In-outer screen of vision and artobject

The artist is a patient. This is the common-sense assumption: the artist loses her mind and spirit to the work, which the viewer analyses. The artist is a doctor. This is Deleuze’s proposition: ‘the writer as such is not a patient but rather a doctor, doctor of herself and of the world. The world is the whole set of symptoms in which sickness is confounded with humankind’ (Deleuze, 1997: 3). The therapy that the artist offers consists in inventing, through ‘a new vision’, a people that is lacking, inventing ‘a possibility of life’ hollowed out by a kind of foreign language within a language, by ‘a becoming-other of language’ (15) that opens ‘an outside or flipside consisting of Visions and Hearings … These visions are not phantasies, but veritable Ideas constituted by the passage of life into language’ (16). The Ideas are not phantasies, but they are analogous to them.

To these two possibilities add a third: the artist is a doctor and a patient, redistributing a multiple–several and shared sinthôme where the drive and desire meets a Thing on the screen of phantasy, or where the symptom and phantasy share a fate, offering this conjunction, diffracted and transformed, via artwork. We can establish an analogy between the subject’s inner world of symptoms and its out–inner extimate screen of phantasy on the one hand, and on the other between the sphere of artistic Ideas and what I have called – establishing a supplementary analogy between Deleuze’s ‘writer’ and a painter – the in–outer screen of Vision (Lichtenberg Ettinger, 1996a). The artwork is both the illness and the remedy, enacting otherwise impossible rapports and realizing the passage onto the screen of Vision of psychic traces from what is otherwise either absence (irremediably lost) or potentiality (not–yet–born).

The intrapsychic trans–subjective doctor–and–patient sphere within the artist is transported onto inter–psychic trans–individual relations between the artist and the viewer with/through the artwork, via a bordersphere captured in the artwork, where transgressive psychic real things are realized, hybrid objects are incarnated, and intrapsychic amnesia is transformed into conductible sinthômes. This doctor–and–patient borderspace finds its echoes in
the viewer; its vibrations impregnate the viewer’s psychic borderspace. It sheds light on an archaic trans-subjective rapport between I and non-I and on a possible transmission between different subjects and objects, beyond time and space, in a potential in-between zone of object-and-subject borne and yielded by painting. It sheds some light on the potentiality to engender/produce/invent and analyse transferential relations in psychoanalysis.

**Out–inner screen of phantasy and objet a**

According to Freud, a symptom is a disguised, repetitive substitute for ideas connected to wishful childhood impulses that have been repressed. These ideas are sexual, if by sexuality we mean not the genital but rather the partial
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pre-Oedipal dimension (Freud, 1916–7: 313–4, 323–9). A ‘veil of amnesia’ covers the early infantile sexual world and its libidinal development. ‘Wherever there is a symptom there is also an amnesia, a gap in the memory’ concerning traumatic failure in the infantile erotic world (Freud, 1910b: 27). Interpreting repetitions in transference and uncovering forgotten memory-traces by ‘filling up this gap’ imply ‘the removal of the conditions which led to the production of the symptom’ (Freud, 1910a: 20; 1910c: 41). Thus psychoanalysis aims at the transformation of repetition and/or amnesia into memory, by working-through regression and repression in the framework of transferential relations between the doctor and the patient.

The repressed ideas are connected with what Lacan describes as ‘holes’ in the Real, which are otherwise connected to art (Lacan, 1975–6). This is implied by the term *sinthôme*. ‘It is the *sinthôme* we must deal with in the very rapport Freud maintained was natural – which doesn’t mean a thing – the sexual rapport’. The *sinthôme* deals with the ‘impossible’ feminine sexual rapport. Sexuality is the domain in psychoanalysis where art may be articulated, since we enter the drive, *jouissance* and art via the same cavity, where they exchange affects, where art by accumulating potentiality shakes frontiers of sense into becoming thresholds, and infuses changes in culture. Art, says Lacan, is related to *jouissance* through the ‘anatomy’ of a cavity (vacuole). An inaccessible trace of a lacking part-object – *objet a* – ‘tickles the Thing (*das Ding*) from within’ and this is ‘the essential quality of everything we call art’ (Lacan, 1968–9).

An artwork attracts, shifts or originates a desire for an object that mysteriously embodies a space in that cavity. A desire, still saturated with the drive, awakens where an artobject joins forces as beauty and horror with an estimated (an outside captured within) gaze or *objet a*, by-passing repression and regression at the price of dangerously approaching the Thing, the primary source of the *Unheimlich* – of uncanny anxiety – which appeals to the viewer to follow it into a mysterious, invisible space beyond yet inside the visible, to abandon defences and to weave into the work its own invisible affect, phantasy, engagement, knowledge. The ‘impossible’ encounter between the drive and the aesthetic object in the in-outer screen of Vision is analogous, up to a point, to the impossible meeting between the drive and the mental object in the out-inner screen of phantasy.

The ‘holes’ hidden from the expanse of signification are the Thing, its vacuole and their originary repression (*Urverdrängung*), *jouissance* (sensual pleasure or pain) and its cavity, and *objet a* and its site. *Objet a* is a remnant of the split from the impulses, from ‘bodily samplings’ of my corpo-reality and from what I call the archaic m/Other. The *objet a* indexes that a libidinal event linked to the *Thing* took place in the psychic space that is a hole. It is a mental trace issued in the course of a primary schism between the drive and its objects through which the subject itself emerges and is cleft. For Lacan, the unconscious reposes on this cleft.
Feminine sex-difference in the poïetic and aesthetic space

We enter art and sex difference through the field of the Real spreading between trauma and phantasy. Trauma is saturated with traces of corporeal and sensorial events whose accompanied affects direct the flowing of the libido; phantasy draws the routes of the libido’s flowing and derivation both when the trauma takes place and when the I later awakens, to search for lost part-objects. And since for Lacan the span of the Real evades the Symbolic, the libido can only be a participant in the hole, and this goes for all other modes through which the body and the Real are presented; ‘it is obviously through this that I am trying to get back to the function of art’ (Lacan, 1975–6). Part-objects are archaic mental samples of bits of me, of others and of the exterior world, to which we are or were once attached as particles ‘by nature fragmentary and fragmented’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 5). These do not compose a ‘whole’: milk, breast, penis (if you have one), but also voices without their masters, gazes without their owners. Whereas Lacan emphasizes the relevance of their loss to art, in the figure of the objet a, Deleuze and Guattari insist on their ever-renewed presence and their productivity by naming them ‘desiring machines’. With the concept of desiring machines we are still bound to bodily organs, but the scope of the part-object’s producing and desiring capacity opens up to embrace animalistic, industrial, sociological, ecological and historical organs. Things – crumbs of the Thing and/or elements producing ‘cuts’ in the Thing’s fluid and undifferentiated existence – become part-objects if I establish erotic and affective non/pre-Oedipal relations to them which inscribe primary psychic archaic traces, or which echo for the post-Oedipal subject repressed archaic traces, by way of repetition and regression, thus temporarily breaking down genital-Oedipal identity to create new patterns for non-genital non-Oedipal libidinal flow. Deleuze and Guattari’s equivalent for the Lacanian, Freudian and Kleinian Thing is the ‘body without organs’. The relations between the desiring machines and the body without organs can be compared to those between the Thing and the part-objects in other psychoanalytical models. For Lacan ‘there is an Urverdrängung, there is a repression that is never annulled. It is the very nature of the Symbolic to involve this hole; and I am aiming at this hole, which I recognize in the Urverdrängung itself’ (Lacan, 1975–6). The symbolic subject is the flipside of the part-objects. It replaces their traces, and the originary repression of the Thing is forever inaccessible. Deleuze and Guattari also locate the originary repression at the level of the relations between Thing and part-objects, as the ‘repulsion of desiring machines by the body without organs’, which is inseparable from the genesis of those machines (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 9).

When from a psychoanalytic perspective we approach art via these ‘holes’ in the Real, art is not the effect of given part-objects, it is not produced by pre-existing part-objects, but rather produces them. The ‘artistic machine’, as Deleuze puts it, produces fragments without totality, cut-up particles,
partitioned scenes analogous to part-objects, as well as resonances linked to Eros and Thanatos (Deleuze, 2000: 155–69)

Objet a is Lacan’s term for the trace that the archaic part-object has left in my unconscious after I have separated from it or lost passionate contact with it. Objet a is no-more a part-object. It hides behind the screen of phantasy, exercising fascinating and horrifying power, threatening to burst into the present Real or to approach consciousness. Between the Thing and the object, it is a product of the archaic Real, a non-sense, a lack or an imprint of a split from the organ marking its loss in the passage into language via originary repression. Objet a is also not-yet a part-object, for it is a remnant retroactively created by discourse. The part-object itself, like originary repression, is never accessed by the symbolic subject. Rather, it is produced by the Symbolic qua lack, since there is no pre-discursive psychic reality. Thus, whereas the Lacanian subject replaces the objet a, Deleuze and Guattari’s subject, ‘with no fixed identity, wandering about over the body without organs’, remains beside the part-objects (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 16).

The objet a with its beyond-appearance vibrations is structured by Lacanian theory in a phallic way through a split, inasmuch as primary inscription replaces production and is replaced by secondary – symbolic – inscription. For Deleuze and Guattari on the other hand the desiring machine remains an eternal source of production, a presence that motivates the connective synthesis. A part of the libidinal connective energy is transformed into a recording energy of inscription (‘Numen’) motivating the disjunctive synthesis. A part of the Numen transforms in turn into energy of consumption (‘Voluptas’) motivating the conjunctive synthesis. Here, production extends into inscription, whereas with Lacan inscription’s price is production: the Real is sacrificed in the passage into culture. The difference between these two theories is that one erects and the other eradicates the Oedipal mechanism of castration. In both theories, however, psychoanalysis supplies a conceptual framework for dealing with the enigma of art in terms of the space opened between part-objects/desiring machines/objet a on the one hand, and on the other hand the Thing/body without organs. And in both the enigma of the poïetic process interlaces with that of the primary psychic relations designated by the term originary repression. In this space art, the aesthetic objects and the poïetic processes are fatally linked to lack, loss, and foreclosure for Lacan, and to presence, production, and the eternal return for Deleuze and Guattari. This is also, for me, precisely the space where the question of a non-phallic sex-difference arises. The matrixial object/objet a and link, as we shall see, are between presence and absence, negotiating both co-emergence and co-fading, the potentially present and the almost lost erotic aerials of the psyche, since they are produced for and shared by a particular kind of trans-subjective hybrid entity, a subjectivity that is feminine but is neither pre-Oedipal nor castrated, that operates within the partial dimension, designating a non-Oedipal, feminine sex-difference, produced/inscribed already in the passage between the Thing and the part-object, and therefore negotiating an aesthetic difference.
The cleft phallic gaze

In the scopic sphere of vision, the objet a is the gaze, lacking and split forever from the passions of the eye, and dwelling in the Other. For Lacan, the eye and the gaze are forever cleft, secluding what is shown to the subject from what it desires to see. The Other doesn’t look at me from where I look at him, nor from where I would like him to look at me, and ‘what I look at is never what I wish to see’ (Lacan, 1964: 103). When I look for the gaze it hides, and precisely for that reason the field of vision is relevant to the unconscious subject; the split in-forms the eye as erotic. A drive is concealed/revealed in the schism from the gaze: ‘The eye and the gaze – this is for us the split in which the drive is manifested at the level of the scopic field’ (1964: 72–3). Via the artwork, a lacking gaze accesses consciousness in the form of a ‘strange contingency’ revealed by an Unheimlich signalling that we are on the horizon of experience, namely approaching ‘the lack that constitutes castration anxiety’ (1964: 73). Thus the underlying threat is the ‘appearance of the phallic ghost’, for the Unheimlich reposes on castration complex (1964: 88).

Since the painter undertakes a dialogue with the gaze, something of the gaze is always contained in the tableau. The painter seduces the eye of the viewer and offers it some imaginary food, but the viewer is solicited by the tableau ‘to lay down his gaze there as one lays down one’s weapons’ (Lacan, 1964: 101). Something that is fermented by this laying down of the gaze is granted to the subject’s eyes of phantasy. The painter’s stroke does not originate in a decision, but concludes an internal stroke which also participates in regression, against which it now creates (as in a reversal of the course of time) a gaze, a product that is also a cause, to which the painter’s actual stroke becomes a response. The gaze fascinates and horrifies the stroke, attracting it into becoming, from the site of the Irreal. In front of the amazing snare of the gaze on apparition’s horizon, consciousness can only conclude the artist’s act by ascribing images and thoughts to that which had none. The viewpoint of the gaze is the artist’s blind spot linked to the Thing, incarnated in painting. When Lacan attributes substitutions of loss-as-a-split to this tacit gaze, it becomes a phallic-extimate relic, an archaic outside captivated within, whose schism is then embodied by the screen of phantasy: the gaze is cast upon the screen when the subject is suspended, and if the subject does rarely appear on the screen, it is as a stain in the picture, while the gaze disappears.

Intersubjective gaze as want-in-being

A slightly different gaze, presented by Lacan in 1965, emphasizes the dimension of intersubjectivity, but the cleft is even more clearly erected, since it is precisely the relations to the want-in-being (manque à être) that are being contrived here.
And remember what I said the tableau [painting] is, the real tableau. It is the gaze. It is the tableau that gazes at whomever is caught in its field, falls into its snare. The painter is he who makes the gaze fall before himself, from the other. [...]he figure [is] projected before him [Signorelli], the figure of he who no longer knows from whence he sees himself, who no longer knows the point from which he gazes upon himself. For the S of the schema which I have shown to be the constitutive site for primordial identification – the identification of the unary stroke, the identification of the I[imaginary], the somewhere from which everything falls into position for the subject – this S, it must be emphasized, has no point, it is that outside which is the point of birth, the point of emergence of some creation, which may be on the order of a reflection, on the order of the secretly organized, of that which falls into position, of that which is instituted as intersubjectivity. With regard to this light – which appears suddenly on the very image of the one whose name is lost, of the one who is presented here as lack – Freud leaves the thing in suspense for us, leaves us kind of tongue-tied, so to speak. It is the apparition of the point of emergence.
in the world from the bursting forth point which, in language, can only be translated as the want-in-being

(Lacan, 1964–5)

It is in the no-place of the *Thing* in art that Lacan first detects, via the gaze, the uncanny 'phallic ghost' (1964). Via the tableau Lacan tracks something of the revelation of intersubjectivity as want-in-being (1964–5), in which the archaic Other as a point of emergence is outside and lacking. Later, in relation to literature (1975–6), Lacan hints at some revelation that passes via a ‘feminine’ sexual rapport (relationship) in the *sinthôme*, a rapport he considers impossible. If the gaze in art is an elevation of ‘woman’ to the level of the Thing (1968–9), then the *sinthôme* is a possibility of a revelation of ‘woman’ as incarnating an impossible rapport. Up until the end of his teaching Lacan repeatedly claimed that there is no sexual rapport (1973–4, 1975–6), that psychoanalysis itself testifies to this, that this lack of rapport is the basis of psychoanalytic discourse. But, if such a rapport existed, it would be feminine. With the *sinthôme* he enigmatically implies an incarnation of a ‘supplementary’ feminine site, stretched out from and retreating back into art, separated from psychosis by less than a whisper.

**Female swerve, feminine rapport and matrixial sex-difference**

In discussing the gaze and art, Lacan (1964) referred to Freud’s idea that the *Unheimlich* strangeness in aesthetic experience ‘springs from its proximity to the castration complex’. But enigmatic *Unheimlichs* are also attached, according to Freud, to the unconscious infantile complex ‘of intra-uterine existence’ or ‘womb-fantasies’ (Freud, 1919: 244, 248). These I have called matrixial. The two complexes, the phallic and the matrixial, to my mind indicate two different clusters of mechanisms, functions, and processes. The phallic structure accounts for an arena of non-rapport; the matrixial apparatus may hold for a space of borderlinking.5 ‘Elevating’ onto art matrixial sparkles that correspond to a channel induced by pre-birth incest has to do, in my view, with yet another phenomenon of the *Unheimlich*, in its relation to transference. Thinking these two concepts together conveys an underlying, dangerous female swerve and a feminine/prenatal rapport that vibrate on the horizon of *with-in-visibility* in art.

Swerve and borderlinking are incidents in the Real at the basis of a feminine-matrixial sex-difference. The swerve as spacing, distancing-apart as well as deviation, digression, and deflection, relates to Merleau-Ponty’s *écart* [gap] and *dehiscence*, which I transfer from the realm of perception to that of psychic affectation; borderlinking relates to his ‘thinking on two’. Speaking of ontogenesis of the aesthetic universe, Merleau-Ponty articulates a space of bursting and dehiscence in the Real prior to the bifurcation into subject and object, where the *écart* between–two is a ‘fragmentation of being’ and a becoming or ‘advent of the difference’ in a ‘virtual foyer’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1968: 215–6).
Minimal affectation conditions the genesis of art-creation and of the painter-gaze (Lyotard, 1995). But where Merleau-Ponty (1968: 201) speaks of perception as écart in relation to a level (niveau), I am thinking of affectation as a swerve in relation to a Thing, and of an affected originary borderlinking which allows us to associate the écart ‘between two’, or between several, to the pli (fold: ‘differentiation of the undifferentiated’ [Deleuze]) and to the Zwiefalt (Heidegger). A ‘pli-de-deux’ (two-fold), an ‘entre-deux’, where ‘it is difference which is differentiated’ (Deleuze, 1993: 10).

Affected swerve and borderlinking inaugurate a psychic co-poïetic space of transformation and differentiation in-between the several opened by the feminine, where a subjective web is linked to woman’s corpo-real Thing. The difference of the feminine is inaugural of its own space and is originary; it is not deduced from the masculine or the male. The originary female swerve is not engaged during the split of the subject nor is it dissolved inside relations to the Other defined by Lacan as ‘treasure of signifiers’, yet it imprints psychic traces. The originary swerve, which concerns the female invisible corporeal specificity (womb) for both male and female infants, is captured in a feminine rapport of the I with the uncognized other. The affected swerve and rapport generate and engrave passages and means of transport through which traces of joint events, jouissances, and phantasies are channelled, means that do not converge on the process of castration. They are non-Oedipal; they account for a difference in a non-phallic apparatus and create supplementary feminine-Other-desire, transported, transformed and transferred within the matrixial borderspace, beyond metaphor and metonymy, by what I have termed in my remarks on painting metamorphosis (Lichtenberg Ettinger, 1993). A feminine borderlinking discloses art as a transferential borderspace.

Echoes of matrixial ‘holes’ and knots sprout through art and re(a)sonate meaning, since in the act of painting the schize between the gaze and the eye falls apart – yet not into absence by fusion or annihilation. These knots display themselves enigmatically, and it is up to us whether to contemplate them once the act is over. I have transported the vague ideas of matrix and metamorphosis from art into psychoanalysis in order to unveil through them (become concepts) a particular spectrum of opaque, trans-individual, shared-in-difference, affected mental events and phantasies bounded by traces of archaic rapport with the feminine-Other. In the matrixial apparatus and by metamorphic processes, this spectrum reaches some level of organization and we may perceive something of it when it arises, partially, in fits and starts, at the horizon of the space of transference.

**Withness-in-differentiation, transgression, and hybridity**

Matrix is an unconscious borderspace of simultaneous co-emergence and co-fading of the I and an uncognized non-I, neither fused nor rejected, which share and transmit joint, hybrid and diffracted objects via conductible borderlinks.
The matrix is a model of a feminine/pre-natal rapport conceived of as a shared psychic borderspace in which differentiation-in-co-emergence and distance-in-proximity are continuously reattuned by a metramorphosis created by and further creating (interwoven by matrixial affects) relations-without-relating on the borders of presence and absence, subject and object, me and the stranger. The matrixial stratum or sphere, involved in the process of creating feminine-Other-desire and Other-sense, coexists and alternates with the phallic stratum. Metramorphosis is a process of inter-psychic trans-individual communication and transformation between/with-in several entities in a matrixial borderspace. It is the route of a passage through which matrixially affected events, materials, and modes infiltrate the Symbolic and diversify on its non-conscious margins through/by sub-symbolic webs. In a joint and multiple marginal trans-individual awareness, perceived boundaries are dissolved into becoming new boundaries; forms are transgressed; borderlines are surpassed and transformed into becoming thresholds; conductible borderlinks are conceived, transformed, and dissolved. Contingent transgressive borderlinks and a borderspace of swerve and encounter emerge as a sex-difference and a creative instance which engrave traces which may be revealed/invented in withness-in-differentiation. In the matrix, relation-without-relating transforms the unknown other and me, and turns both of us into partial subjects – still unknown to each other – in subjectivity-as-encounter. Metramorphosis is a co-poïetic activity in an inter-psychic web that remembers, conducts, transfers, and inscribes feminine jouissance, swerve, and rapport. Via art the effects of the borderlink’s activity are transmitted to the threshold of culture.

_Thingnified Ça-voir_, 8 swerve and borderlinking

Something of the erotic antennae of the psyche transmits to and receives from the Other, through the phantasy mechanism, an echo of matrixial ‘holes’: resonances of an archaic incestual rapport with the becoming-mother and affective remnants from the female swerve and the hybrid objet a. Metramorphic borderlink diffracts and assembles traces in a trans-subjective web, disengaged from and unappropriated even retroactively by the phallus. And if art and sexuality come to play with each other through the mediation of partial drives, then elucidating the specificity of the matrix as sex-difference in the partial dimension leads to articulating a supplementary aesthetic-erotic zone. Conceptualizing a level of an-Other feminine difference and of a non-equivalence between the sexes9 promoted by feminine jouissance, swerve, and borderlinking is possible only if whatever of it that escapes pre-established discourse is nonetheless unthinkingly known, and not only ex-sists with-in female corpo-reality but is traced by the artist, ‘written’ in/by art, becoming somewhat thinkable through the contemplation of art and its production, making some sense, finally articulated and shared in a transferential borderspace.

The knowledge of the Real is not a host of data awaiting decoding by
means of signification to produce signified knowledge (*savoir*) that will also constitute the subject as cleft, but is rather an ‘invention’ that happens ‘in any first encounter with sexual rapport’ (Lacan, 1973–4). Thus a metamorphic process of webbing-in-withness – exchanges of affects based on the conduction of/in shared (asymmetrically and not in the same way) trauma and phantasy, and transmissions-in-transformation of phantasy, beginning between a becoming-subject and a becoming-m/Other-to-be, but more generally between any *I* in co-emergence with an uncognized *non I*, in a *between* which initiates a plural-several, partial and diffracted ‘woman’ – can release knowledge from ‘holes’ in the Real and inscribe traces of a rapport in what a ‘*sinthôme*’ would turn into if viewed from this feminine side: as an intersection that creates/invents/reveals/releases a potential desire from its dangerous (foreclosed in the phallus, but *between foreclosure and repression* in the matrix) archaic zone. In painting, metamorphosis knits thingified *Ça-voir* and not
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signified savoir. The matrixial-other sex-difference treasures a dimension of potentiality and transgressivity in an inter-psychic, trans-individual, connectionist sub-symbolic web.10

Severalized hole, floating eye, diffracted gaze

If a ‘hole’ may ‘become two holes’ according to Lacan (1961–2), who uses here somewhat embryological imagery, then it may also become several holes. And moving from the phallic to the matrixial perspective, the several holes stand for a diffraction of the eye-and-gaze between several – not infinite, not one – entities, a sharing of the eye-and-gaze by several individuals, a composing of the eye-and-gaze by several components, and a dispersal and divergence of ‘grains’ of subjectivity between several different individuals, by which some eye-and-gaze(s) become borderlinks between partial subjects along which a diffracted gaze is plaited within the multiple-several holes, with their floating eyes, without fusion or split. All of this takes place to begin with in relation to a female swerve, since it occurs with-in the becoming subject co-emerging in pre-birth incest together with the mother-to-be. (I emphasize that when I write of the partial subject-to-be in the womb I refer only to the last intra-uterine period when the infant is already ‘post-mature’ [Winnicott] and we assume that its phantasy life has begun. The feminine ‘archaic origin’ echoed by the ‘matrix’ doesn’t indicate any limitation on women’s rights over their bodies, quite to the contrary! This configuration supports woman’s full co-response-ability for any event occurring with-in her own not-One corpo-reality and disqualifies phallic regulations of it.) The subject-to-be is a pre-subject in the desire and the discourse of the m/Other-to-be who transgresses her own individual psychic boundaries and shares the pre-subject’s Real that stretches ‘between trauma and phantasy’. The matrixial angle illuminates the borderspace between inside and outside in subjectivity-as-encounter, where a continuity rather than a split between inside and outside and eye and gaze comes to light. This continuity, connecting to a hybrid gaze and a floating eye, is sieve-like. It is a mark of difference whose advent is transformation, and which roves, since its elements are diffracted between several floating erotic points of vision that do not converge at a fixed emergence point.

Swerving the ‘gaze’, the ‘tableau’ and the ‘sinthôme’ towards the matrix allows further articulation concerning art and its production. In art, by means of metamorphosis, something of the secret organization that begins with vagrancy and severality with no possible fixed point of vision rises to the surface as a shared, hybrid, and severalized gaze in relation with (and not split from) the severalized hole and its eroticized floating eye – just as something of the horror of castration emerges through the phallic gaze and its fixed/fixing eye. In the gaze, the Phallus carves intersubjectivity together with a point of emergence into what is want-in-being, so that the split of the eye from the gaze is constitutive of the subject. In the matrix, the gaze carves trans-subjectivity in co-emerging entities in a becoming-rapport, between presence and
want-in-being in severality; for the gaze in the matrix rolls into several eyes, transforms the viewer’s point of vision and returns through his/her eyes to the Other of culture transformed.

**Matrixial Unheimlich**

In the experience of the matrixial *uncanny*, the gaze is not split and yet not fused with the eye, grasped as the *eroticized aerial of the psyche*. The gaze is saturated with primary distributions of energies that correspond to a rotating swerve, with traces of archaic *jouissance*, and with intensities striving for apparition. These traces and intensities are unexpectedly incarnated in swerve and borderlinking in/by the act of painting beyond-as-inside the visible. In the act of painting, the gaze moves between several archaic as well as potential participants, creates/disjoints each subject (potential-viewer) as partial with-in subjectivity-as-encounter – the subject’s view transformed in difference from other viewers’ transformations. The gaze of the artist, having trespassed its eye, is vibrated by it, so as to awaken a new swerve or roll it up in a rapport. The matrixial gaze is re-diffracted by each affected eye onto a potentially joint-by-several erotic screen of Vision. Wallowing with-in a shared and moving eye, the gaze re-diffracts at the moment of its rolling-in. Something – but not-all – of this act and its affects is transported into and conducted via the artwork, thus transforming the point of view of the viewer in difference from, yet in relation to, the non-conscious swerves and links of the artist, who captures/produces/conducts Ideas and phantasies. The tableau connects the gaze of the viewer who happens to be touched by it with its own lost zone beyond-the-schize, via vibrations embedded in the tableau that mysteriously conduct *diffracted traces* (Lyotard, 1995) of the artist’s act and gaze.

A severalized cavity opens, indexing a hidden female site which arises as originary feminine swerve, along with a borderlinks capturing the singularity of each pre-birth incest arising as transgression, as originary feminine difference. A non-conscious transferential channel is opened which offers the possibility of inscribing traces of inter-psychic non-fusional and non-split encounter with-in the Other, by weaving the matrixial web into an enlarged-Other, which would thereby contain sub-knowledge that is not conditioned by the repression of signifiers but rather by the emerging-, dispersing- and fading-in-transformation of the materials of the Real. Such a relation with its swerve(s) is transferred via artwork from the artist to the viewer. It is also transferred from the artwork to both viewer and artist, transforming their own erotic point of emergence of vision – the eye-with-gaze in the scopic psychic dimension.

**Besidedness with-in-out a transferential borderspace**

In terms of the unconscious art-coefficient and relations of transference, Duchamp suggests a kind of aesthetic osmosis between the artist and the
viewer via the artwork (Duchamp, 1975: 188–9). I suggest that a transferential borderspace of inter-with-ness, besidedness,\textsuperscript{13} and transgression embedded in relations of transference seeks ways to become known and thinkable via the screen of Vision. Psychoanalysis can discern, apprehend, and otherwise work-through an analogous borderspace embedded in a screen of phantasy stretched in transference/counter-transference relationships, in which an assembled and diffracted trans-individual doctor–patient entity can roll itself bit by bit into the Symbolic level.

It was Freud (1910) himself who qualified some transferential phenomena as Unheimlich, thus opening the route for Duchamp to deliver them to an aesthetic sphere and to make them intersect with aesthetic experience. ‘Mysterious’, even ‘mystical’ (Freud, 1910: 22), affective uncanny contingencies underlie the therapeutic potentiality of psychoanalysis, in terms of the patient’s openness to inter-personal interaction, influence and suggestibility, or his/her ‘tendency for transference’ in the encounter with the doctor with-in the psychoanalytic process. This tendency for transference, since it reposes on ‘sexuality, on the activity of the libido’ (Freud, 1916–7: 446) enters our ‘holes’.

Doctor and patient arrive at their transferential encounter with different phantasies and desires. Nevertheless, their phantasies and desires are somehow, mysteriously, temporarily and partially shared in a non-symmetrical yet reciprocal way, and are transformed in/by the encounter, and re-transmitted. Furthermore, phantasies and desires are created in the transferential borderspace as already conductible and shareable though in-difference, contrived specifically in/for each unexpected and unique psychoanalytic encounter. A matrixial borderspace for inscribing originary besidedness with-in/out is opened in the space of transference. This vagrancy of phantasy and desire is not a replacement of one’s own phantasy and desire by that of an other. Beside a phallic transference/counter-transference an other one happens, where trans-individual subjectivity-as-encounter is created between an I and an unknown other, or between an I and the unknown zone of a known non-I. The Unheimlich, both allowing and accompanying the transference/counter-transference matrixial rapport between doctor and patient, signal to both that a common-in-difference event which equally-but-differently concerns each of them approaches the margins of shared awareness, surrounds the edges of its cavity and is about to appear. Traces of a buried-alive trauma are about to be re-born from amnesia into co-emerging memory, and the potentiality of partially sharing it in the transferential borderspace is the condition for its appearance.

Such Unheimlichs allow and accompany seeing with-in/through a work of art. That is how we may read Duchamp’s art coefficient connected to space of transference: the artist and the viewer transform the artwork and are transformed by it in different times and places and to different degrees, in different-yet-connected ways. Each viewer gives the artwork new life, and what escapes the capture of the artist’s awareness is the kernel of this process. Such Unheimlichs otherwise allow and accompany the borderlinking through psychoanalysis.
Affective phenomena like admiration, amazement, empathy, anxiety and awe which are hidden inside the patient’s readiness for transference, as well as closely related phenomena like wonder, dread, compassion and again empathy (and even telepathy), which are hidden in the doctor’s tendency for counter-transference, also arise in viewing art, as if transferential object becomes a partial subject and communicates with us. Shared, exchanged and diffracted on the unconscious partial dimension, these affects attract and diffuse aesthetic matrixial threads and participate in the artwork’s potentiality for hurting and healing.

Co-poïesis inter-with the other

A matrixial phantasy bursts forth in each individual in withness within a composite subjectivity, testifying that the feminine/pre-natal archaic encounter does not retroactively melt away into an Oedipal ‘castration’ model and is not constructed, subjugated, or destroyed by the phallus, but rather opens a different channel beside it. The transferential encounter may involve a form of potential communication through which some materials and modes from the matrixial stratum may find expression, beyond art and psychosis, in psychoanalysis. And maybe that is where Lacan aims when, transporting the analyst from the status of a subject supposed to know (sujet-supposé-savoir) to the status of relics in the form of the objet a, he somewhat subversively remarks: ‘I have said and done enough to stop anyone – at least anyone from my close circles – from daring, from risking, to advance that one can be the mother [as an analyst in a didactic analysis]. Yet this is precisely what this is all about’ (Lacan, 1961–2, June). Parallel to this passage from positioning the analyst as a sujet-supposé-savoir to positioning him/her as an objet a we note that there occurs a passage from a masculine to a feminine position, and a move from transference as repetition to transference as ‘impossible’ yet potential encounter between subjects and with their becoming-joint-through-sharing psychic part-objects.

Feminine jouissance, which ‘does not wait for phallic organization to enter into play, will take on aspects of revelation which it will keep forever’ (Lacan, 1961–2). This revelation emerges in the matrix from the singularity of each encounter as a unique co-poïesis. It inscribes a potentiality appearing as a series of unexpected revelations in the transferential space. Another kind of appearance, or rather apparition, consists of modes of revelation in/by art. Raising the phallic objet a as ‘woman’ in art to the level of the Thing in primordial extimacy does not designate a regressive step. And linking with an inter-with matrixial sinthôme via art does not indicate a return to the womb in the Real nor a psychotic disintegration or fusion, but rather a realization of unforeseen potentiality with-in-out, where ‘original’ and ‘readymade’ intersect in difference. The enigma of femininity that touches upon the originary repression of the Thing – the Urverdrängung, the primordial unconscious as connected to sex and death beyond/before the separating line of castration, beyond/before the threshold of language – is foreclosed in the phallus but is emerging-
fading-by-transformation in the matrix. Something of those co-emergence and co-fading in the Real is delivered to the Symbolic’s ‘margins’ via covenants hidden in art. Since a matrixial co-poïesis is also experienced in transference and counter-transference, I take psychoanalytic relations as always containing a dimension of uncanny borderline trans-subjectivity, and psychoanalytic theory as a laboratory for new concepts born in/by art.

Something is interwoven between several entities into a tissue whose connections may become accessible via art. Something, but not-All. If for Lacan the ‘woman’ between jouis-presence and jouis-absence is Other even when she is in-between (1971–2), in the matrix she is a border-Other becoming-between in withness. A metramorphic dissolving is not a parting/cutting by either repression or foreclosure but rather a shared-in-difference transformation. Something of the impossible feminine position of in-ter-with the Other is interlaced in trans-subjectivity in relation-without-relating. Trans-subjectivity lies beside the One and the split subject.

Re-in/di-fuse

Let us now consider some of the aesthetic potentialities of the matrixial gaze, at the moment of its emergence and its eclipsing, still saturated with jouissance, aroused by the libido, excited by the drive to pass from the artist to the art and back again, and from the art to the viewer and back again, via erotic tunnels. Let us consider poïetic subjectivity-as-encounter, still stretched between trauma and phantasy, creating/producing different yet connected desires in the artist and the viewer.

In the scopic sphere in the matrixial partial dimension, the gaze rolls within the eye without its collapsing, since the matrixial gaze is hybrid and diffracted and the eye is a floating, severalized and shared erotic conductible antenna with no fixed-and-one point of emergence, with-in subjectivity-as-encounter. Metramorphosis directly creates and covenants knots in a trans-individual non-conscious web, and touches upon the sinthôme from a feminine site in a joint borderspace. A matrixial place/space/side awakes in the act of painting when a schize is transformed into a link. Awareness of some sparkles from it in the transferential space does not necessarily indicate psychotic disintegration, schizophrenic multiplicity or folie-à-deux.

This web-like subjectivity conducts and transmits a diffracted gaze, where we appear on the screen as a with-in-visible sieve. Each withness engenders its particular sieve in which, beyond the visible, a gaze that is the continuity of the inside outside and the outside with-in inspires and expires: inspirits us. Encounters, in the screen of phantasy as in the screen of Vision, attest that imprints are interwoven: that traces deviating from an unknown Other etch imprints in me unconsciously, that traces abandoning me still keep in touch via my unknown Others, and that an im-pure object is created inside trans-subjective heterogenesis.
In the matrixial borderspace partial subject and partial-object intersect and transmit poïetic archaic traces upon each other and in a connectionist web, while a partial non-I co-emerges with them. The flowing of the experience is inscribed in metramorphosis as asymmetrical yet reciprocal relations that create erotic antennae, shared but possessing different re(a)sonating minimal sense for each partial subject, artist, and viewer. These aerials register what returns from the Other as traces, and transmit a centreless or several-centred gaze. The matrixial filter tears affected trans-subjective events out of foreclosure. Metramorphosis transgresses the boundaries of the body-in-identity as male and
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female, and confers meaning to a variety of shifting traces of borderlinking beyond-as-before gender identifications. These traces do not converge into the confusion of One nor do they disintegrate into undifferentiation or total absence.

Even in the fading-by-transformation of the matrixial borderspace, diffracted gazes still twinkle in one another’s eyes. Awareness of the impossibility of a total split and the impossibility of not-sharing implies certain modifications in the classic Lacanian understanding of the structure of the unconscious, continuing the very late Lacan in Deleuze and Guattari’s anti-Oedipal direction. This has ethical implications beyond aesthetics, concerning covenantal relations with several strangers who induce changes in me, and whom I sway, in recognition of the impossibility of being fully cognizant of or of total splitting from the Other.

The doctor and patient co-emerge in the transferential space, sharing-in-difference the screen of phantasy through floating sharing and floating attention. The artist and the viewer, as doctor and patient, co-emerge in diverse ways with the work and by the work, sharing-in-difference the screen of Vision through passage-to-action and floating viewing. A matrixial gaze floats to the edges of visibility when a floating eye traverses the screen. Artist and viewer are not in passive/active contradiction in relation to the screen, and yet neither do they amalgamate; they are not the same, and they are not symmetrical. They exchange and keep a distance in proximity that allows the artist a freedom to act and allows the viewer emphatic com-passion as well as the freedom to re-in/di-fuse: a possibility for re-diffusion and re-infusion of elements in the transferential borderspace where elements neither fuse nor refuse each other. Re-in/di-fusing with-in the matrix hollows a critical space of subversion and resistance which becomes indeed a refusal of/for the split subject inside the phallus with its ‘woman’ as absence.

**Com-passionate withnessing and transgressive potentiality**

Of all of the kinds of contemporary means of production that compel the gaze of the viewer to meld with the gaze of the artist or the camera, hiding symbiotic gratification behind the offer of a controlling gaze, painting renews its critical relevancy as a vehicle for com-passionate yet critical distance, offering a grasp of floating time and space shared with the other while retuning distances-in-proximity.

The phallic gaze excites us while threatening to annihilate us in its emergence on the screen, giving us the illusion of a participation in mastery. The matrixial gaze thrills us while fragmenting, multiplying, scattering, and joining grains together. It turns us into what we may call participatory witnesses to traumatic events, at the price of diffracting us into grains. It threatens us with disintegration while allowing transgression towards a drama wider than that of our-individual-selves.
The matrixial perspective invites us to reassess the contemporary ‘death’ of painting, for its killing is the product of a phallic overdose. This reflex, like the total death of the subject, concerns the split subject only. In the matrixial border-space, there is never One-split subject nor its total want-in-being, but rather marginal and migratory severality. Painting ever-opens new aesthetic fields.

The matrixial gaze cannot be encompassed entirely by only-one subject, and cannot encompass it either. It was never a lost wholeness nor an endless multiplicity, and it remains partial, allowing for compassionate screening without identity, because while it breaks your imaginary wholeness it also conducts you to its (and your) margins and out of its (and your) own one-space. Different grains, spaced in a floating time, yet timed by a floating transferential borderspace in the artwork, will have no control over the gaze, nor will any grain suffer its total loss. The matrixial gaze reflects and creates libidinal metramorphic routes as it partly perishes and partly arises through its diffraction in the several, in its passing to several other grains and webs. Thus the
matrix indicates specific ways to rethink the effects of series (Buci-Glucksmann, 1995), and of the transition from one period to another. Trauma is defined in the matrix as relational; it can therefore only be worked through in a new transformational relation. Likewise, I rethink the phenomenon of unconscious transmission between artists and over generations in terms other than those of copy versus original, influence, etc., and instead in terms of transgression, trans-subjective and trans-generational ‘phylogenetic’ memory, and as an axis of potentiality for future realization of relational working-through.

The matrixial transferential borderspace carries contemporary art beyond the Duchampian era, in the sense that the binary contradiction between ‘an original’ and a ‘ready-made’ fades away; yet the two do not collide, but rather make each other swerve further with new exchanges. The matrix suggests a supplementary relief to the idea of transference that Duchamp transferred from psychoanalysis to art. The rapport between original and readymade in the matrixial sphere in painting creates a third zone of severality in the space of transference. Wandering, scattered and sprayed among floating eyes, it is impossible to re-gather the matrixial gaze’s traces; but you may join them in a labyrinth woven in the course of creating the matrixial web in the screen of Vision.

The artist with-in his/her doctor-and-patient dimension is a witness without event in com-passionate withnessing. The viewer is challenged by the artwork to join this matrixial borderspace. Beyond representation, s/he is carried by an event s/he did not necessarily experience, and through the matrixial web an unexpected transformation and reaction to that event arises. This, I believe, touches on an ethical aspect already carried inside aesthetics via affects attached to the objet a and to borderlinks. It was Lévinas who traced a radical path of thinking the ethical in terms of the feminine. In doing so he claimed, as I have said elsewhere, a space of sexual difference that unfolds directly in/from the feminine (Lévinas, 1993; 1997).

And nothing guides us in advance as to what withnessing the matrixial gaze will destine me or the Other, or as to which withness we will allocate the gaze.

Nothing foresees or prescribes the passage from a symptom to a sinthôme, neither in the phallus nor in the matrix.

Nothing paves the way for the passage onto an Irreal-Real in the form of an artwork. Nothing inscribes the artistic act in the painter’s stroke.

Nothing guarantees the power of the artwork to give rise to a response in viewers nor indicates in advance what transformation will take place in the shared matrixial web. The matrixial gaze is an encounter, and it can be partially retrieved only in another encounter.

Nothing proscribes specific linking of out-inner knots in-to an in-outer trans-subjective web.
And nothing decides beforehand what would lead the viewer to produce his/her own threads—’cause’/objet a/borderlink within a particular transferential borderspace.

**Memory and amnesia: Conclusions**

I suggest considering a matrixial transferential borderspace in artmaking and the artobject. This inaugurates a channel of co-emergence and co-fading where trauma, phantasy and desire join traces. It is a space of diffraction, severality, dispersal and partiality, shareability and hybridity, with-ness, conductivity, pass-ability and transmission, a space of potentiality. It is opened in/by the act of painting through a transgression of the splits between eye and gaze and I and non-I which momentarily defies the unconscious. The act of painting perforates
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a borderspace which is not conscious, but does not correspond to the structure of the unconscious as defined by a network of repressed signifiers worked through metaphors, etc. If amnesia plays a part here, it is double-edged. It looks toward a future in which whatever of it will transform into memory will have become a memory of that which was neither repressed nor forgotten, that which from the onset appears for the first time as a shared memory in the transferential borderspace, creating its veil of amnesia, hurting while healing. The act of painting looks to the past when it elevates the screen of phantasy into a screen of Vision, by way of Ideas, while suspending—without-removing the veil of amnesia, healing traumatic relations while hurting.

In the matrixial co-poïetic borderspace, I and an extimate – intimate–unknown – non-I share an ephemeral, unpredictable and singular alliance, in which each participant (as well as their hybrid objet a) is partial and relational in differentiating jointness. Partial subjects discern each other via conductible borderlinks, interlinking while transmitting affects and pathic information, addressing one another in a relation—without-relating that takes place in the course of alternations in distance-in-proximity in reciprocal non-cognition. Each partial-object is composite; each partial subject participates in several specific covenants. A ‘woman’ which is not confined to the contours of the one-body with its inside versus outside polarity interweaves a sex difference based not on an essence or a negation but on borderspacing links and on webbing links to a female swerve. ‘Woman’ is not a foreclosed Other, but a border–Other, a vacillating withness. The matrixial borderspace of co-birth in originary differentiation produces com-possible feminine-Other-desire which allows one to work, in art’s transferential borderspace, with the idea of an assembled and partial doctor-and-patient trans-subjectivity.

The matrixial apparatus made itself available to me through the act of painting. Putting it ‘in the service’ of psychoanalysis means a temporary contraction of its fluid sense into a particular channel. Thus the function of art for psychoanalysis may be to enlarge the scope of the unconscious and to question sex difference through analogies to phantasmatic binding with the lost objet a and with partial-objects, through relational trauma and phantasy, through further cohering with imaginary representation, through further adhering with desire, and by opening new symbolic significance that incorporates transferential history. The function of psychoanalytic theory for art may be to lend its conceptual tools to exposing the existence in art of a site of yet unformulated knowledge about sexuality and subjectivity, to clarify this site as a source for ideas that are awaiting signification in language, and to articulate them. If the act of painting elevates the screen of phantasy into a screen of Vision, by way of Ideas, while suspending without removing the veil of amnesia, and if it creates with its veil of amnesia memory as a future anterior, psychoanalysis may use revelations from the screen of Vision to perforate the veil of amnesia in the transference/counter-transference relations and attain/produce memories of trauma that are otherwise inaccessible but without which healing is impossible.
The encounter between trauma, phantasy, and desire behind the veil of amnesia yet without lifting it, or while producing it, is what is proper to artwork. If painting enables me to articulate something via ideas issued by/in/from it, it is in an after-time, from a temporary artist-as-viewer site still saturated with doctor-and-patient affectations. If psychoanalytic discourse reposes on ‘woman’ as absence, on the impossibility of elaborating what is beyond the phallus, on the impossibility of feminine rapport and on the othering of ‘woman’ to the point of her foreclosure, in an analogy to a ‘gaze’ that is the forever schized so that a certain unconscious and a split subject can emerge, then art may be a site from which some light may be shed on another ‘woman’, for in the act of painting the schize between the gaze and the eye melts and is woven into swerved difference. This act of art is not accessible to ‘therapy’, but the doctor and the patient in transference/counter-transference relations may elaborate something from whatever is imprinted for the first time in the transferential borderspaces of art, in order to lift culture’s veil of amnesia.

Notes

1 Most quotations from French sources were translated by Joseph Simas and Bracha Lichtenberg Ettinger. Existing English translations have often been modified. References indicate the corresponding passage in the published English translation, where available.

2 ‘Sinthôme’ is Lacan’s return to an ancient term which he uses to describe the symptom, as transformed by the writer into a piece of literature. It plays on saint homme (saintly man) and the English sin (sinful man), and refers to psychosis.

3 The scope of this article does not allow me a detailed presentation of the objet a. For further explanations see Lacan (1964) and Lichtenberg Ettinger (1995a, 1995b).

4 Lacan is referring to Freud’s patient.

5 I.e., they do not simply indicate two different organs, the female womb and the male penis. See Lichtenberg Ettinger (1992, 1996a and 1997).

6 I have coined the term ‘co-poïesis’ after Maturana and Varela’s ‘autopoïesis’ (1980). I use co-poïesis to designate a reciprocal but different trans-psychic engendering of partial subjects by one another in the matrixial borderspace.

7 I define withness—in-differentiation as jointness that puts the I and the non-I in a witnessing and sharing (with) relations.

8 Savoir is French for ‘knowledge’. Ça is the ‘Id’ (as well as ‘this’) and voir is ‘to see’.

9 Non-equivalence (Lacan, 1975–6) in no way implies inequality of rights.

10 On connectionism and sub-symbols, see Smolensky (1988).

11 It was Lacan in his 1972–3 and 1975–6 seminars who spoke of a feminine-supplementary jouissance. But for him, this jouissance is entirely incomprehensive in principle for both men and women.

12 Freud differentiates between two uses of the term unconscious: one to designate a particular system, which for Lacan corresponds to the treasure of repressed signifiers, the other to designate a phenomenon. I use the term non-conscious to indicate this second possibility of unconscious phenomena outside the ‘unconscious’ as a system (Freud, 1916–7: 437).

13 I am re-introducing and subverting the meaning of a beside rejected by Freud, for he believed in the more phallic replacement of the patient’s old ideas with new
ones. Freud considered the beside only in relation to hypnosis, and he rejected it altogether when he replaced hypnosis with transference (Freud, 1916–7: 437).

14 ‘Compassion’ in Hebrew: matrixes or wombs: rahamin.

15 In the theoretical passage from positing the analyst as a subject who is meant to know in the transference to positing him as an objet a, there also occurs a certain devaluation of the father’s position and a movement from the definition of transference as regression to its definition as a meeting of the subject with a remnant (objet a), realized for the patient in the figure of the analyst.

16 According to Lacan’s repeated claim (1972–3), a ‘woman’ is not-All in the phallic function.

17 Moreover, psychosis in a woman may relate to a total foreclosure of the matrixial stratum or to its melting into the phallic stratum. I therefore claim a ‘normal’–‘neurotic’ dimension of the matrix and not its foreclosure as psychosis (see Lichtenberg Ettinger, 1997).

18 I start from heterogenesis in the sense of Lévinas, Deleuze and Guattari, but continue it in a slightly different way in the matrix. For Lévinas, for example, the total otherness of the Other–‘woman’ is its condition, while in the matrix I emphasize difference-in-jointness where ‘woman’ is not a ‘total’ Other. In this account, subjectivity, trauma, phantasy, and Vision are far from being private non-historical entities that a certain perspective in art history presents them to be in order to establish itself as its opposite, as the ethical one.

19 This is a claim to non-Oedipal matrixial sublimation.

20 Modifications in general agreement with the direction taken by the British Independent group and the British/American Relational group working around the journal Psychoanalytic Dialogues.

21 My non-Oedipal position, close in some aspects to Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus (1983), diverges from it on several major points, and this is one of them: severality versus multiplicity.

22 Freud refers to an archaic memory that passes from one generation to another as a phylogenetic memory (1939: 102).

23 I am referring to the idea of ‘events without witnesses’ (an expression of Dori Lawb’s), which is in my view linked to the matrixial gaze (Felman and Lawb, 1992). These events can be carried in a matrixial space and transformed by a matrixial gaze.
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