

## On The Greek Conception Of Education And The Teaching Of Psychoanalysis

Intervention sur l'exposé de Ph. Rappart : « De la conception grecque de l'éducation et de l'enseignement de la psychanalyse » Congrès de l'école Freudienne de Paris sur « L'enseignement de la psychanalyse », à Paris le 17 avril 1970, publié dans Lettres de L'école de freudienne, 1971, n° 8 pp. 2-10.

The following is a first draft translation by R. Groome (2009) and was taken from the original French rédaction of a discussion and critique of Oury, Michaud, and Lacan to a présentation by Ph. Rappard.

**Ph. Rappart – Argument:** Nemo is interrogated on the institutions that do not properly speak transmit a teaching but that possess an important role in the éducation of subjects (in Greece the opposition between cult and the teaching of the master of music or gymnastics)<sup>1</sup>. With reference to the actual society, Nemo thinks that it is preferable to study the paths by which one 'teaches to be what one is' instead of, for example, the contents of knowledge that are dispensed in the Faculties. He remarks that in effect the establishment of teaching transmit an ideology, not a "way of being".

*G. Michaud asks Rappard for clarifications on the opposition of the Greek 'spiritualist' and the Hebraic 'materialist' in the text of his communication.*

*Rappart responds with the distinction made by the protestant theologians: in the first place, by Luther's distinction between Eros in the Greek sense and Agape in the Occidental-Christian sense – the notion of love promoted by Saint Paul after the teachings of Christ. He refers to the book 'Eros and Agape' by Anders Nigren.*

*Lacan interrogates Rappart on the possible usage of the distinction between Eros and Agape outside of the historical problem. Is there an interest at the level of psychoanalysis? He makes an allusion to his seminar on the Ethics of Psychoanalysis (1959-1960).*

---

<sup>1</sup> - The identity of who is referred to as *Nemo* here is confusing for the translator. For the moment, let us just state the etymological background leaving until later a more satisfactory response. *Nemo* is the Latin word for 'nobody' and is often used in stories of transformation. From Odysseus's tale of the slaying of the Cyclops by Perseus (=person, nobody, Nemo); Jule's Verne's Captain Nemo and the slaying of the giant squid, to Disney's 'Finding Nemo' there is a certain recognition and the passage from *Nemos* to *Nomos*.

*G. Michaud reposes his question and makes it precise that it had been posed in the distinction of materialism and spiritualism such that it appears in the communication of Rappart.*

*Rappart responds that the spiritualism is certainly to be situated on the side of Eros and that the materialism on the side of Agape. Once Agape is situated on the side of materialism, science can intervene.*

*Lacan manifests his surprise before the fact that the distinction of Eros and Agape is now being supposed understood while the reference is not even mentioned in the initial text of Rappart. Moreover, this distinction is extremely debatable in a religious critique. With regard to usage that psychoanalysis can make of it, it is limited strictly to the clarification that it can bring to a certain historical turning point where Eros and Agape manifest the transitory figure of a certain bi-polarity in the practice of love (see the Ethics seminar).*

*Lacan remarks that the text of Rappart holds indications that are more important for psychoanalysis; most notably those contained in the last part are pertinent. He asks Rappart for his commentary on the end of his text relative to civil community and the task of 'love as scientific object'.*

**Rappart:** These last phrases are addressed to psychiatrists in institutions that have an affair in their practice of the 'task' and original duality; the problem being to leave to the community what characterizes it as a civil community; the latter seems to be able to possess an analytic function. Civil community is not a religious community. It puts love in suspense to the interior: it is a vacuolar community<sup>2</sup>.

*Oury interrogates Rappart on what he names in his text ' the act of obeying' in articulating the question of teaching. Parting from the citation of Freud, " we dare take this love itself as the object of analysis", Oury poses the question of knowing if this love, object of analysis, can be the object of a teaching and if its teaching is a teaching on the object of analysis.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Vacuoles are essentially enclosed compartments of a cell which are filled with fluid such as water or various enzymes, though in certain cases they may contain solids which have been engulfed. The majority of vacuoles are formed through the fusion of multiple membrane vesicles. The organelle has no basic shape or size, instead varying its structure according to the needs of the cell.

*Lacan intervenes in order to point out the interest of Rappart's text seems to be concentrated on what concerns instruction; notably in the passage " the instruction does not consist in the methodic development of the faculties, it is a certain paradoxical way of developing a négation.*

*G. Michaud notes that it is the practice in institutions, notably in the création of therapeutic clubs, that the " the community in the community" is evidence of what is alleged by Rappart when he speaks of the "catastrophe that accounts for the community when it wants to love or be loved". That is to say, for example, when there is a confusion in an institution of the fields of the symbolic and the imaginary.*

*Rappart adds that if this sentence in his text takes aim at therapeutic clubs, it also concerns the school. The idéal will be a school that does not search to make itself loved or not loved.*

**Lacan:** The opposition of instruction and initiation in the text of Rappart is important if it would only be for the reason of the tendency to reproduce initiation metaphors with regards to psychoanalysis. Once posed that the analysis is not properly speaking an initiation, it will be necessary to ask in what does it participâte in its instruction. Without a doubt one instructs oneself in analysis, but to instruct oneself is very well different than to receive information.