

AUTHORITY AND TRANSFERENCE: NOTES ON THE WHITE CASTLE, BY O. PAMUK

Fabiano Chagas Rabêlo^{1 2}, Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5026-8396>

Oswaldo Costa Martins³, Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5024-6573>

Karla Patrícia Holanda Martins³, Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3242-6287>

ABSTRACT. This is a bibliographical research, in essay format, that comments on the book of O. Pamuk *O castelo branco*. From it, it was sought to clarify the historical, cultural and epistemic conditions of the accomplishment of the analytic discourse, questioning the use of authority in analytical technique in comparison with other modalities of social ties. The categories of analysis adopted are Koyré's contributions to the construction of the modern scientific method, Lacan's elaborations on the subject of science, his discourse's theory and the concepts of transference, uncanny and narcissism of small differences. It is emphasized that the Pamuk text has as its center the problematization of the feeling of the uncanny between two look-alikes in a relation strongly marked by the cultural distance, the rivalry and the admiration. It is then discussed the participation of the subject of the unconscious in the act of knowing and the influence of narcissism on the production of obstacles in the field of knowledge. It is emphasized that, by failing to intervene through its own signifiers and Ideal of Self, the psychoanalyst evidences the relation of the subject with its master-signifiers and its object cause of desire. Psychoanalysis thus demonstrates that the social injunction to place oneself in the place of the other is crossed by the contradictions of the narcissism of small differences. In the end, it is questioned through the feeling of the uncanny as a motive of segregation and violence the manifestations of the other in me that I reject.

Keywords: Othman Pamuk; science; discourse of the analyst.

AUTORIDADE E TRANSFERÊNCIA: NOTAS SOBRE O CASTELO BRANCO, DE O. PAMUK

RESUMO. Esta é uma pesquisa bibliográfica, em formato de ensaio, que comenta o livro de O. Pamuk *O castelo branco*. A partir dele, busca-se esclarecer as condições históricas, culturais e epistêmicas de realização do discurso analítico, interrogando o uso da autoridade na técnica analítica em comparação com outras modalidades de laço social. As categorias de análise adotadas são as contribuições de Koyré sobre a construção do método científico moderno, as elaborações de Lacan sobre o sujeito da ciência, sua teoria dos discursos e os conceitos de transferência, estranho e

¹ Universidade Federal do Piauí (UFPI), Parnaíba-PI, Brazil.

² E-mail: fabrabelo@gmail.com

³ Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC), Fortaleza-CE, Brazil.



narcisismo das pequenas diferenças. Salienta-se que o texto de Pamuk possui como centro a problematização do sentimento do estranho entre dois sócias em uma relação fortemente marcada pela distância cultural, a rivalidade e a admiração. Discute-se, em seguida, a participação do sujeito do inconsciente no ato de conhecer e a influência do narcisismo na produção de obstáculos no campo do saber. Salienta-se que, ao não intervir por meio de seus próprios significantes e Ideal de Eu, o psicanalista evidencia a relação do sujeito com seus significantes mestres e seu objeto causa do desejo. A psicanálise vem demonstrar por essa via que a injunção social de se colocar no lugar do outro é atravessada pelas contradições do narcisismo das pequenas diferenças. Ao final, indaga-se por meio do sentimento do estranho como móbil da segregação e da violência o que há do outro em mim que eu rejeito.

Palavras-chave: Ohram Pamuk; ciência; discurso do analista.

AUTORIDAD Y TRANSFERENCIA: NOTAS SOBRE EL CASTELO BRANCO, DE O. PAMUK

RESUMEN. Esta es una investigación bibliográfica, en formato de ensayo, que comenta el libro de O. Pamuk *El castillo blanco*. Se busca aclarar las condiciones históricas, culturales y epistémicas de realización del discurso analítico, interrogando el uso de la autoridad en la técnica analítica en comparación con otras modalidades de lazo social. Las categorías de análisis adoptadas son las contribuciones de Koyré sobre la construcción del método científico moderno, las elaboraciones de Lacan sobre el sujeto de la ciencia, su teoría de los discursos y los conceptos de transferencia, ominoso y narcisismo de las pequeñas diferencias. Se destaca que el texto de Pamuk tiene como centro la problematización del sentimiento del ominoso entre dos socios en una relación fuertemente marcada por la distancia cultural, la rivalidad y la admiración. Se discute la participación del sujeto del inconsciente en el acto de conocer y la influencia del narcisismo en la producción de obstáculos en el campo del saber. Se subraya que, al no intervenir por medio de sus propios significantes e ideal de yo, el psicoanalista evidencia la relación del sujeto con sus significantes maestros y su objeto causa del deseo. El psicoanálisis viene a demostrar por esa vía que la injunción social de colocarse en el lugar del otro es atravesada por las contradicciones del narcisismo de las pequeñas diferencias. Al final, se indaga por medio del sentimiento del extraño, como móvil de la segregación y de la violencia, lo que hay del otro en mí que yo rechazo.

Palabras clave: Ohram Pamuk; ciencia; discurso del analista.

Introduction

Starting from the commentary on the book by the Turkish writer Ohram Pamuk (2007), *O castelo branco*, to advance the discussion about psychoanalytic technique, especially about the use the analyst makes the authority attributed to him and the means he uses to promote the effects he expects to trigger. By being both a historical and a fictional construction, Pamuk's book allows us to approach some aspects of this question from the inside out by exploring the impasses and impotence points of the discourse of the master

(Lacan, 1992b). It is questioned the limit of this discourse from which a transition to different forms of social ties becomes possible, including the discourse of the analyst.

The advent of psychoanalysis was the result of the concomitant action of historical factors with specific contingencies related to the biography of its creator. This means that in the absence of certain social, cultural, and epistemic conditions, psychoanalysis would scarcely have existed (Lacan, 1998). Lacan (1992b) returns to this question a few years after that affirmation, this time supported by his theory of discourse, by which he questions the minimum conditions that enabled the emergence of psychoanalysis. He argues that the discourse of the analyst appears for the first time because of repeated and successive quarter-turn movements that change the elements that make up the structure of discourses. For Lacan (1998), one of the fundamental events for this is the consolidation of science and its method, which generated as a correlate a form of subjectivity quite different from the one that existed until then. Henceforth, methodical doubt - and no longer faith - becomes the foundation for the construction of knowledge.

Besides the discourse of science, another crucial point for understanding the conditions of possibility of psychoanalysis is the decline of the social figure of the father, which triggered consequences of extreme relevance in the public and private spheres, promoting a substantial transformation of the relation of the subject to the tradition and authority figures. In Pamuk's narrative, such decline is closely associated with the fall of the Ottoman empire, with repercussions in the field of arts, knowledge, and politics (Costa, 2017, Imbrizi, Matsubara & Silva, 2014).

It may be said that the title of the book most likely constitutes a reference to this question. The castle, in a denotative sense, represents the center of power, the sultan's house. In a metaphorical sense, it is possible to situate it as the theoretical and philosophical structure, whose base is a religious worldview and the Aristotelian cosmology. Finally, it can still be a reference to narcissism, especially that of the Sultan, the fragile foundation of the Ottoman Empire.

Hence, another line of work that the book allows to develop is that of the distance between what is the order of the self and what is of the subject, especially as regards its relation to the obstacles of the act of knowing. With this in mind, it begins with Freud's statement (2001) that compares the narcissistic cut operated by Copernicus in holding that the earth is not the center of the universe with the psychoanalytic proposition that the Self is not master on its own house. At this point, the theme of ignorance, one of the passions engendered by repression (Freud, 1997a), takes on a central place.

It is also worth mentioning that such discrepancy between the subject and the Self is accentuated by the fact that the plot of the book is based around two antagonists with contrasting qualities: master and slave, Italian and Ottoman, Christian and Muslim. Despite the differences, both share the passion for knowledge, as well as a disconcerting physical resemblance. There is another essential element of the plot: the theme of the double and the uncanny, which denounces a structural point of opaqueness of the psyche, tributary of its division, that limits the reflexive thought and the act of knowing.

First, some methodological considerations are drawn and guide the writing of this essay. Next, an outline of the book's history is outlined, highlighting its points considered most sensitive. Subsequently we discuss the transformations that have led to the establishment of a new subjectivity by the influence of modern science. Then, referring to the relationship between the main characters, what is considered a point of impossibility in it is questioned: the access and control by the subject of the signifiers who occupy the place of agent in the discourse of the master. Then there is an interpolation between the

discourses of the master and the analyst, highlighting how each of them operates. Finally, we address the problem of authority in these two modes of social tie.

Methodology

This is a bibliographical research, in essay format, in which Pamuk's text acts as guideline of the argumentative course. It is located on the frontier between psychoanalytic clinical research and literary and cultural studies. It is possible to situate it within the scope of extension psychoanalysis (Lacan, 2003), since, through dialogue with literature, it questions the historical, cultural and epistemic conditions of possibility of psychoanalysis.

The main categories of analysis are: Koyré's (2006) contributions on the construction of the modern scientific method, Lacan's elaborations (1998) on the subject of science, his theory of discourse (Lacan, 1992b), the concept of transference (Freud, 1997c, Lacan, 1992a) and the categories of uncanny (Freud, 1997f) and narcissism of small differences (Freud, 1929/1997). In addition to these authors, we have used some articles that address the above-mentioned concepts and that focus on the work of Pamuk. It should also be added the entry of the entry of the Encyclopedia Britannica (2017) about the caliph Mehmet IV that was fundamental to the understanding of the historical context that serves as a background for the plot of the book.

Between East and West, science and religion

The story of *O castelo branco* is set in the mid-seventeenth century, at the beginning of the reign of Mehmet IV, who rose to the throne at only 6 years old, in 1648. His reign was marked by intrigue, uprisings, war incursions and some conquests (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2017). Mehmet IV, however, was not interested in governing, devoting much of his time to hunting. Hence, his monarch assignments were often delegated to representatives and councilors - pasha and vizier - which made the political environment even more unstable. The plot ends near the end of the reign of Mehmet IV, deposed in 1687 after suffering a disastrous defeat in a campaign against Austria. His death occurs three years later in exile.

In general, the Mehmet IV caliphate was a period of contrasts. One notices the effects of the decadence of the Ottoman Empire, which remained for much of the Middle Ages as the greatest power on the globe. This downward movement is evident in the political, cultural and economic spheres. Namely, through the loss of military hegemony and the ever more evident perception of European scientific and artistic advances driven by the Enlightenment and the Renaissance. Nevertheless, such a period cherishes the nostalgic hope of recovering the summit of the glory of the empire, especially through a reckless expansionary war project. Thus, Mehmet IV sought to match the achievements of his grandfather, Mehmet II, whose stories of conquest he had heard from an early age (Pamuk, 2007).

It can be said then that this book, like others by the same author, explores the tensions arising from the Westernization of Turkish customs and traditions. The difference lies in the problematization of the consequences of this process in the field of knowledge, questioning how the Enlightenment uses the Eastern Arab epistemic tradition and transforms it.

The book follows the first-person narrative of one of the protagonists, a Venetian young man of wealthy background, well-educated, in his early twenties. His name does not appear at all throughout the book. This absence of name plays a key role: that of accentuating the effects of depersonalization conjured up by the phenomenon of the double.

Therefore, such a character is designated here as the protagonist, sometimes by his Viennese.

At the beginning of the story, he finds himself on a ship about to be assaulted by an Ottoman frigate. After the attack, unlike the fate of many of his fellow travelers, his life is spared. The Venetian presents himself to his imminent executioners as a doctor. He insists he could be more useful alive than dead.

Once captured, his life changes radically. The protagonist is forced to leave behind family, friends, bride, his history and his identity. Gradually, he adapts himself to the condition of slave/prisoner and, by the exercise of his new office, manages to gain the confidence of the guards of the prison. To promote small cures, he relies on knowledge of physics, anatomy, and physiology. His fame spreads, which makes him little by little more requested by the jailers. His reputation then reaches the ears of the Sadik Pasha, the lord of the prison, who goes on to request his services.

However, another element besides his ability to provide cures draws attention from Pasha. The protagonist has an incredible physical resemblance to a local inventor and scholar, whose name is Hoja, a word that means master or lord in Arabic (Pamuk, 2007). In return for his services, Pasha offers him the prisoner as a gift. From then on, the plot centers around the relationship between the two. This is how the Venetian becomes Hoja's slave and assistant in his researches. Hoja, in turn, states quite clearly what he expects from the protagonist: that he conveys to him in detailed and thorough manner everything he knows and learned in the West. To this end, Hoja is willing to take advantage of all possible expedients. At the center of his research is the attempt to demonstrate a heliocentric cosmology.

The point of tension of this relation is the fact that, despite occupying diametrically opposite positions, both are look-alike, of a similarity that causes them bothersome and perplexity. Thus, in contrast to the imaginary consistency of the Self, the plot explores the phenomenon of the uncanny/disturbing as the instant of fading of identities.

The central thesis of Freud (1997e) on the uncanny is that, through this phenomenon, what should remain repressed presents itself in a manifest way, being accompanied frequently by the affection of anguish and the feeling of derealization and desubjectivation. Freud resorts to etymology to demonstrate the ambiguity of the word *Unheimliche*, accentuating its use both in the sense of what is similar, familiar, domesticated, and habitual as of what is hidden, unknown, and threatening. The uncanny is not, therefore, the unknown, hardly any familiar thing which, through repression, has become threatening.

Freud also emphasizes that the feeling of strangeness presupposes a regression to a moment of psychic development in which a clear distinction between the inner world (Self) and the external world (Other) is not yet settled, from which results the belief in magic, in the supernatural and the omnipotence of thoughts and desires, whose supposed efficacy overlaps with natural laws in explaining everyday phenomena (Lustoza, 2015).

Returning to the characters in the book, it is important to emphasize the tense relationship between them, sometimes marked by contempt, sometimes by admiration. If, on the one hand, the slave - Western and infidel - instigates with his presence the repulsion from Hoja, on the other hand, the interest of Hoja for the European knowledge is enough to sustain a share of curiosity and expectation. On the venetian side, respect is also not absent, since Hoja embodies the cultural legacy of the Ottoman Empire, heir to an entire scientific, philosophical and artistic tradition of the ancient world. Nevertheless, the condition of slave and the memories of the life that led and of which he was private guarantees an aggressive component to the relation, although in the form of a resigned ambivalence. Between the

probable death in freedom and the preserved life as a slave, the protagonist opts for the latter, although he never fails to plan escapes.

This is the point of the plot that this work aims to explore. It is recognized in the relation between Hoja and the protagonist a tension that goes back to a structural impossibility of the discourse of the master. Hoja emphasizes through the discourse of the master to obtain something whose access is only achieved through the discourse of the analyst. That is, to know why, despite the physical similarity, each of them remains so different from each other.

In this way, the reason for Lacan (1992b) is to consider the discourse of the analyst as the reverse of the discourse of the master: while the latter commands, governs and consequently produces the unconscious, since it requires the repression of certain signifiers and drive tendencies; that seeks to give expression and favor the elaboration of the formations of the unconscious.

After carrying out some small tasks, such as organizing a pyrotechnic presentation, the duo is tasked by the Pasha to develop "[...] a weapon that will turn the world into a prison for our enemies" (Pamuk 2007, p. 47). Under the pretext of carrying out this enterprise, Hoja receives a large sum. However, he uses these resources to carry out other scientific projects of his own choosing, such as building a clock that would be able to determine the precise time of prayer throughout the Arab world and a cartography of the universe through which he intended confirm or refute the existence of an invisible star that would orbit the space between the earth and the moon. These two lines of research indicate the harmony of Hoja with the European Enlightenment spirit of the 18th century.

The hypothesis of the Unconscious and the subject of science

The inventions of Hoja reflect the historical course of construction of the modern scientific method, which occurred by the combination of two correlated processes: the instrumentalization of reason and the development of a mathematical language (Koyré, 2006). Such procedures, in turn, presuppose the need to question methodically and rationally the data presented as an immediate truth are obtained through perception, common sense or intuition. For this reason, the hypothesis of the existence of a star invisible to the naked eye that would orbit between the earth and the moon should be considered valid, credible and worthy of investigation until it has been refuted by means of mathematical and experimental arguments.

Hoja's astronomical models thus embody a stage in the course of modern science. They are the materialization of a theory - an effort of abstraction based on an algebraic and logical language - whose objective is the mathematization of the real. Such models, in turn, also constitute the core of experimental situations that fulfill the function of demonstrating or refuting the truth of a given conjecture.

It is worth emphasizing the difference between mathematization and quantification. The former transforms the understanding and approach reality by means of a reduction of the real to the symbolic; the second is reduced to accounting for sensitive elements of reality. Mathematization allows the logical substitution of indeterminate elements, which makes possible the advance in scientific research; quantification represents an information organization procedure that precedes and prepares the theoretical leap that mathematization makes feasible (Ferreira & Alberti, 2013).

The hypothesis of the unconscious, as Freud (1997d) defines it in *Metapsychological Articles*, is also the product of the same demands that lead Hoja to postulate the existence of the invisible planet. Such a statement, before demonstrating the inconsistency of the

Freudian invention, indicates that the Freudian pathway closely follows the demands of modern scientific discourse (Biazin & Kessler, 2017, Lima & Ferreira, 2015). This fact can be seen in the need to build a model of the psychic apparatus that serves as a compass for clinical research. The function of this model is to minimize as much as possible the pregnancy that the premise of a self-reflective consciousness imposes on psychological research. Hence Freud argued that the hypothesis of the unconscious constituted a legitimate and necessary theoretical construct, since in its absence many psychic phenomena remained obscure and irrational (Freud, 1997d).

Thus, like Hoja's astronomical model, the perspective of the unconscious does not exclude a material referent: the psychopathological phenomena that the clinics presents. On the other hand, the realization and understanding of the formations of the unconscious are not achieved by pure observation and accumulation of data. It is necessary a theoretical mediation, the metapsychology, that brings with it important ethical and philosophical consequences.

The narrative of Pamuk also allows us to address what Freud (2001) presents as the three narcissistic wounds arising from the advances of science: the first, with Copernicus, when he indicates that the earth is not the center of the universe; the second, with Darwin, when proposing that the human being has a similar origin to other species; finally, psychoanalysis, by sustaining that thought, consciousness and psychism are not overlapping common territories, that there is an unconscious thought inaccessible to consciousness and that most of our psychic activities are, in fact, unconscious.

It can be said that the passage from the discourse of the master to the analyst presupposes a mobilization work of these narcissistic wounds that come to occupy a place in the discursive structure. Instead of ignoring the lack or the impossibility to say, psychoanalysis begins to consider them, demarcating them as the limiting condition of discourses.

From the above, it is possible to affirm that the difficulties of the research in psychoanalysis go back to a dilemma that inhabits the core of any theory of the psyche. That is, where to situate the subject of knowledge. In the case of psychoanalysis, the researcher/analyst will hardly fail to influence and be influenced by the analysand, which Freud problematizes from the recognition of an irreducible dimension of the suggestion present in every intersubjective relation. This fact, in the view of some critics, compromises all the results of the analytic research, disqualifying their conclusions (Grünbaum according to Mezan, 2014). This difficulty, for example, is partly healed in the field of natural sciences by the experimental method. It should be noted, however, that Freud, before acritically leaning on the use of suggestion, moves toward reducing its effects through psychoanalytic management of transference. Therefore, according to him, psychoanalysis adopts the world view of science, which is inevitably incomplete and partial, subject to corrections, additions and substitutions (Freud, 1997g).

Lacan (1998) will approach this problem from another angle. For him, the subject of psychoanalysis is the same as that of science (Biazin & Kessler, 2017, Lima & Ferreira, 2015). However, while in this the subject is forcluded, returning in the real in the form of a suffering or a subjective error of the researcher; psychoanalysis, in turn, collects the effects of the manifestations of the subject in the real and seeks to build a rational way of investigation and treatment of psychic phenomena. That is to say, if science excludes the psychic division from the act of knowing, psychoanalysis bases its field of research on this very division.

Let us see, then, how this forclosed dimension of the subject of science appears in Pamuk's book (2007). Hoja's investigations demonstrate the fragile context in which modern scientific research takes place at its inception. Now they are perceived with suspicion, since some of their conclusions clash with the worldview of representatives of the State and religion, or as something desirable and salutary, since their results favor the development of useful techniques for war, control of nature and the governance of men.

It is realized the impotence of Hoja in convincing others of the heliocentric theory of the universe. His conclusion: the pasha, the vizier, the sultan, the nobles and other members of the court are idiots, because they are not convinced. His main goal seems to be to persuade the sultan that the earth is not the center of the world. Thus, Hoja would be doing a great service to the empire, contributing to the intellectual formation of the sultan, curbing his passions and consolidating a more rational and thoughtful way of thinking and acting, which would reflect in his way of governing. The irony lies in the fact that the young Caliph, an eight-year-old boy, is more interested in his abilities as an astrologer than an astronomer. Faced with the monarch's questions about the predictions of the future, Hoja gives evasive and abstract answers, fearing the fate of the astrologers who preceded him: the accusation of conspiracy and the condemnation to death.

It is interesting to highlight the contrast of affections that the sultan inspires in the protagonists. While his presence awakens in Hoja feelings of reverence, respect and fear; his look-alike is taken by a discreet motion of affection and sympathy. Where the former perceives a figure of authority with whom he maintains bonds of obligation, which entails risks, but also opportunities; the second, perhaps already imbued with a conception of family and childhood which will henceforth become more and more widespread in the West, conceives before him only a child, with all the necessities and vicissitudes associated with it. In both cases, however, the manifestations of the Ideal of Self in the social dynamics are perceptible. On the side of Hoja, it is the main social referent of the Ottoman empire from whom all seek to obtain approval; in turn with the Venetian, one sees the projection of a yearning for completeness of his own narcissism, similar to what happens to parents in relation to their children. Thus, an analogy is proposed between the sultan's place for the empire and that of the baby in the narcissistic economy of the parents: "[...] his majesty the baby" (Freud, 1997b, p. 57). Therefore, narcissism based on ideals is hypothesized by Freud as an obstacle to the truth of the unconscious and, consequently, to the exercise of psychoanalysis.

Dentro dessa conjuntura, o problema da ignorância se coloca de modo premente para Hoja, incitando afetos e paixões contraditórios. Ele se pergunta: o que leva tantas pessoas ao erro, impedindo que avancem em direção a um entendimento mais acurado e racional dos fatos? Por que justamente um escravo infiel é capaz de ir tão longe onde tantos nobres muçulmanos falham?

Impasses of the discourse of the the master and the authority of the analyst

Between one project and another, Hoja tirelessly questions his slave, urging him to tell everything he knows about himself, what he has read and learned. In addition to specific information, Hoja has a broader purpose: to understand how others, Westerners, think. Therefore, the interrogation takes on an almost confessional character. He demands that the Venetian report everything, including his most repulsive deeds and thoughts. Nothing should be omitted. Hoja aims to access its most intimate truth - his and slave's - which made them to become what they are.

As indicated in the introduction, the proposal of discourse of Lacan (1992b) represents an attempt to mathematize the possible relations between the heterogeneous elements that make up the social bond. They are: S1 and S2, respectively the master signifier and knowledge, which, when articulated, composes the minimum structure of the signifying chain, the small object 'a' - plus de jouir object and cause of desire - and S/, the subject divided, representing the Freudian hypothesis of the unconscious. It should be noted that the subject appears in this formula in its symbolic and real double determination, from the signifier and the jouissance.

It follows that the subject in psychoanalysis is not confused with conscious reflective thinking, as defended by different philosophical currents. It is rather a logical operator that is inferred from the symbolic order that governs the language. In this perspective, the subject is rather the effect of language than its agent, from which subjective division is deduced and the existence of an off-centered knowledge of the ego. For psychoanalysis, there is something that inhabits the core of our being, which remains as impossible to be represented and that determines thought.

Throughout his seminars between the years of 1970-1971, Lacan develops his proposition on the discourses, considering its foundation in the game of social positions. Its formulation relates to the three impossible offices mentioned by Freud: to govern, to psychoanalyze and to educate. Lacan proposes four formulas of structure for the discourses: of the master, of the university, of the hysteric and of the analyst³, according to the illustration. For Lacan (1992b, p. 158): discourses are 'the apparatus, whose mere presence "[...] dominates and governs everything that eventually can arise from words. They are speeches without words, and they come to dwell in him"'.

The discourse of the master is defined by its relation to 'knowledge', which is not on the side of the agent, but on the side of the Other. The agent of this discourse is the signifier that the master incarnates to command (S1). Such signifiers are addressed to the slave in the place of knowing (S2), which is urged to produce, but which is expropriated from the fruit of his labor. For Lacan, in the discourse of the master the very condition of the subject is represented as the effect of language. It can be seen that the mathema that represents the subject (S/) is under the bar, in the place of truth, in the remainder condition. In this way, the subject is what escapes the regulation of the distribution of jouissance in the social bond by the discourse of the master,

In the discourse of the analyst, the agent is the object cause of desire that, focusing on the subject, impels him to work, causing him to produce a knowledge from his own master signifiers. It is, in this case, unlike the knowledge generated in the field of science, a singular and non-universalizable knowledge. For this reason, Lacan maintains an ethical dimension inherent in the discourse of the analyst, which does not seek to appease suffering, the peaceful insertion of the individual into the social bond or the production of a knowledge about himself that can be widely shared. What is expected of an analysis is that it can touch the real that constitutes the truth for each subject.

There is, therefore, according to Nguyễn (2016), a responsibility on the part of the one who occupies the place of agent in the discourse of the analyst. For the author, it is a sexual responsibility, since the knowledge produced in this discourse and what comes from it in the form of an act do not serve the jouissance of the analyst.

What the Lacanian formula allows to isolate is the limit of the discourse of the master: the present impossibility of the subject to access his own truth. The tension that arises from

³ In another situation, he refers to a fifth discourse, naming it the discourse of the capitalist.

the forcing this limit leaves passage to other modalities of social bonds, among them, the discourse of the analyst. This, on the contrary of the discourse of the master, reveals what remains veiled in this discourse

It is argued that the tension between the characters of the book allows us to see the quarter-turn movements - the exchange of the elements in the places demarcated in the structure of the discourses - that could culminate in the analytic discourse. It is possible to represent the situation as follows: Hoja, moved by his desire, interrogates the Venetian in the place of slave, who is incited to work. The fact that the protagonist is an educated and learned person evidences that knowledge in the discourse of the master is on the side of the Other. However, if the master is in charge, he does it from his mastersignifiers. The origin of these signifiers, however, escapes him, leaving him the enigma of his subjective division under the bar, in the place of truth.

Hoja tries to advance at this point, using for this his authority of master. That is, he strives to go as far as possible within this mode of discursiveness which is the discourse of the master. Therefore, it imposes punishments and offers rewards to press the protagonist to state his most intimate truth. The curious thing is that the more he advances in this game, the more it incorporates the ways of acting, speaking, and proceeding from the slave, so that, over time, it becomes increasingly difficult for others to distinguish one from the other.

It is possible to establish a parallel of this procedure with the Freudian technique in a moment previous to the adoption of the free association and later to the abandonment of hypnosis, when Freud used the suggestion as a way to overcome the resistances of his patients (Ferreira & Carrijo, 2016, Rabêlo, Danziato, Veras Filho, Quadros & Carvalho, 2017). The difference lies in the fact that for Freud resistance is the result of psychic division, whereas for Hoja it is a cowardice of thought. It is curious to imagine what would be the result if Hoja decided to make use of hypnosis in his interrogations.

The procedure is reversed when the Venetian objects that to understand others - the idiots - it would be necessary that before he understood his own way of thinking. In accepting this provocation, one notices that Hoja is strongly imbued with the Enlightenment ideal. For him, thought, through methodical reflection, must be able to access its truth. It is a procedure similar to the Cartesian hyperbolic doubt, which represents an earlier stage necessary for the formulation of the hypothesis of the unconscious (Lacan, 1998).

Perhaps we can locate at this point a movement of hystericization of the position of Hoja, when he leaves the position of agent of the discourse of the master and assumes its division as subject of the desire in the discourse of the hysteric. Lacan (1992b) maintains that the discourse of science is the discourse of the hysteric, insofar as it questions the cause, the small object *a* in the field of the Other, from its own subjective division.

A game is then created. The protagonist, on his own initiative, builds a table - furniture that does not conform to local customs - where each one sits face to face with a sheet of paper in which they try to answer in writing the question: how did I become what I am? At this point, it is interesting to highlight the contrast between the function of the divan in psychoanalytic technique and that of the table in Pamuk's book. If the divan, a word that comes from Arabic and means place of speech (Quinet, 1992), in the analytical device is an accessory that acts as a bulkhead that hinders the production of a scopic reciprocity and a mode of discursivity based on ordinary common discourse (Lacan, 1986); the table, in this context, represents a space that separates and demarcates a distance, but also opens the possibility for a scale movement by specular inversion.

A strong transferential bond is consolidated between the protagonists, who engage in a technique of psychological research strongly based on the discourse of the master,

alternating in the place of agent. It is then necessary to question the fate and effects of this bond in comparison with the discourse of the analyst.

Freud (1997c) writes that transference is a function of the analysand, and its manifestations are spontaneous, either in analysis or outside it. If the analyst is included in the affective manifestations mobilized by the transference, this is due to the vicissitudes of the psychic dynamics of the analysand, which, as a rule, happens in the most paradoxical way: by the expectation of an affective retribution or, as indicated by Lacan (1992a), by the hope that he will be revealed a knowledge of what is most intimate to him and that will clarify the reasons for his suffering. This initial attitude most of the time soon turns into hatred, anger or frustration, being such feelings, as well as love, expression of the transference (Freud, 1997c). With this, a whole palette of affective manifestations that populate human relations every day is artificially deployed in a two-way relationship within the psychoanalytic device.

This does not mean, however, that transference is established as a bond between two subjects. The analyst is warned of the disparity implied by transference, since it is always in vogue what is concealed in other discourses, but which represents its basis and foundation: that every social bond goes back to the structure of the relation of a divided subject with his lost object, his *agalma* (Lacan, 1992a), which he tries to recover. The *agalma* in Lacan's teaching constitutes this enigmatic object cause of desire which is believed to be contained in the beloved. His/her brilliance is the driving force of transfer love. The assumption of his possession engenders the authority of which the analyst uses in a very peculiar way to promote analysis.

In the analytic perspective, the analyst, this strange interlocutor, consents to empty himself of his subjective marks so as to collect what emerges from the analysand's singular speech, giving a destiny another to his own narcissistic ideals. For this, he must refrain from responding to the demands of satisfaction addressed to him. It is again emphasized that this is an extremely artificial situation, given that, day by day, we are unceasingly called to respond from the discourse of the master, which uses authority to regulate social bonds in the *polis* and promote sharing of jouissance.

As a consequence of this argument, the conduction of an analysis cannot occur spontaneously or randomly, thus requiring the presence of an analyst who consents in a way advised to occupy this place in act. For this reason, Lacan (1992b) adds that the desire of the analyst is the decisive element for an analysis to take place. It is a desire debugged in the analyst's own analysis, which enables him to take the place of object a semblant in this discourse (Danziato & Rabêlo, 2018).

The outcome of the plot exposes a structural imposture inherent in the discourse of the master, evidencing that knowledge is inexorably on the side of the slave. The solution found by Hoja is to change his identity and take the place of the Venetian in his hometown. By agreeing to this exchange, Hoja demonstrates a change of position regarding the impasse in which he was involved, which does not necessarily represent the resolution of that impasse. It remained to the protagonist the possibility of writing his memoirs, this time assuming as the place of his statement the person whom he was once.

Now, this conclusion shows that the discourse of the master promotes an intricate set of mutual identifications, which leads to the illusion of intersubjectivity. Lacan denounced the risk (1953-54 / 1986) of taking identification with the analyst as the index at the end of an analysis. Identification in this context, at most, can represent a stage of analytical work - a manifestation of the analysand's resistances - and, at worst, its failure. What is expected

from an analysis is that it can lead to the emergence of an unprecedented desire to reduce the symptom to a singular trait of the subject (Danziano & Rabêlo, 2018).

The theme of the double and the uncanny points to an original and residual inconsistency present in every identity constitution, which now appears in the form of fascination and now of threat. The approach of the uncanny in the book has, in addition to aesthetic and clinical repercussions, a political dimension (Lima & Vorcaro, 2017). Their questioning favors the isolation and symbolization of the traits that mobilize aggressiveness and rivalry, on which the narcissism of small differences is supported.

The narcissism of small differences constitutes the projection of an aggressive motion to a similar and close person who carries a differential trait (Freud, 1997f). Sustained by a dialectic that evolves individual and group psychic processes, two coordinated and dependent movements articulate: on the one hand, it selects an object that catalyzes the aggressiveness that happens to be the target of practices of violence and segregation; on the other hand, mutual identifications are promoted between members of a particular social circle from the reference to the excluded element.

In this way, the irruption of the stranger's feeling - for which the narcissism of small differences (Freud, 1997f) constitutes a defense - can lead to different outcomes. It is believed that, once recognized and subjectivated, such traits can act on other modalities of social responses other than barbarism, violence and segregation. The fact that art and literature seek the feeling of the uncanny to obtain an aesthetic effect corroborates this argument.

Pamuk's book addresses this question as it explores the paroxysm of the presence of a foreigner in the life of an enlightened Turkish scientist at the dawn of the Enlightenment at the beginning of the fall of the Ottoman empire. Moreover, it articulates the theme of the production of knowledge with the blind spots and the ignorance that narcissism inevitably promotes. The challenge Pamuk alludes to is to recognize and temper such manifestations, giving them other fates and treatments. It is expected that psychoanalysis is up to this challenge.

Final considerations

The book by Pamuk analyzed herein has as its center the problematization of the feeling of the stranger in a social situation strongly marked by cultural distance, rivalry and by identity tensions. By accompanying the narrative, the consequences of narcissism to what is of the order of knowledge were interrogated from the psychoanalytical framework. It was possible to extract some epistemic, methodological and political consequences, which are considered of great relevance to the psychoanalyst, but which may be of interest to other areas, such as literary criticism and cultural studies.

It was emphasized the epistemic consequences, because, when discussing the participation of the subject of the unconscious in the act of knowing and the influence of narcissism on the production of obstacles in the field of knowledge, the way is paved to interrogate the situation of psychoanalysis in the present time. How to sustain its atopic place in relation to science, favoring the manifestations of what scientific discourse does not cease to produce as a return of the manifestations of the subject in the real?

Methodological consequences were also mentioned, since the reading of the book stimulated the discussion about analytical technique in order to specify its use of authority, contrasting with other modalities of social bonds. It was pointed out that, by not intervening

by means of his master signifiers and his Ideal of Self, the psychoanalyst makes it possible to show the relation of the subject with his master signifiers and his object cause of desire.

From the above, contrary to what is commonly affirmed as a corollary of an attitude of tolerance and recognition of differences, psychoanalysis shows that the injunction to put oneself in the place of the other is crossed by the contradictions of the narcissism of small differences. It is then proposed a shift of the problem. It is questioned by the feeling of the stranger, what is there of the other in me that I reject?. It is possible that there arises an attitude of more openness to that which exists in each individual. This is not without its political and ethical consequences. Thus, one arrives at the theme of segregation and the exacerbation of radicalisms of identity, unfortunately so in vogue today.

References

- Biazin, R. R., & Kessler, C. H. (2017). Psicanálise e ciência: a equação dos sujeitos. *Psicologia USP*, 28(3), 414-423. doi: 10.1590/0103-656420160184
- Costa, A. O. (2017). Notas sobre a transmissão: articulações entre tradição e criação. *Trivium - Estudos Interdisciplinares*, 9(2), 172-183. doi: 10.18379/2176-4891.2017v2p.172
- Danziato, L., & Rabêlo, F. C. (2018). Ato psicanalítico e a formação do analista. *Revista AffectioSocietatis*, 15(10), 228-248. doi: 10.17533/udea.affs.v15n28a10
- Encyclopædia Britannica. (2017). Mehmed IV. Londres, UK: Encyclopædia Britannica inc. Recuperado de: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Mehmed-IV>
- Ferreira, M. R., & Alberti, S. (2013). Psicanálise e ciência: a emergência de um sujeito sem qualidade. *Psicanálise & Barroco*, 11(2), 210-224.
- Ferreira, D. D., & Carrijo, C. (2016). O manejo transferencial em Freud: uma análise da relação entre transferência e sugestão. *Ágora*, 19(3), 393-408. doi: 10.1590/S1516-14982016003004
- Freud, S. (1997a). ZurEinführungin der Behandlung (Weitere Ratschlagezur Technik der Psychoanalyse I). In S. Freud. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. Ergänzungsband, p. 181-203). Frankfurt am Main, GER: S. Fischer. Original publicadoem 1914.
- Freud, S.(1997b). ZurEinführungdesNarzismuss. In S. Freud. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. III,p. 28-68).Frankfurt am Main, GER: S. Fischer. Original publicadoem 1914.
- Freud, S.(1997c). Bemerkungenüber die Übertragungsliebe(WeitereRatschlagezurTechnik der Psychoanalyse III). In S. Freud. *Studienausgabe* (Vol.Ergänzungsband, p. 217-230).Frankfurt am Main, GER: S. Fischer. Original publicadoem 1915.
- Freud, S.(1997d). Das Unbewusste.In S. Freud. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. III, p. 119-173). Frankfurt am Main, GER: S. Fischer. Original publicadoem 1915.
- Freud, S.(1997e). Das Unhemliches.In: S. Freud. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. IV,p. 241-274).Frankfurt am Main, GER:S. Fischer. Original publicadoem 1919.

- Freud, S. (1997f). Unbehagen in der Kultur. In S. Freud. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. IX, p. 191-270). Frankfurt am Main, GER: S. Fischer. Original publicado em 1929.
- Freud, S. (1997g) Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse- 3. Vorlesung: über eine Weltanschauung. In S. Freud. *Studienausgabe* (Vol. I, p. 586-608). Frankfurt am Main, GER: S. Fischer. Original publicado em 1933.
- Freud, S. (2001). Eine Schwierigkeit der Psychoanalyse. In S. Freud. *Abriss der Psychoanalyse: einführende Darstellungen* (p. 185-194). Frankfurt am Main, GER: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag. Original publicado em 1917.
- Imbrizi, J. M., Matsubara, F. K., & Silva, M. L. F. (2014). A arte de narrar a história de uma vida em Orhan Pamuk: possíveis aproximações com as ideias de Sigmund Freud. *Fractal: Revista de Psicologia*, 26(spe), 695-714. doi:10.1590/1984-0292/1320
- Koyré, A. (2006). *Do mundo fechado ao universo infinito*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Forense Universitária.
- Lacan, J. (1986). *O seminário: livro 01 os escritos técnicos de Freud (1953-1954)*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Jorge Zahar.
- Lacan, J. (1992). *O seminário: livro 08: a transferência (1960-1961)*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Jorge Zahar.
- Lacan, J. (1992). *O seminário: livro 17: o avesso da psicanálise (1970-1971)*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Jorge Zahar.
- Lacan, J. (1998). Ciência e verdade. In J. Lacan. *Escritos* (p. 496-533). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Jorge Zahar. Original publicado em 1966.
- Lacan, J. (2003). Proposição de 9 de outubro sobre o psicanalista da escola. In J. Lacan. *Outros escritos* (p. 248-264). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Jorge Zahar. Original publicado em 1967.
- Lima, C. H., & Ferreira, M. R. (2015). Lacan com Koyré: teoria do sujeito e suas incidências clínicas. *Arquivos Brasileiros de Psicologia*, 67(1), 37-50.
- Lima, V. V., & Vorcaro, A. M. R. (2017). O estranho como categoria política: psicanálise, teoria queer e as experiências de indeterminação. *Psicologia em Estudo*, 22(3), 473-484. doi: 10.4025/psicolestud.v22i3.37026
- Lustoza, R. Z. (2015). A natureza secreta do estranho: uma interpretação lacaniana da angústia em Freud. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 35(2), 473-487. doi: 10.1590/1982-370301192014
- Mezan, R. (2014). Pesquisa em psicanálise: algumas reflexões. In R. Mezan. *O tronco e os ramos: estudos de história da psicanálise* (p. 528-575). São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras.
- Nguyen, A. (2016). A irrupção do político: resposta da psicanálise e o laço social. *Trivium: Estudos Interdisciplinares*, 8(2), 208-215. doi: 10.18379/2176-4891.2016v2p.208
- Pamuk, O. (2007). *O castelo branco*. São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras.

Quinet, A. (1992). *As 4 + 1 condições de análise*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Jorge Zahar.

Rabêlo, F. C., Danziato, L., Veras Filho, C. J. C., Quadros, R. B. S., & Carvalho, G. O. (2017). Os fundamentos da técnica da transferência de 1895 a 1905. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 37(1), 132-145. doi: 10.1590/1982-3703003712015

Received: Apr. 16, 2018
Approved: Dec. 06, 2018

Fabiano Chagas Rabêlo: Psychoanalyst - Professor at the Universidade Federal do Piauí- UFPI - Campus Parnaíba – PhD student in Psychology at the Universidade Federal do Ceará- UFC - CAPES/PDSE Scholarship.

Oswaldo Costa Martins: Psychoanalyst. PhD student in Psychology at the UFC - Universidade Federal do Ceará/CAPES_DS. Member of the School of Psychoanalysis of the Forums of the Lacanian Field.

Karla Patrícia Holanda Martins: Psychoanalyst, professor in undergraduate and graduate courses in psychology of the UFC – Universidade Federal do Ceará - PhD in Psychoanalytical theory from UFRJ.