

Retrieved from:

The European Journal of Psychoanalysis

Jun 24, 2024

<https://www.journal-psychoanalysis.eu/articles/freuds-massenpsychologie-and-lacans-patristic-exegesis/>

John Gale

Freud's Massenpsychologie and Lacan's "Patristic" Exegesis

First of all, I would like to thank the organisers and particularly Cristiana Cimino for inviting me to make a contribution by responding to Professor Nobus' presentation. It is an honour, although I am very aware that I have a limited ability to do so. I should like to start by dwelling for a moment a paragraph from the advanced notice:

In order to recover this lost clinical dimension of Freud's 1921 volume, I shall return to the way in which the text was interpreted during the 1950s and 60s by Jacques Lacan, for whom the key point of Freud's exposition is to be situated in the notion of '*einzigster Zug*' and its ramifications for our understanding of the principle of identification. Apart from the fact that Lacan's idiosyncratic reading—'*einzigster Zug*' is effectively a 'unary trait' of Freud's book in the most literal sense—will enable me to present some fundamental aspects of what psychoanalytic interpretation entails, within as well as outside the clinical setting, it will also prompt me to investigate the place and function of identification in Lacan's theory of subjectivity and, most crucially, the meaning of identification in Lacan's conception of the end (the direction and the finality) of the psychoanalytic treatment.

Nobus 2022

From this dense paragraph, we can see immediately that the territory Professor Nobus intends to explore is concerned with: (1) Lacan's interpretation of Freud (which, this implies, may differ from other interpretations, including other psychoanalytic interpretations); (2) Lacan's interpretation during a specific period – the 1950's and 1960's (perhaps earlier or later he interpreted it differently?); (3) psychoanalytic interpretation more broadly, or to be more precise, some (not all) 'fundamental aspects' not exactly of interpretation itself but of what that interpretation 'entails'; (4) that the inevitable consequences of these fundamental aspects (what it entails) concerns not only the clinical sphere but also the 'outside'; (5) that the notion of '*einzigster Zug*' is a 'unary trait' in Freud's text; (6) that this was 'key' in Lacan's reading of Freud's text; (7) that this reading was idiosyncratic; (8) that there is a single component or function or characteristic in Freud's text and that this needs to be understood, not figuratively or metaphorically or allegorically, but in a 'most literal sense'; (9) that it has 'ramifications' (consequences?) for the way in which we 'understand identification'; (10) that identification has both a 'function' (it does something) and a 'place' (is topographical) within Lacan's theory of subjectivity; (11) that it has a specific 'meaning' within Lacan's concept of the end of analytic treatment; and (12) that this specific meaning concerns both 'direction' (the goal aimed at) and 'finality' (its end as such) in as much as they are two aspects (are there other aspects?) of ending. I shall endeavour to comment on some of these extremely complex points.

From the *Massenpsychologie* to Identification

In the *Massenpsychologie*, which Freud wrote in 1921, he said little that was new. In substance the text concerns matters which had hitherto already been the subject of his major studies. These were now simply postulated as being of sociological significance. However, Freud's argument is astonishingly naïve as he seems not to have noticed that this may be problematic. Moreover, the writing decidedly complacent [1]. Older ideas are cobbled together onto the work of others, notably that of Le Bon, which, like the rest, Freud did not read critically[2]. The text is fairly short and can be read through in one sitting. The reader having got the answers to manifold questions about society, politics, the Church, the army, and even about falling in love. In fact, given its sweeping generalisations, across manifold discourses, including history, sociology and theology it is, perhaps, surprising that it continues to be read. As Michel de Certeau reliably puts it, Freud was simply not competent in these fields (1987: 104). The 'booklet' was based on the simplistic idea that what had been said of the individual in terms of his or her relations to other family members, the object of love and the analyst, could be said of the crowd (Carveth 2018)[3]. Yet the question about the relationship between the way the singularity of the subject (*haecceitas*) is 'constituted in its structure' and the Other does not go away (S9: 109). Thus Ricoeur (1970) thought the study entirely failed in its aim and is not a book about social psychology at all. Freud himself told Romain Rolland that he had grave doubts about the text[4]. Indeed, towards the end of his life he seems to have had increasing misgivings about the status of his socio-historical studies as a whole, claiming he only wrote them as a way of passing the time while smoking his pipe (de Certeau 1987: 104)[5]. Nevertheless, in his learned exposition Professor Nobus has been able to show the way Lacan deciphers, masterfully, in Freud's text something of profound significance.

The novelist Anthony Powell, looking back on his life said that he felt his whole personality had been formed and his future shaped more than anything else by his time at school. I suspect that many of us could say something similar. If not about school, about university or the army or the Church. Perhaps. And, of course, those places are institutions (groups). But they are also places where we meet and form a link with significant individuals – school masters or mistresses, tutors and so on – and unconsciously identify with them, making their 'paths in thinking' our own (Heidegger[6]) even when this identification is expressed only in the adoption of small, seemingly insignificant details in outlook, manner or turn of phrase as well as a more fundamental moral stance[7]. Indeed, in some respects, the tutorial system has something of an analytic quality to it as the tutor aims, to adopt Wittgenstein's idiom, not to give over his thoughts to others but to 'stimulate someone to thoughts of his own' (PI Preface). Showing us 'not so much a formal thinking, but a certain style of being-in-the-world' (Benvenuto 2020: 158). Powell's remark refers to the past, the present and the future, and the way all three 'ecstasies' are mixed up in our experience (SZ 328); something Freud had noticed (*Nachträglichkeit*). There seems to me to be something in Powell's take on it. The idea that there is a time when one was not yet formed. A time when one is being formed. And a time after which an essential formation has taken place, and from which all future developments follow a course that could almost have been predicted. Though never entirely. Strange and unexpected things do happen to us in the course of life, yet although they come as a surprise at the time, often in retrospect we glimpse the way even they seem to have conformed to an overall pattern already set during the brevity of youth. A thread that ties us to bonds formed much earlier. Establishing a path that our life will follow throughout its short span. One which, however, does not correspond exactly to what we would have chosen consciously.

Lacan's Exegesis and the Semiotics of Scripture

Krutzen lists references to the *Massen* text in thirteen of the seminars, from 1954 till 1976[8]. Professor Nobus tells us that one of the more significant of these comes in 1961 in Seminar IX (henceforth S9)[9]. And that what interested Lacan was a particular phrase that Freud had used in chapter vii, when listing three types of identification (*Identifizierung*). Lacan developed the point in relation to the way the subject constitutes himself through the process of symbolic rather than specular identification through the assimilation of small aspects of others[10]. That is to say, secondary identification. The phrase in question, we are told, being a *hapax legomena* in Freud's corpus that nobody seems to have noticed: '*nur einen einzigen Zug*' (GW XIII: 117). It appears in one of the most coherent passages in the *Massen* text, one that

has nothing to do with the social sphere as such. This attention, on Lacan's part, to Freud's *modus scribendi* and more specifically to this particular lexical marker illustrates the way the exegesis of a text resembles an analysis both being, necessarily, hermeneutical[11]. Getting behind the text and probing it Lacan carefully translates *einzigem* with *unaire* rather than 'single' (*unique*) (S9: 33), seeing it as a primordial symbolic term which is introjected to produce the 'ego ideal' which he more than Freud, carefully distinguishes from the superego (Laplanche and Pontalis 1980: 144)[12]. Reading this passage in Lacan, it is hard not to be impressed by his multifarious scholarship despite his ingrained tendency to heighten and intensify an expression in support of the transposition of Freud's ideas into his own. But this is because, working from Freud's text, Lacan faced a conundrum. And so just when we think we have grasped something of what Freud meant by '*einzigem Zug*' – which had, at first, seemed transparent but has become more complex – Lacan does something unexpected. He changes the meaning of the thing he has been setting out by a 'reversal of the position around the One' (S9: 95). At first it seems as if he has lost confidence in his own exegesis and realised that if he continues his interpretation to its logical conclusion, he will end up saying something he knows to be wrong. But Lacan is, in fact, doing something far more sophisticated. He is reminding us that no narrative is definitive. That it would be a mistake to read Freud as a set of dogmatic truths. Because a text always has more secrets to give up, more meanings for us to elucidate, and new angles to lay open. And in the future diverse paths in thinking will continue to open up so long as we really know how to read.

This approach is, itself, reminiscent of the *De magistro*, a treatise by Augustine on 'signs' to which Lacan may have been indebted. In it, Augustine says that before we can understand a sign we must understand the thing signified[13]. Without that prior understanding the sign will be meaningless. This epistemology holds good for the hermeneutics of the *Confessions* too[14]. Thus, Augustine thought Ambrose a good exegete because he already knew the spiritual things – as opposed to the literal things – that the biblical text signified. Scripture did not reveal things to him, because he already knew them (Aug. *conf.* V, 24f; VI, 4; cf. Cary 2008: 104-5). Like Ambrose, Lacan already knows that what Freud's text signifies is not the same as what it says. Lacan knows that language and thus thought have limitations. This is a moment of crisis in Lacan's commentary on the Massen text and he is trying to find his way out of the literal sense Freud intends. Augustine had similar problems with scripture. He realised that there were not only the external signs and the invisible truths they signify but also the author's intent (*voluntas*) (Aug. *mag.* 8; *doctr. christ.* 2, 5). At first, he thought it would solve everything if Moses appeared to him. He could then ask him to explain the meaning of the many obscure passages in the Old Testament. But then he realised that Moses would probably be speaking in Hebrew and like Freud, he did not know Hebrew[15]. So he realised he would not get anywhere like that. Then he thought a bit more and realised that even if Moses spoke Latin it would not be much help either (Aug. *conf.* XI, 5). Because it was not what Moses thought or intended that interested him but what the text signified. Which is not quite the same thing.

Lacan has already told us that the key phrase in the Massen text – maybe the only useful signifier in the entire work – is *einzigem Zug*. And that this means '*trait unaire*'. Now he tells us what it really means. That is to say, what it signifies, what Augustine refers to as *veritas* which he distinguishes from *verum*, 'truth' in the sense of the literal meaning (*conf.* XI, 5). Starting with an excursus on 'the One' (*monas*) (S9: 38), Lacan says by 'unary trait' he is not referring to an incorporation (*Einverleibung*), a 'consumption of the enemy, of the adversary, of the father', as we find it in primary identification (S9: 95)[16]. Its function is 'no longer that of [the Kantian] *Einheit*' (S9: 96). By this 'reversal' he re-defines unary in relation to its opposites, thus 'abandoning the unifying unity' it comes to signify 'difference as such', as a 'distinctive' unity (*Einzigkeit*) that designates radical otherness rather than sameness (S9: 95, 109). That is to say, Lacan gives to Freud's text a meaning Freud did not know or intend, one that overcomes the two main ways in which identity is conceived[17]. In this, Lacan's way of reading Freud closely resembles the Platonist epistemology outlined by Augustine in the *De Doctrina Christiana* (particularly chapter iii). One that hinges, moreover, on an understanding of *voluntas* and *velle* as 'will' rather than 'wish' (Cary 2008: 297 n. 56 [18]).

Of course, someone might conclude that this merely reveals that Lacan's Freud is made in his own image. In which case, I should have to object to the word 'merely'[19]. For to do an exegesis is not to 'throw a

signification over some naked thing' as Heidegger puts it, for meaning is not arbitrary but 'bound by an absolute criterion: the truth, the *al?theia* of being (*ens et verum convertuntur*)' (Heidegger SZ 150; see D'hert 1978: 159). The well-known example given by Xenophanes may suffice. He wrote that Ethiopians think their gods have stub noses and are black; that Thracians see them with blue eyes and red hair, as the different races see the gods having their own characteristics. By the same token he says that if oxen could paint, they would paint gods that looked like oxen. Thus, he understood, not only the essential relativity of religious ideas in general but also something essential in our identification with the father (fr. 14-16, Diels 1906: 49).

The Interpretative Situation and Its *Telos*

The exegesis of a text at some point reaches an end[20]. It is a process that has a *telos*. It depends on inner judgements that are arrived at over time and which often starts with a sense of not understanding. Frequently it involves us in long detours, making mistakes along the way, misunderstanding things, going in the wrong direction in a line of thought or coming to a dead-end and having to make a new start. Such a procedure is also dependent on other texts we have read. Some texts speak to us at one stage in life, others only later on as, at points, we identify to varying degrees with one or other idea or writer. This is particularly true when we become immersed in the corpus of an author such as Freud or Lacan. Our shifting identifications will, of course, all have their prehistory in our memory. As a result, in these developing positions and provisional readings, we can sometimes with hindsight discern earlier identifications or influences and somehow move beyond them. Even when, in so doing, as Sergio Benvenuto says, evocatively, a text cannot be entirely swept away but rather becomes one of our 'precious texts' into which we can turn back, now and then, with a kind of 'reverence' (2020: 2, 73). In this case, while moving beyond the text, it nevertheless remains part of us. Could these shifting identifications be described as forming a 'unary' strand, as Lacan describes it, like separate notches on a stone age hunting stick? Might this mean that some of the radical shifts in our trains of thought, judgements and position turn out not to have been so fundamental after all? Rather, a step along a path that was marked out from the very beginning in the first notch. And if so, where is free will in this course? Is there not a danger that this becomes another way of talking about fate or divine providence?

What might it mean – both for the analyst ('being the one') and for the patient – to end an analysis? What might the notion of an end to identification in the analytic relationship mean?

If an analysis resembles the exegesis of a text, can we understand something of the nature of ending an analysis from the experience of finishing reading or deconstructing a text? During our engagement with a text our relationship to it changes. We seem to get to know the author and have a sense of the variations in his style often in marked phases. And of those literary ticks that every writer has; his repetitive use of certain words or expressions, his style and mastery of language and of plot. But to speak of an end is not the same as saying that everything that could be said about the text, has been said. Far from it. In this sense, the 'end' is only ever partial. A point from whence others will make a new beginning.

The Cynic philosopher refused to call himself a sage, insisting he knew nothing (Goulet-Cazé, 1986). This tradition comes down to us in the Socratic paradox 'I am wiser [...] as I do not know anything' (Plat. *Apol.* 21d; cf. Courcelle 1975). The doctrine that the divine is beyond Being and thus beyond language or mind led pseudo-Denys to assert that not-knowing or unknowing (?????) surpasses knowing, as the latter is always an inaccurate means of expression (*De div. nom.* vii, 3). Beginning with Meister Eckhart this apophatic note became central for the Rhineland mystics (Brons, 1976)[21]. Many later thinkers, including Heidegger, refer to it. A similarly apophatic note runs through the *Tractatus*. It amounts to an understanding that there are things which are 'not a part of the world' and are consequently unknowable (T. 5.641). This is manifest in the case of pedagogy, an example of which is where Wittgenstein writes: 'My propositions serve as elucidations in the following way: anyone who understands me eventually recognizes them as nonsensical, when he has used them – as steps – to climb up beyond them. (He must, so to speak, throw away the ladder

after he has climbed up it). He must transcend these propositions, and then he will see the world aright.' (T 6.54-7). Might moving beyond identification be something like this? We could, perhaps, see this tradition in Lacan's notion that imaginary self-knowledge must be challenged, as it is fundamentally a misrecognition based on the ego (E 306); and in relation to the subject-supposed-to-know, the dissolution of which forms part of the end of analysis (Fink 1999: 30)[22].

To end an analysis is to end a movement towards truth. A movement which, in fact, can never reach a conclusion. For truth does not only have 'one face' (Lacan 17: 201). Just as reaching the end of a commentary in the process of textual criticism can only ever be a partial ending. For there are always further significations waiting to be disclosed. In fact, an exegesis often raises more questions than it answers. In expounding the *Massenpsychologie* Lacan managed to transcend Freud, disclosing a meaning Freud did not intend. Surely, in so doing, he invites us to do the same. For the purpose of reading the work of others is not just to be able to repeat as facts what the author wrote but to find our own thoughts. And ultimately, having scaled that work, to move beyond it and 'throw away the ladder'.

Bibliography:

Benvenuto, S. (2020). *Conversations with Lacan. Seven Lectures for Understanding Lacan*. London and New York: Routledge.

Brons, B. (1976). *Gott und die Seienden. Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von neuplatonischer Metaphysik und christlicher Tradition bei Dionysius Areopagita*. Forschungen zur Kirchen und Dogmengeschichte 28. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Carveth, D. L. (2018). *Psychoanalytic Thinking. A Dialectical Critique of Contemporary Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cary, P. (2008). *Outward Signs. The Powerlessness of External Things in Augustine's Thought*. Oxford: OUP.

Certeau, M. de (1987). 'Psychanalyse et histoire' *Histoire et psychanalyse entre science et fiction*. Paris: Gallimard.

Cimino, C. (2020). *Tra La Vita e La Morte. La Psicoanalisi Scomodà*. Castel San Pietro Romano: Manifestolibri.

Courcelle, P. (1975). *Connais-toi toi-même. De Socrate à saint Bernard*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.

D'hert, I. (1978). *Wittgenstein's Relevance for Theology*. Frankfurt und Main: Peter Lang.

Evans, D. (1996). *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London and New York: Routledge.

Fink, B. (1999). *A Clinical Introduction to Lacanian Psychoanalysis: Theory and Technique*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. (1986). *L'Ascèse Cynique. Un commentaire de Diogène Laërce, VI. 70-71*. Histoire de doctrines de l'antiquité classique, 10. Paris : Librairie philosophique J. Vrin.

Hadot, P. (1987). *Exercices Spirituels et Philosophie Antique*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.

Kroll-Fratoni, M. (2013). The Significance of Meister Eckhart's View of the Self for Psychoanalytic Theories of Subjectivity: A Radical Hermeneutic Study (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/783>

Laplanche, J. and Pontalis, J.-B. (1980). *The Language of Psycho-Analysis* (trans) D. Nicholson-Smith. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Ricoeur, P. (1970). *Freud and Philosophy. An Essay on Interpretation* (trans) D. Savage. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Abbreviations:

Arist. anal. post. Aristotle. *Posterior Analytics. Topica* (trans) H. Tredennick and E. S. Forster. Loeb Classical Library 391. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Aug. Conf. Œuvres de saint Augustine. *Les Confessions*. Bibliothèque Augustinienne vols 13 & 14 (ed) M. Skutella with notes by A. Solignac and a French translation by E. Tréhorel/ Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1962.

Aug. mag. Sancti Aurelii Augustini. *De Magistro* (ed.) K.-D. Daur. Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina XXIX: 141-203. Turnholti: Brepols, 1970.

Aug. *doctr. christ.* Sancti Aurelii Augustini. *De Doctrina Christiana* (ed.) K.-D. Daur. Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina XXXII. Turnholti: Brepols, 1962.

De div. nom. Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. *De divinis nominibus*. Corpus Dionysiacum I (ed) Beate Regina Suchla. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990.

Diels. Diels, H. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und Deutsch* vol. I. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1906.

DL. *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers* vol II: Books 6-10 (trans) by R. D. Hicks. Loeb Classical Library 185. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

E. Lacan, J. (2006). *Écrits. The First Complete Edition in English* (trans.) B. Fink. New York/London: W.W. Norton.

GW XIII. Freud, S. (1967) [1921]. Massenpsychologie und Ich-analyse in *Gesammelte Werke* XIII: 71-161. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag.

PI. Wittgenstein, L. (1999). *Philosophical Investigations* (trans) G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwells.

Plat. *Apol.* *Plato. Apology* (trans) H. N. Fowler. Loeb Classical Library 36. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

SE XVIII. Freud, S. (1921). Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* XVIII: 65-144 (trans) J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1921.

S1. Lacan, J. (1975). *Le Séminaire. Livre I. Les écrits techniques de Freud 1953-1954* (ed) J.-A. Miller. Paris: Seuil. Eng: *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book I. Freud's Papers on Technique 1953-1954* (ed) J.-A. Miller, (trans) J. Forrester. Cambridge: CUP.

S7. Lacan, J. 1992). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book VII. The Ethics of Psychoanalysis* (ed) J.-A. Miller, (trans) D. Porter. London: Routledge.

S9. Lacan, J. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book IX. Identification 1961-1962* (trans) C. Gallagher: http://www.lacaninireland.com/web/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Seminar-IX-Amended-Iby-MCL-7.NOV_.20111.pdf

S17. Lacan, J. (2007). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XVII. The Other Side of Psychoanalysis* (ed) J.-A. Miller, (trans) R. Grigg. New York/London: Norton and Company.

SZ. Heidegger, M. *Sein und Zeit*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2006. Eng.: Heidegger, M. (1990). *Being and Time* (trans) J. McQuarrie and E. Robinson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

T. Wittgenstein, L. (1961). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (trans) D. F. Pears and B. F. McGuinness. London: Routledge.

Notes:

[1] *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* SE XVIII: 65-144. The idea for the study occurred to Freud in the spring of 1919 but he did not start work on it until the February 1920, a first draft being finished in August the same year. A final version being completed March 1921 and was published a few months later as *Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse* (Leipzig-Vienna-Zurich: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag). Freud was unhappy with the word 'group' in the English translation of the title (letter Freud to Jones 2nd August 1920, cited in Gay, P. *Freud. A Life For Our Time* 394 (London: Max, 2006). An annotated MS of the text is held in the manuscript library at Columbia University. On the reception of the work see Ferenczi, S. (1922). *Freuds Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse. Der Individualpsychologische Fortschritt Schriften zur Psychoanalyse II*: 122-26.

[2] Carveth puts this in context, linking it to the strange case of the dedication that Freud wrote, at the request of Edoardo Weiss to Mussolini, in the front of his *Warum Krieg?* (published in 1933 by the Internationales Institut für Geistige Zusammenarbeit), a brief correspondence with Einstein. In his expression of admiration for a great leader, Carveth sees Freud's fundamentally reactionary socio-political position. Weiss, in his account of the matter was at pains to explain it away in relation to Mussolini's archaeological excavations (Mein Erinnerungen an Sigmund Freud *Freud-Weiss Briefe*). This is more or less repeated by Gay (2006). But Carveth is more persuasive, seeing Freud's position, like that of Le Bon and Gabriel Tarde, as part of a reaction against democratic trends, in which strong leadership is made necessary to keep people under control. Hence not only his anti-Americanism but also the overly hierarchical way he organised the IPA to maintain a supposed doctrinal purity (Carveth 2018). See also: Sokolowsky, L. (2011). *La dédicace de Freud à Mussolini in Freud et la Guerre* (ed) M. Belilos 85-95. Paris: Michel de Maule); and Roazen, P. (2005). *Edoardo Weiss: The House That Freud Built*. New York: Transaction Publishers; also more recently, Horst. R. (2020). *Einstein and Freud on Why War? Review of Contemporary Philosophy* 19: 7-25.

[3] Views on Freud's notion of the individual have varied considerably and the question remains unresolved. Gay (2006) argues that from as early as 1911 Freud had been convinced that individual and social psychology were inseparable. Perhaps the clearest link between Freud's notion of the individual and the Massen text is found in his second theory of the psychical apparatus with the notion of the superego. As an internalisation of parental prohibitions (*The Ego and the Id*, SE XIX, 1923b) or in delusions of being watched (*Mourning and Melancholia*, SE XIV 1917e). Lacan's critique of the cultural conformism and adaptation of ego psychology clearly stands in direct opposition to much of this (Carveth 2018).

[4] Freud explained to Ernest Jones that he had experienced some difficulty in getting going with it though once he got down to writing things went fairly smoothly: Gay (2006). Freud had mixed feelings about Rolland, his exchanges being both intimate and 'marked by personal frictions', see: Fisher, D. J. (1976). Sigmund Freud and Romain Rolland: The Terrestrial Animal and His Great Oceanic Friend *American Imago* 33(1): 1-59.

[5] Originally published in 1978 in Le Goff, J. et al. *La Nouvelle Histoire* 477-87. Paris: Retz CEPL.

[6] Heidegger is said to have told Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann when preparing the first volume of the *Gesamtausgabe* that his motto for the collected 'works' should be *Wege, nicht Werke*.

[7] van Haute gives the example of a student who might unconsciously imitate the way a respected professor 'walks or talks, or even the way she turns the pages of her lecture notes' (van Haute, P. *Against Adaptation: Lacan's 'Subversion of the Subject'* 95-6 (trans) P. Crowe and M. Vankerck. New York: Other Press, 2002).

[8] Krutzen, H. (2009). *Jacques Lacan Séminaire 1952-1980* (3rd edition) p. 803. Paris : Economica.

[9] 13th December 1961. Lacan returns to this point in further seminars: S12 (3rd March 1965); S16 (29th January 1969); and S21 (12th March 1974; and 19th March 1974).

[10] Secondary identification, Freud writes, is a partial and an extremely limited one which only borrows a single trait from the person (SE XVIII: 107); Lacan S9: 33.

[11] 'C'est en quoi la méthode des commentaires se révèle féconde. Commenter un texte, c'est comme faire une analyse' (S1: 87).

[12] Lacan's English translators have rendered this variously as 'unbroken line', 'single stroke' or 'unitary trait' see: Evans (1996).

[13] The most recent critical edition was edited by K.-D. Kaur from Martin Skutella's draft and published in 1970 in the *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina XXIX*: 157-203. Rather misleadingly Forrester in the English edition of Seminar I refers to this rather than to the text, corrupted with obvious interpolations, which Lacan had before him. The latter had been published in 1941 and edited by Thonnard in the series *Bibliothèque augustinienne VI*: 7-153. Lacan professed to having already read the *De magistro* before the discussion recorded in 1954 and said that traces of what he remembered of Augustine's text can be found in his previous lecture ('*quelques traces dans ma mémoire...la dernière fois*'). Later he says he had read the treatise again ('*relire*') for this occasion (273). Lacan returns to this treatise in the following two lectures that year: S1 (30th June 1954); (7th July 1954); and at various intervals over the next few years: S2 (15th June 1955) and (29th June 1955); S3 (30th November 1955); and (8th February 1956); and S20 (19th December 1972).

[14] *Bibliothèque Augustinienne* (ed) M. Skutella with extensive notes by A. Solignac and a French translation by E. Tréhorel (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1962).

[15] The Massen text was the first of Freud's works translated into Hebrew. As he was unable to read the proofs, he got a relative to check them apologising to the translator (Gay 2006: 600). '*Mit besonderer Genugthuung habe ich die Übersetzung meiner Massenpsychologie in unsere heilige Sprache zur Hand genommen. Ich, unwissendes Kind einer vorzionistischen Zeit, kann sie leider nicht lesen, aber ich freue mich an ihrer Versicherung, dass diese Übersetzung einem Publikum dienen wird dem die vorhandene deutsche oder englische Ausgabe nichts gesagt hätte. Noch mehr beglückt mich Ihre Zusage, dass diese Uebersetzung einer kleinen aus der Schar meiner Arbeiten herausgegriffenen Schrift nicht vereinzelt bleiben wird. So darf ich hoffen, dass das Befremden, welches die erste Wirkung eines psychoanalytischen Buches zu sein pflegt, bald anderen und freundlicheren Einstellungen weichen mag*' in Rolnik, E.J. (2015). Psychoanalysis in Israel: New Beginnings, Old Trajectories *Journal für Psychoanalyse* 56: 64 n. 13.

[16] This refers, indirectly, to the 'unit' or primary *archē* of the Pythagoreans (DL viii, 25). Aristotle's definition being 'substance without position (*Arist. anal. post. I, 87a*).

[17] These being either based on the Latin *idem* or as 'selfhood' from *ipse*; see the discussion by Ricoeur in *Oneself as Another* (trans) K. Blamey. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago press, 1992.

[18] On the distinction and interrelation of the will, reason and desire before and including Augustine see Harrison, S. (2006). *Augustine's Way into the Will. The Theological and Philosophical Significance of De Libero Arbitrio*. Oxford: OUP. Might this parallel Lacan's rendition of Freud's *Wunsch* with 'desire' rather than 'wish'?

[19] This is reminiscent of the way each generation has created Jesus of Nazareth in its own image. E.g. while the paintings of the crusaders show Jesus leading troops into battle, Quakers depicted him as a pacifist. See: Pelikan, J. (1997). *The Illustrated Jesus through the Centuries* (Yale University Press).

[20] Freud himself, of course, grappled with the knotty question of whether or not an analysis can ever really be thought complete (SE XXIII, 1937c). Recently, Cimino has re-examined it in relation to Fachinelli and Ferenczi (Cimino 2020).

[21] Lacan does refer to Eckhart but in relation to *das Ding* rather than to knowledge (S7: 63). But Kroll-Fratoni (2013) suggests, persuasively, further similarities.

[22] An objection might be made that while the analyst knows he does not possess the knowledge the patient ascribes to him this is not the same as 'knowing nothing' (see e.g. Evans 1996: 197-8). But precisely the same point can be made in relation to the Socratic dictum (see: Hadot 1987: 31).

Bio:

John Gale is the Editor-in-chief of the online journal *Vestigia* and President of the International Network of Psychoanalytic Practices (INPP). Formerly a Benedictine monk he lectured in philosophy and patristics before leaving the priesthood. For thirty years he worked in therapeutic communities for the treatment of psychosis and ran a programme for traumatised and homeless ex-soldiers in conjunction with the Tavistock Clinic, London. He was a board member of a number of organisations including the International Society for the Psychological and Social Treatment of Psychosis (ISPS UK), and sat on the editorial advisory boards of various journals. He is the author of many scholarly articles at the interface of philosophy, psychoanalysis and spirituality, and has edited a number of books including *Insanity and Divinity. Studies in Psychosis and Spirituality* (Routledge, 2014). He has a particular interest in the work of Lacan, in language and silence, tradition, absence, mysticism, madness, place and dwelling. Foremost literary references in his articles are to Stoicism and Neoplatonism, Evagrius Ponticus, Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, the work of Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Pierre Hadot, Michel Foucault and Michel de Certeau.