

Report on the 1st study day of the **Viennese Psychoanalytic Seminar (VPS)**, hosted by the New Lacanian Field Austria (Neues Lacansches Feld Österreich) and the Institute of the Freudian Field (Paris)

The title of the conference was: “Singular Effects of Psychoanalysis in the 21st century” and it took place on the 20th and 21st of November in Vienna, at the Institut français d’Autriche-Vienne, a week after the attacks in Paris. These attacks were – and still are – in a reference to the phenomena of the new clinic of the 21st century. An effect of this intrusion of the real was the cancellation of all events in Paris; this also concerned the conference “Faire couple” of the École de la cause freudienne on said weekend. For a time, Psychoanalysis was silenced, as **Gil Caroz** emphasized in his opening lecture.

Psychoanalysis in Austria was physically destroyed by National Socialism and ethically contaminated in a way that is effective until today. In his reception speech, **Avi Rybnicki** described the beginning of his work in Vienna as a path that originated from a crisis. This seemingly impossible path after almost ten years led to the founding of the New Lacanian Field Austria, which is an attempt to establish despite everything a clinical Lacanian field in Austria while it was clear from the beginning that this would not be possible without a connection to the École. This attempt therefore was supported by members of the Freudian Field through their active and intense commitment and dedication. Avi Rybnicki turned to Jacques-Alain Miller who invented the Viennese Psychoanalytic Seminar (VPS), which is a cooperation between the Freudian Field and the Lacanian Field in Austria. This can lead the Lacanfeld Österreich out of its isolation.

Lilia Mahjoub in her opening speech stressed the equivalence of the particular solutions of the subject, but at the same time the structural difference between neurosis and psychosis. Both aspects are central for the ethics of psychoanalysis in the 21st century. To clarify, Lilia connected the reading of seminar III with the later teachings of Lacan. Lacan showed us that Freud’s symbolic reading of Schreber’s memoirs creates no awareness for the problem of the distinction between neurosis and psychosis. This distinction is essential for the clinical orientation as well as it is necessary nowadays to go beyond it towards an equality of particular solutions of the subject. This last point stresses an orientation towards the real. Exactly in this place the presence of the analyst becomes apparent in the analytic act, which requires an active handling of transference. The presence of the analyst touches upon his desire, wherein the ethical dimension of analysis lies.

Yves Vanderveken opens on Saturday morning with a reference to the attacks in Paris. These put a focus on a real outside of meaning, in which the changed coordinates of the contemporary Other and the subjectivity of our times can be read. The alarming consequence is that the grimace of the future, which Lacan read from the grammar of his present, is already here.

The attacks in a way embody the grimaces of the clinic with which we are confronted in the

clinic of the 21st century. The clinical changes in the form of cases that cannot be classified made it necessary to rethink the binary clinic of neurosis and psychosis in terms of the new research program of ordinary psychosis. It's not that the "old clinic" has to be given up but she loses its extraordinary position. The discreet signs of the ordinary psychosis point to this. These seem so ordinary that they are eaten up by the spirit of the DSM. The discreet signs answer to the nowadays commonplace foreclosure of the name of the father. It is a semblant among others in the face of a jouissance that can never be entirely grasped. This process of ordinarizing requires the analyst to be more precise, clearer, more differentiated in handling that which the subject will have found as a particular solution for himself.

Norbert Leber then asks about the coordinates of this new real Other and about the relation between the singularity of the subject. **Shlomo Lieber** refers to the fact that nothing changes in the eternal fight between Eros and death drive, which Freud described in the last chapter of his "Civilization and its Discontents", whereas the contemporary clinic seems to have brought changes on the level of narcissism.

Andreas Steininger then presents in a clinical case how a bodily symptom gives consistency to the existence of a subject und makes a connection to the social bond possible.

Gil Caroz not only presented a clinical case but also was able to demonstrate an important distinction in the logical handling of the position of the analyst in transference, between the work with a neurotic patient and a subject holding ordinary psychosis: while the orientation of the treatment with a neurotic always points in the direction of S1, it is part of analytic constructions in the 21st century to help the patient find an S2 and to make a connection to something, to make a chain. In transference the analyst is prepared to become a symptom and thus limits an excessive jouissance. Love condescend the jouissance towards desire. On the road from S1 to a possible S2 lies the dimension of humanity, of connecting to a social bond.

Markus Zöchmeister continues the series of case presentations and talks about difficulties in handling the transference with a subject that is flooded by excessive love for the analyst, a love speaking from the real.

In the final contribution of the study day **Avi Rybnicki** talks about the discreet signs of ordinary psychosis. Psychoanalysis does not have **the** answer to contemporary problems, to vague anxiety and proceeding dissolution. With her research program on ordinary psychosis she offers not **one** new category in sense of the DSM, but she helps the subject, whose identification are breaking away, to invent his sinthome as a particular and singular solution. In the borromean clinic the paternal metaphor is one of the possible knotting of the three registers, maybe the most comfortable. Ordinary psychosis, as Avi Rybnicki understands it, demands respect for singular solutions. It refuses itself to generalization and asks for a practice that can listen to small discreet signs. It demands for the slightly odd parts of the speech of the analysand to be heard. The analyst is the addressee of these signs, he is there with his body and offers the subject to newly formulate his being through talking.

Written by Markus Zöchmeister, translated by Sophie Steininger, read and added by Avi Rybnicki and Gil Caroz