

Read Jacques-Alain Miller  
**How do Analyses end Paradoxes  
of the Pass**

Lacan Circle of Australia on 15/10/2022  
Conversation on "Another Lacan"

Daniel Roy

**M**y starting points are both a comment about the title of the book and a surprise when reading the very beginning of "*Liminaire*". Jacques-Alain Miller makes the comment (p.7 French edition) that "the pass was Lacan's most controversial invention for his students" at the same time as he himself addresses the question of "the practice of the pass" (such as the ECF "carried on with the experience" following Lacan's death) as being "aligned with an original definition of the psychoanalyst". Thus, Miller introduces a very robust dialectical engine to help us read the "effects of the pass" in our School: on the one hand, the signifier of the pass introduces controversy within the analytic group, on the other hand "the practice of the pass" opens up a new definition of the psychoanalyst.

We will see that this "original definition of the psychoanalyst" brings to bear the difference between Freud and Lacan with respect to their conception of the "structural outcome of analysis". Miller demonstrates that this is not a difference of opinion, but the fact that Lacan takes seriously the structural dimension of Freud's conception in order to show the articulation of its logical framework. Taking into account Freud, he does not let go of the supposition to know what he considers an "impasse" for which he seeks its outcome, which is precisely the position of the passer in the pass 1, "moments of the pass".

Comments on the title of Jacques-Alain Miller's text.

1) It is a title that takes on the grammatical form of

a question. We expect a question mark that isn't there. It would therefore mean that it is in the affirmative. In a way this is true, but it also states a paradox in that it is like a question that includes its own answer. The sentence states that "analyses do end", which would suppose that indeed an answer exists. The answer is in the enunciation of the "how", and "in what way".

2) It is therefore an answer which does not depend on a question, nor does it depend on a previous question; I would say that it emerges in the course of the cure as a "response from the real", a real which in the text is signaled as "unpredictable", and which will eventually be called "moment of the pass". But "how analyses end" also appears as a "response from the real" in the analytic community. It creates a hole in the social fabric that is constituted by the analytic community, and I do believe that the impact of Miller's text is to show that it is precisely the community's embracing of such a dimension that makes it a School, and not just a professional group. What dimension are we talking about? The one that takes into account that the pass constitutes a response collected from the real, one that is not of the order of an *Aufhebung*, of a "realization" in the order of the subjective for this subject, insofar as he would have been able to answer the question "How did you finish your analysis?"

As a question, the sentence "How do analyses end?" has come into existence in the analytic commu-

nity since 1937 with Freud's text "*Die endliche und die unendliche Analysis*" [Analysis Terminable and Interminable]. In "*Liminaire*", Miller's reading of Freud's text has particularly enlightened me.

Let's go back to it (p.10-11). At the end there is an irreducible obstacle, a resistance that is the "original rock", the rock of castration that manifests in two ways. Indeed, Freud offers us two answers. On the one hand, there is the analysis that ends to everyone's satisfaction. An analysis from which the protagonists will be able to say that it is "finished" from a practical point of view- an end as "an empirical phenomenon that comes into being when the analysand leaves the analyst, to the satisfaction of one and the other" – a situation that we all know, but which is rarely mentioned in our circles. On the other hand, "what is structural in the end" for Freud, namely analysis insofar as it cannot be considered in the dimension of the "finite", that is to say, as a process which comes to an end, which has a conclusion. Why? Because according to Freud, experience shows that analyses come up against an insurmountable [*indépassable*] obstacle, an obstacle that constitutes an impasse, "the rock of castration", an obstacle that nevertheless manifests in two different ways, on the side of woman and on the side of man. From this structural point of view, analysis presents itself as *unendliche*, as unable to find an end other than in the acceptance of an insurmountable [*indépassable*] element: It is "For the woman, penis envy, for the male the refusal of femininity, his rebellion against a passive or feminine position towards another man". Therefore it is "penis envy" on the side of woman, and "refusal of femininity on the side of man".

Here then, is the Freudian paradox: analyses that come to an end teach us nothing about the "how". And if we form a structural idea about what happens at this point, then an analysis appears as something that "can never be declared finished." In assuming that Freud has given us knowledge important for analysis on this point, Lacan will then take the next step by transforming the points of this impasse into reference points for its outcome, that is to say, for "the pass". These points are as follows: at the end of treatment, one finds an obstacle that separates the sexes (the Lacanian translation is: there is no sexual relationship). This obstacle nevertheless displays a common feature, but in two different ways or voices (*voix/voies*) (there is no signifier for woman).

It is on this point that Miller offers a remarkable formulation of this Freudian moment and of the

next step taken up by Lacan. This is what he writes: "The difference between the sexes introduced by Freud here turns out to be in fact a separation of the sexes." This remarkable "substitution" of the term "separation" for the Freudian phrase "difference between the sexes" opens up new possibilities from the point of view of structure as well as practice. Indeed, the term "separation" shatters the one of "difference between the sexes" both from the point of view of separation between the sexes ("no dialogue between the sexes") and separation insofar as it does not register in the same place for either ("there is no sexual relationship"). From this perspective, we can formulate the Freudian impasse in terms that make it resonate differently:

- For a woman, she is separated from the organ as instrument, that is to say insofar as it passes through the signifier, she struggles with this point of privation and can't reconcile herself to it...
- For the male, the separation is located in relation to the fact that there is no one who can say what it is to be a man, who can say what the use of the phallus as signifier is, other than to say that it is lost; and he can't reconcile himself to it...

I focused on this passage in "*Liminaire*" because it helped me understand the leap made by Miller in his Caracas text. Indeed, he takes up again in this text, what he calls "the closing clause" of analysis according to Freud, namely the irreducibility of the castration complex (p.32). By applying what we have learned from this remarkable formula in "*Liminaire*", namely that we can replace "castration complex" with "separation", we understand better what leads him to say that Lacan does not "erase the genital" on the Freudian question of the irreducibility of the castration complex, but indicates "that the question of the end of analysis is not situated at the level of the sexual relation that doesn't exist" (p.33). It is a question of separation from the existence of the sexual relationship, insofar as each according to their choice, has their own way and -- I venture to say here in relation to the text -- has their own way of jouissance. Here, the question is at what point the subject's desire is fixed in the fantasy (p.38) and this point is the object, the object of the drive.

The end of analysis therefore finds resolution at the level of the object, this "object which shuts off

[*obture*] the relation that doesn't exist thereby giving it the consistency of the fantasy" (p.33) It seems to me that we should understand here the structural function of the object as the surplus jouissance that contrasts with the acceptance of the non-existence of the sexual relation and which, instead, can be called the "obturator object" [*objet obturateur*] because of the place it occupies in the fantasy.

Hence we note a displacement, indicated in the text (p.33), at the point of impact of the separation, introduced by the sexual question when it encounters its impasse. It is therefore a displacement to the object itself in such a way as to operate as a "separating object". This is the sentence: "Therefore, the end of analysis, insofar as it supposes the advent of an absence, depends on the crossing of the fantasy and the separation of the object" [Miller, *The Symptom* 10, Ralph Chipman translation].

At the end of the text "*Pour la passe*" [For the pass] (p.44), Miller, wondering about what is being transmitted in the pass, offers this response: "what is not lost", namely the signifiers of the "*Witz* of the pass", which is the medium through which these signifiers circulate and which highlights the "paradox of the pass", "insofar as it is fundamentally placed at the level of the object".

This development then makes it possible to grasp the novelty of the sentence: "The device of the pass recovers at the level of the signifier the moment of the pass, the essential of which is played out at the level of the object" (p.45). This "essential" that we

have located today in the term "separation" – separation, in the *Witz*, of jouissance when it comes into speech, the moment when the real function of the object is observed.

The ECF has followed on from Lacan who, with his transference to Freud, taking seriously Freud's question, and taking into account the presence of Freud's desire in his work, extricated the pass. Miller summarizes this with a remark in his text, that has practical, theoretical and political significance: "The pass is an integral part of the practice of psychoanalysis" insofar as, "according to Lacan, an analysis is equivalent to a demonstration", namely "a logical process requiring a conclusion" (p. 284-85: *Sur le mutualisme*) [On mutualism]

The consequence for the practice of psychoanalysis is that the dimension of the pass is not present on the horizon of the treatment, at some ideal point where the answer will be found at the end point. But it is instead always already there, insofar as each analysand, she or he, comes up against two reals: that the sexual does not achieve any coming together of bodies and of jouissances, and that the presence of women brings to the social and to subjectivity a principle of limitlessness that triggers anxiety. Miller puts at the heart of his text and his presentation "the absence of the signifier woman". It is "the lost signifier" (p.34) of the analytic experience, and we are far from over teasing out all its consequences.

**Translation Mia Lalanne**