



ESSAY AND CONTINGENCY.

Alexander Cruz Aponasenko

Received: February 2013 – Accepted: September 2013

Member of the Psychoanalytical research team of C.S.M. No. 1 "Dr. Hugo Rosarios".

✉: alikcruz@gmail.com

"assaulted" by the feeling, until such time that ended up giving in to the insistence, had a time of thought. Some reason mingled in the process, said it was located between Homer's inspiracionism and Poe's rationalism. What really interests us at this time is to note that the writing of Borges, as many other authors and may not only writers, comes in response to an encounter.

Borges used to say that when he wrote, it was the themes generally those who were to find him. He said he could walk down a street and suddenly be struck by a sense, over the years he came to know and identify the feeling. A piece would occur sometime rather soon. Borges's recommendation, or at least what he did was surrender. There was like a kind of acceptance, resignation perhaps. The topic was so insistent that he ended up writing to get rid of it.

Borges was not, however, a simple clerk. From the time he was

What do we mean when we say encounter? The Lacanian psychoanalysis streak has a beautiful way of referring to the encounter. The encounter is what is subject to contingency. It opposes to repetition automatism. Contingency is simply what happens and in turn cannot help but to happen. For psychoanalysis, contingency is the real itself. And it is a real product of a certain lack of sex. In this way, not having sex in the sense of proportion between the sexes and between the joys, the contingency arises. The clinical psychoanalysis tackles to lead patients to the point where they are able to make something instead of agonizing quota to meet. But the path of clinical psychoanalysis is not what we want to do, for there is no one way, or no one way of thinking about them. Venturing here that: a writer is the product of an encounter. Let us explain this a little later. The meeting has meant that, as we noted earlier, there is no actual relationship.

Jean Allouch considers the following scenario: someone asks what is the usual topic when in a meeting with analysts. He replies that he has never been in a meeting with analysts, as a psychoanalyst is something that exists only fleetingly in a session of psychoanalysis. In fact, that is a conclusion drawn immediately when observing the analytic discourse in the seminar *The reverse of psychoanalysis*. The analyst position itself is only achieved when the analytic discourse makes an appearance, which just happens so fleetingly. It is a position that cannot be fixed. Nobody remains enrolled in the analytic discourse intently, as if you can be in the hysterical discourse, university or master.

Someone carrying Borges in a taxi to a lecture receives a question: And what do you do? To which the individual answered: "Borges, I'm a writer." Borges said, "ahh, I also write sometimes." Beyond the anecdotal to the situation, there is an indication lightning flight extremely thin on the words of Borges. *Sometimes*. That sometimes makes the lack of a constant, a discontinuity that opens the door to an encounter every time. Borges understood this perfectly well. So let others call him writer. He was a person who wrote sometimes.

1789

We said that the writer is a product of an encounter. To what else if not a meeting Borges refers when he says that it is he who is approached by his subjects. He is found. His attitude towards the game is like pointing that Freud analysts to open their ears and listen to retain the possibility of the unexpected. This is not to in any way establish some sort of identity between Freud and Borges, less between psychoanalysis and Scripture, but noted that the logic of the game is common to the two fields, and how to operate with the meeting? is a question that is in the substrates of the two disciplines.

Borges is clear in saying what his proceeding. He was a master of the game. And there was something I knew I was going to put in the line of the meeting. Reading. Before anything else, Borges was presented as a reader. And what I did was read, until the time it was taken by surprise. Sometimes.

Barthes says something very interesting about the moment of surprise. There is a moment when the reader looks up the text. At that moment the occurrence Barthes writer located. There may be several times or none of these. You may have them for someone and not for another. Writing can not be the only way to do something with that. But anyone can be a victim of the encounter.

In the case of writing, what genre would be more akin to the meeting? Since it is necessary to point out that it need not be a genre that privileges some relation to the contingent, but we believe that the trial has certain features that make it easier to locate the author's relationship with the contingent. Why? He says the test is a genre free. If you've read anything of psychoanalysis can not help but smile at the thought of how much freedom it's truly free. To say that there is a literary genre in which you can write with freedom is to put the bait on a hook where the subject is going to sting. It is not nothing but a call for subjectivity. The supposed freedom can be the most inhibitory at the time of writing, since the emergence of subjectivity is parallel to the emergence of the object, which usually results paralyzing situation. Thinking about the emergence of a text object is not unreasonable. In our favor we have advocated that Borges that a text should be able to recover the voice, look at the text as carrying an object. That bearing is what gives life, makes a living text. References to this point together in style.

Perhaps that is privileged if the trial, the author inevitably confront such emergencies. Hence all knowledge be relegated to the background, not entirely absent. For knowledge is necessary to give a course to what happens. The test may allow become visible marks what was the writing, that caused it. Brands often hidden when it comes to writing such academic format. Not in all cases it should be added, if rather scarce. To affirm that such effects do not occur in academic writing is denying the extent of the contingency.

References.

- (1) Allouch, J. (2001). *Hola... ¿Lacan? Ciertamente*. No. Edelp. Buenos Aires.
- (2) Barthes, R. (1994). *El susurro del lenguaje*. Paidós. Barcelona.
- (3) Borges, J. L. (1993). *Borges en la Escuela Freudiana de Buenos Aires*. Agalma. Buenos Aires.
- (4) Freud, S. (2003). *La interpretación de los sueños*. Obras Completas. Biblioteca Nueva. Madrid.
- (5) Lacan, J. (2006). *El seminario. Libro 17. El reverso del psicoanálisis*. Paidós. Buenos Aires.
- (6) Lacan, J. (2006). *El seminario. Libro 23. El Sinthome*. Paidós. Buenos Aires.