



**“Anxiety is indeed the typical symptom of any advent of the real [1],”**

Anxiety is not without an object [2]. There is something analogous to what anxiety signals in the subject. This is the meaning of the not-without in Lacan’s formula, which reveals that this something analogous to the object is not missing. But the not-without does not designate it. It therefore presupposes the support of the fact of lack [3]. A fragment uttered by an analysand, speaking of a young man: “... was orienting himself as he spoke”. Questioning the guarantee of free association, Lacan goes on to say that the meaning of all enunciation “is oriented towards that hole in the real [...] which precisely allows the symbolic to form a knot in it [4]”. Speaking of the understanding of psychoanalysis through the knot, he says: “the knot is the negative of religion”. He adds: “We do not believe in the object, but we observe desire, and from this observation of desire we induce the cause as objectified [5]”. So he does not give in to the religious slope, but affirms the path of logic that allows us to induce the object.

The “anxiety, symptom” in the preface can therefore be understood as the sign of any “advent of the real”. Lacan evokes the advent of the real for the first time in *Television* [6], situating it as an effect of science. He introduces the term in a context where the event of the body, that is, the jouissance of a living body, is not present. This raises the question of defining what he calls an advent of the real in the field of psychoanalysis. On the other hand, he developed the event of the body to a great extent. In the “Geneva Conference on the Symptom”, he describes the bodily event through which Freud discovered the unconscious, starting with the question of the relationship between anxiety and sex. Hans, with his first erection, is confronted with an experience of jouissance, a bodily event, the encounter with the sexual real that brings phobia into play. Thus, by substituting a frightening signifier for the object of anxiety, the first fact of the unconscious-language emerges: the horse of jouissance, a symptom-jouissance that constitutes the unconscious, which does not represent the subject but determines his jouissance.

“It is not paradise that is lost. It’s a certain object [7].” Perhaps, on a formal level, it would not be correct to say that the signifier is produced by the subject, but the function of the signifier conferred on this object, is part of the effectiveness of the subject to make anxiety speak, and this is what makes the language evolve. In the seminar on Anxiety, Lacan formulates “anxiety is an affect of the subject [...] that does not deceive [8].” He ranks it according to the structure, that of the speaking

subject, which is determined by an effect of the signifier. This is where anxiety is the sign, the witness of an essential gap that Freudian doctrine clarifies [9]. This structure of the relationship of anxiety with desire, this double gap between the subject and the fallen [*chu*] object of the subject in anxiety.

If the real is out of the symbolic, what are the ways of access to the real in the analytical experience? First, what goes wrong in life, what falls on us, is the definition of trauma, and then the paths traced by language are inscribed. Any trauma, and Freud places it at the origin of neurosis, affects not the subject directly, but his body. “The event of a real, is an advent only if the signifier is added to it”, so the advent itself would be: “the invention of the signifier by phobia and then on this axis, the Freudian invention of the unconscious and the advent of psychoanalysis as a new discourse [10].”

Diego Mautino  
Rome, October 2023

---

[1] J. Lacan, *La Troisième* [Rome, 1974], Navarin Éditeur, Paris 2021, p. 23 § 5.

[2] Cfr. J. Lacan, *Des Noms-du-Père* [1963], Seuil, Paris 2005, p. 71 ; voir aussi, J. Lacan, Le séminaire, Livre XVII, *L'envers de la psychanalyse* [1969-1970], Seuil, Paris 1991, p. 65 § 4. J. Lacan, The Seminar, Book XVII, *The Other Side of Psychoanalysis* [1969-1970], Norton, N.Y. 2006.

[3] Cfr. J. Lacan, Le Séminaire livre XVI, *D'un Autre à l'autre* [1968-1969], Seuil, Paris, 2006, p. 295.

[4] Cfr. J. Lacan, Conférence au Centre Culturel Français le 30 mars 1974, in *Lacan in Italia* [1953-1978], La Salamandra, Milano 1978, pp. 104-147.

[5] J. Lacan, Le Séminaire, Livre XXIII, *Le sinthome* [1975-1976], Seuil, Paris, 2005, p. 36 § 3, 4, 7. J. Lacan, The Seminar, Book XXIII, *The Sinthome* [1975-1976], Polity, 2016.

[6] J. Lacan, « Télévision » [1973], dans *Autres écrits*, Seuil, Paris 2001, p. 536, 92, § 6.

[7] J. Lacan, *L'objet de la psychanalyse* [1965-1966], Leçon du 22 juin 1966, inédit.

[8] J. Lacan, Le séminaire, Livre X, *L'angoisse* [1962-1963], Seuil, Paris 2004, pp. 92, § 2 et 188, § 3 ; J. Lacan, The Seminar, Book X, *Anxiety* [1962-1963], Polity, N.Y., 2014; voir aussi, *Des Noms-du-Père*, op. cit., p. 69, § 3.

[9] S. Freud, «La terra promessa», Lettre inédite à Chaim Koffler, le 26/02/1930, *L'ospite ingrato*, Quodlibet, Rome 2003, p. 95.

[10] C. Soler, *Avènements du réel, de l'angoisse au symptôme*, Cours 2015-2016, Formations cliniques du Champ lacanien, *Collège clinique psychanalytique de Paris*, Éditions du Champ lacanien, Paris 2016, p. 170.

<https://if-epfcl-paris2024.champlacanienfrance.net>

