’s seduction:

Dora: When I wanted to shut myself in the bedroom in the afternoon to rest, there was no more key. I’m certain that was Mr. K who took it away.

Freud: Naturally one can’t be indifferent as to whether a girl is “open” or “closed”. It is obvious which key would be used to “open” in such a case.

Dora: I was sure you would say that!²⁵

Marcia Rosa, a colleague from the EBP, commenting on the play in her book about hysteria²⁶, realizes that we can find the feminist critique to psychoanalysis sustained in Dora’s lines, questioning Freud as a man attached on phallogocentric meaning. Which doesn’t bother Lacan, on the contrary, he was also making his own critique to psychoanalysis at that time, looking for the material state of the symptom.

As we know in Freud’s report about the case, he paid especial attention to Dora’s cough and her aphonia, interpreting it as an unconscious way to sustain the relationship between her so loved but impotent father, and Mrs. K. And what Lacan has revealed in his many comments about Dora, is that her cough and aphonia metaphorizes her identification with father’s jouissance, his *père-version*, his phallic version of jouissance about how to have a sexual relation with woman, interpreted by Dora as oral sex.

And it is important to note, as Laurent says, that if

17 Lacan, Jacques. ‘Considerações sobre a histeria’. *Opção lacaniana, Revista Brasileira Internacional de Psicanálise*, n. 50, dez. 2007: 17.
18 Lacan, Jacques. *RSI, the Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXII (unpublished)*. Class of 21 January 1975.

19 Miller, J.-A. « L’Un est lettre ». *Op. cit.*: 34.

20 Lacan, Jacques. *The sinthome*. *Op. cit.*: 88.

21 Laurent, Éric. *Op. cit.*: 2.

22 Lacan, Jacques. *The sinthome*. 22 *Op. cit.*: 88.

23 Hélène Cixous. *Portrait of Dora*. University of Washington Libraries, 1979: 65.

24 *Ibid.*: 49.

25 *Ibid.*: 46.

26 Rosa, Márcia. *Por onde andarão as históricas de outrora? Um estudo lacaniano sobre as histerias*. Belo Horizonte: Labtrans, 2019.

the incomplete hysteria has always been in twos, “this two is not only the link between the hysterical and her interpreter, but also designates the fact that she extracts a symptom from the other with which she is in love”²⁷. So, the hysteric is more interested in the Other’s symptom than in having access to “her own bodily femininity”²⁸, as Lacan says.

If we turn hysteria inside out, giving priority to real Unconscious, we could search for a letter which insists on a singular jouissance repetition. And even in Freud’s text, we can find some elements to locate the jouissance as a body event, before the incidence of the oral sexual fantasies around her father and Mrs. K. As Lacan says, still in “Presentations of Transference”, Freud gave, quote, “[...] the most distant image that Dora retrieves from early childhood [...], probably still an infant, sucking her left thumb, while with her right hand she tugs at the ear of her brother”²⁹. And he continues “What we seem to have here is the imaginary mold in which all the situations orchestrated by Dora during her life came to be cast – a perfect illustration, yet to appear in Freud’s work, of repetition automatism.”³⁰

Marcia Rosa paid attention to the fact that Dora’s father used to call her “the little sucker”³¹, proposing it as one name for her mode of jouissance, the early mold of her oral jouissance, and as an “anchor”³² which could sustain the subject considered as rigid hysteria, earlier than the development of her symptomatology linked to her father.

Another interesting thing to underline in Cixous’ Dora is her fascinated attachment to Mrs. K. Instead of being an element to be deciphered, uncovered by the repression of the Unconscious, as it was with Freud’s Dora (although Freud hadn’t given it due importance, as Lacan says³³), Dora’s idolatry for Mrs. K is out in the open in the play. In a work presented on the 7th ENAPOL developed with colleagues from EBP, we sustained this idea³⁴. We can read it in the play, where Dora talks to Mrs. K³⁵:

Dora: You are absolutely everything to me. And I am nothing, nothing. No one listens to me. I love you as though you were God. Someone for whom I don’t exist. For whom I am living [...]. Let me kiss you, let me take you in my arms! Just once. [...] Everything you know. Everything I don’t know. Let me give you this love.

27 Laurent, Éric. “Falar com seu sintoma, falar com seu corpo”. VI ENAPOL’ argument: <https://enapol.com/vi/portfolio-items/hablar-con-el-propio-sintoma-hablar-con-el-propio-cuerpo/?portfolioCats=13>.

28 Lacan, Jacques. « Presentation on Transference ». In *Écrits*. Norton. 2005: 181.

29 *Ibid.*: 180.

30 *Ibid.*

31 Rosa, Marcia. *Op. cit.*: 89.

Mrs. K: Oh! It’s impossible, impossible my mad little child! My God! What am I going to do with you?

Dora: Tell me more, tell me everything, everything women know how to make jam, how to make love [...].

We can see Dora completely raptured, ecstatic by Mrs. K, who represented The Woman that doesn’t exist. As hysterical, she still suffers from the inexistence of the sexual relation, from the encounter with the Other sex, which is the feminine, transferring it to the Other Woman, idealized, depositary of a knowledge about how to be a woman. When a woman does not believe in The Woman – for she does not exist – she can incarnate a singular and *sinthomatical* version of being one woman.

But as hysterical, Dora avoids the traumatic lack of identification for The Woman and the unspeakable way of jouissance which concerns her singularity. And the more she searches in the Other Woman the missing identification for herself, the more she ignores the real jouissance which could give her basis for a *sinthomatical* solution, to identify not with the Other’s symptom but with her own singularity. But as hysterical, historical³⁶, as Lacan plays with the word in Seminar XXIV, she prefers the stories around the love for her father as armor to sustain her body.

And we could ask: if Cixous’ Dora didn’t care about Freud’s interpretations, doesn’t she install another partner to believe, Mrs. K, The Woman as a symptom to avoid the feminine?³⁷

Marie-Hélène Brousse³⁸, regarding contemporary versions of hysteria states that, in some cases, homosexuality can be read as a symptom which installs The Woman in the place left empty by the father as a decadent exception in our civilization. That means, The Woman as Universal can function as one of the names-of-the-father when the paternal function has already declined. And in this case, men with whom the classic hysteric identifies, become useless as a support to investigate femininity’s mystery and as a connector to have access to a feminine jouissance, which, however, can appear in different versions, including devastations.

32 *Ibid.*: 127.

33 Lacan, Jacques. “Presentation on Transference”. *Op. cit.*: 180-185.

34 Fuentes, M.J.S. et al. VII ENAPOL: <https://enapol.com/vii/conversaciones/mujeres-frente-al-espejonuevas-virilidades/>.

35 Cixous, Hélène. *Portrait of Dora*. *Op. cit.*: 40-42.

36 Lacan, Jacques. *L’insu que sait de l’une-béveuve s’aile à mourre: the Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXIV (unpublished)*. Class of 14 December 1976.

37 Cf. VII ENAPOL’ s work. *Op. cit.*

38 Brousse, Marie-Hélène. « L’homosexualité féminine au pluriel ou quand les hystériques se passent de leurs hommes de paille. Elles ont choisi : les homosexualités féminines ». Ed. Michèle. 2013 :33.

Laurent³⁹ ponders that the rigid hysteric without partner presented by Cixous is more related to Clarice Lispector than to Dora herself. Indeed, Cixous, the most important disseminator of the Brazilian writer's work in France, was strongly influenced by her style, with whom she also was completely fascinated, to the point of saying, quote, "I am Clarice Lispector. [...] I am sure that she gives me my hidden similarity".⁴⁰

In fact, the feminist and Joyce expert was looking for a "feminine style" of writing different from Joyce's, who she considered, quote, "torments the signifier"⁴¹. In counterpoint, for Cixous, Lispector didn't operate at the level of the word, but with meaning's abolition, with disjointed speeches without ending or beginning, something like we can find in *Portrait of Dora*. The play mixes parallel scenes without linearity, past and present are recovered with repetitive speeches, self-referenced, full of digressions without meaning, voices expressing the impossibility of saying something⁴².

There, Dora is totally lost: "To whom can I address this letter? To whom can I address my silence? My suicide?".⁴³

Certainly, something closer to Lispector's style is there. Someone who wrote alone, in the confines of existence, very far away from the Other or another in whom she could find a support for herself. And sometimes, sinking in the unspeakable, far away from language as well. As she once wrote: "But what an abyss, between the word and what it attempted..."⁴⁴

If we could consider her as rigid hysteria, this could be the subject for another conference... which could, however, illuminate the field of investigation into singular solutions in *sinthomatic* hysteria.

Maria Josefina Sota Fuentes

Edited by Jared Elwart and Liliana Kruszel

39 Laurent, Eric. « Conferencia 'El sinthome' », Op. cit.: 2.

40 Cixous, Hélène. *Photos de Racine*. Ed. *Des femmes*, 1994 : 89 (Cf. VII ENAPOL's work. Op. cit.).

41 Cixous, Hélène. "A arte de Clarice Lispector". Op. cit.: 2.

42 Cf. VII ENAPOL's work. Op. cit.

43 Cixous, Hélène. *Portrait of Dora*. Op. cit.: 43.

44 Lispector, Clarice. *A paixão segundo G.H. Rocco*, 2020: 65

LC EXPRESS

The LC EXPRESS is produced and distributed by
LACANIAN COMPASS

Editor: Liliana Kruszel

Advisor: Pierre-Gilles Guéguen

Art designer: Tom Vallone

Artwork: "Untitled", 2021, Felipe Jácome Reyes

The Lacanian Compass is an associated group of the New Lacanian School (NLS) dedicated to the development and promotion of the Lacanian Orientation of Psychoanalysis in the United States, psychoanalysis as first described by Sigmund Freud and further elaborated by Jacques Lacan and Jacques-Alain Miller.

To subscribe to Lacanian Compass, fill out the subscription form on the 'contact' page of lacaniancompass.com

For more information and to access the archive, visit lacaniancompass.com

VOLUME 7 - ISSUE 2, JANUARY 2024



LACANIAN COMPASS
LACANIANCOMPASS.COM