

Questioning love. The *Heptameron* of Margarita de Navarra

Andrés Barbarosch (EFA)

Lacan - in a Review of the Ethics Seminar - gives a definition that I am interested in mentioning: "Analysis revalues desire in the principle of ethics. Censorship itself, at first the only figuration of morality, draws all its energy from him. There seems to be no other root of ethics." The reading that he carries out of Freud's *Psychology Project* with which he promotes ethical interrogation in our practice positions him at the antipodes of the scientism of a Kris who had been in charge of editing the essay found among the Freud-Fliess correspondence, to the one that he gave to the publication in a fragmentary way, an euphemism for the censorship that he exerted on it.

Kris, art historian, part-time conservator at the *Kunsthistorische Museum*, part-time psychoanalyst, close to the Freuds, emigrated to the USA with the analytical diaspora like most Viennese. There he fought for the scientific validity of psychoanalysis and for its acceptance by the medical profession.

Much younger, also a Viennese and an emigrant like him, close to the Kris family, Eric Kandel, half psychoanalyst and half neurophysiologist, who in 2000 won a Nobel Prize in molecular biology for his research on the memory of a mollusk, *Aplysia*, for whom brain chemistry opened the door to business with laboratories and in the field of neurosciences he was renowned with a few isolated phrases from Freud, such as the desire to reduce phenomena to physical-chemical factors.

There are other possibilities in this area. Siri Hustvedt has worked seriously on art, psychoanalysis, and neuroscience with a sensitivity regarding the unconscious under a title that still resonates with us: "A Woman looking at men looking at women." Lacan considers women

in the plural making wefts, or weavs. Norberto Ferreyra raises women in the distinction between culture and civilization.

Regarding the malaise in culture, Freud raises an essential disorder of sexuality, which implies going through the laws of the word; it is not something chemical, even though it involves chemical processes. Apart from Freud's final reflections on ethics, I want to return to the way in which he concludes with a question: Will Eros be able to prevail for once against Thanatos? How to say it without receiving the objection of not paying attention to the mix and unmix of drives?

— With the development of science at the service of laboratory business, even considering its eventual beneficial effects, Thanatos wins.

In opposition to this bear hug of the Ego Psychology with the discourse of science, Lacan did not stop returning to the ethics of psychoanalysis. In fact, in *Seminar XX* he proposed to redo it and in *Seminar XXI* he continues his reformulation of interrogating love.

In such a case, if we speak of love, it is because of the place that it is taking in the analysis - the transference - as love to knowledge. There are analysts who considered the transference as an artifice, something characteristic of psychoanalysis. Lacan did not share that opinion. What the analysis of love through transference captures can lead us to the details of its composition. Transference love is a condition of analysis even though both love and transference exist outside of analysis. The transference involves other issues that are not related to love. On another level, how to do, as an analyst, in the transference when facing the negative therapeutic reaction, the monotony of the phantasy, the oblativity? Can Eros prevail for once against Thanatos?

Lacan does a detailed fabric on courtly love in *Seminar VII*. He walks past ancient and medieval authors, literary critics - mostly men, only one woman, Margarita de Navarra (1492-1549), for one of her books: the *Heptameron*.

In "Homage to Marguerite Duras. The outburst of Lol V. Stein", says that in Seminar VII he kept his hand tight in the invisibility of another Margarita, that of the Heptameron. There he talks about Novel X, which I will take tangentially; a story of an impossible love with a tragic end in the 16th century - the romance of Amadour and Floride - which today has different commentaries (Lacan, Porge, Rabaté and others) as well as that of the historian Lucien Febvre.

Was the Queen of Navarre a libertine author, the writer of a mystical treatise? Seventy-two *nouvelles* narrated at the rate of ten a day, the French Decameron, which throughout his life he was unable to conclude.

This book was stolen by a person from his service published under another title and adulterated - later improved in another version - but also censored; it was not until the middle of the 19th century that a reliable text was available. It has gone from integrating the genre of the erotic and the comic to the literary canon. He strikes a certain balance between the mischievous spirit and courtly love conventions.

The novel is about five gentlemen and five ladies who arrive in different groups at an abbey near the Pyrenees in search of refuge from the floods, going through dangers and, others, having perished in the attempt. They remain isolated for ten days during which the construction of a bridge will take and they choose as a pastime, so as not to get bored, a place in the meadow where they can tell stories. This is the framework in which the novels are narrated.

Unlike the Decameron, the slogan is that the stories are narrated based on events that occurred and, at the end of each story, there is a dialogue between the participants moderated by Parlamente. It has been possible to identify several of the characters from anagrams and slight distortions of the names, as well as Parlamente as Margarita herself.

Some editions of the *Heptameron* contained an erotic vignette at the beginning of each novel. Lacan warns that the stories operate a censorship effect on the readers, who do not stop at the final dialogues where the richness of the book resides.

Margarita is double. There is a worldly one - who walks through the halls of the palaces - and another mystical Christian who took sides with the Reformation. Franciscan bishops and friars are presented as the worst villains in this book. Margarita as Montagne condemns the cruelty of the test of love that mirrored the logic of sacrifice in a theological era. Margarita, in the novel X, embodies the character of Floride. Margarita is a flower and the Lover of the story is Admiral Bonnivet. Commanding the troops of Francis I of France, Margarita's brother - who was fighting for Italy with Emperor Charles V - was massacred along with his army in the battle of Pavia (1525). Drive disengagement: death.

An impossible love between a queen and a commoner - but not platonic - breaks the face of courtesy with rape attempts. I will not dwell on Parlamente's wise reflection in the final dialogue. In the novel he commits suicide in combat to defend the faith and she enters a convent in the heart of Jesus.

Lacan, towards the end of *Kant with Sade*, says: "Such us, for example, the disagree which , somewath hastily, was brougth upon all objects the proposed themselves as goods, as been incapable of causing the harmony of wills: simply by introducing competition. So Milan that Charles V and Francois I knew what it costed both to see the same good. This is indeed to misrecognize the nature of the object of desire." And as regards to desire, there is no agreement of wills either, whose derisory image Lacan gives with Brueghel's "Parable of the Blind", where the stumbling block of the first corresponds to the fall of those who follow him in the procession.

I can then return to the question: Will Eros be able to prevail for once against Thanatos? Not if there is no place for failure, the occasion for there to be a desire.