

Autor: Alicia Lezcano

Título: Experiencia, coraje y verdad

Dispositivo: Mesas Simultáneas de Trabajos Libres

Queridísimo Berganza !

It is only unwillingly that I forgive you for writing so little about yourself, but a certain touching resignation reflected in every line of your letter makes me refrain from asking you more than you can accomplish...you can see how the words issue forth from my heart and the letters from my crow-quill pen, let us talk about the past of the SSS.....

Only then perhaps, your obdurate heart and your hardened mouth will open up, and you will let me know that you are still not dead to me.

Your Cipion

A 15 year-old young man interchanges correspondence with a friend. They share many secrets. They chose a code to transmit each other ciphered messages: the Spanish language.

Written within the years 1871 and 1880, these letters correspond to Sigmund Freud and his friend of his youth Eduard Silverstein.

Both teenagers signed under the names of Cipión and Berganza, the two talking dogs in Cervantes's' *Dialogue of the dogs*. The boys taught themselves Spanish in out-of-school hours and founded a sort of a secret society which they called their "Academia Española or Castellana" AE or AC. Among other acronyms that insist either as signatures or as references in their letters, is S.S.S, whose nature make translators doubt, as it might likely refer to "Espanische Sprach-Schule ". School of Spanish Language or maybe, the initial letters of their names. Today we could place -at least in an imaginary way- that Supposed Knowledge in the figure of the "wise dog" and first foundation created by Freud.

This correspondence dates back to a dark, unknown but decisive decade in Freud's formation. His letters, conceived under the flame of friendship, give

testimony of his scientific, philosophic and literary interests as well as of his emotional life at that time.

His concern -and analysis- for the complexities of the human soul and his passion for the truth may be very well read in advance.

Correspondence that I would like to focus on, not only because of its content, but also because it is expressed in our own language and because it founds a pact of exchange: one will give account of his life, the other will listen, since: “I suspect we have enough to tell each other to dispense with a third for an audience [...] “ I trust you do not show my letters to anyone, if they should ask to see them, because I want to be able to write with complete candor and about whatever comes into my head”.

We cannot less than amaze ourselves with these beginnings out of what Freud will later edify as the psychoanalytical method. Could a shadowy notion of modern psychoanalysis conceivably have been awakened in Freud by a story of Cervantes?

It is worth noting –as a special feature of the Spanish edition- that it is the only one that confronts directly the reader with the peculiar aspects of the Spanish employed by Freud. In the English, the French and the Italian translations, the Castilian passages go accompanied by translations based on the German reconstruction.

We acknowledge the sensibility of the German editor Walter Boehlich for having allowed us to take in our hands the task of understanding Freud’s Spanish since such is the tongue of the intimacy of the first love, of shared secrets.

Cervantes’ dogs do not bark, they discover themselves through talking. Let’s listen to the beginning of the dialogues:

BERGANZA: Brother Cipión, I hear you talk, and know that I am speaking to you, and yet I cannot believe it, for it seems to me that for us to be talking oversteps the bounds of nature.

CIPIÓN: How true, Berganza; and the miracle is all the greater in that not only do we talk, but we discourse with reason, when in fact we are devoid of it; for the difference between animals and man is that man is a rational creature and animals are irrational ones.

Cervantes attributes to two irrational animals the hazardous grace of the human language. He does not put the accent on the fact that they speak like in fables, rather, on the fact that they are aware that they speak and of what it implies to have a language.

Even if this event does not turn them into men, the faculty of speech as such, is for both a good reason to be surprised.

Lacan used to say: *"To take the word is the most arduous task that can ever be proposed to man"* and he pointed out: *"To speak is, above all, to speak to others"*

Cervantes allowed his characters to change insofar as they spoke: Cipión and Berganza, Don Quixote and Sancho..

Certainly, it is not one without the other, as it happens between Sigmund and Eduard. They **sincerely** address to one another, they ask one another to open their **soul** and heart. The **knowledge of the other** is what they demand and, at the same time, **the taking care of** each other. These are some of the necessary conditions entailed in the concept of "parrhesia", of crucial importance in the Greco-Romanic thought and a bond between Christianity and Paganism.

Foucault considers that this sincere form of the expression of **truth** constitutes it as the sole ethical warranty of the political power and as a unitive bond between care of the self and care of the others.

This “true utterance” is a different verediction of such of prophecy, wisdom or rhetoric. The “free speaking” gives account of an accurate coincidence between “belief and truth”.

The “parrhesia” always involves a “risk” or a “danger” for the one who tells the truth. The “parrhesiastes” is placed in an inferior position with regard to the speaker.

The term “parrhesia” has its origins in the tragedies of Euripides, Phoenicias, Hippolytus, Bacchantes, Electra, Ion, and Orestes. Ion poses the question of who has the right, the duty and the courage of telling the truth. It centers on the displacement of the ‘truth revealed’ of the Oracle of Delphos, to the truth told by some human beings to other human beings, through the “parrhesia”.

This tragedy makes reference to the **human struggle for the truth despite the silence of the gods; men must achieve -by their own means- to discover and to tell the truth.**

So, the question is, how to discover the truth if the gods remain silent?

With **Courage** I attempt to introduce you the disturbing figure of Dionysius, the Cynic.

Not without the risk of disregarding any principle whatsoever in the name of morale, good habits, philosophical seriousness and today, even science itself.

The cynic is “a warrior of philosophy”.

His style is deprived of the formality of the Ancients; he employs new ways of expression: the parody, the satire, the anecdote, the joke. His effect is immediate because he either trips up or unmasks. “With the punch of his humor he punctures any rhetorical balloon”.

Cynism derives from the Greek word *κύων*, “Kion” (“dog” in English). .It is a movement led by a group of ancient Greeks which, rather than a system or an original philosophical school, was a vital attitude exemplified by three or four figures.

Under the emblem of the dog, they led a canine life, sunbathing in the Athenian Agora. In this regard, the anecdote is widely known: **Diogenes, was gaily lying under the sun of Korinthos, when Alexander the Great approached him**

and putting on his airs, he asked him, “ask me whatever you desire...”, to which the cynic replied: “with just one thing you can help me, take yourself aside, you are blocking the sun from me.”.

Says Michel Onfray: “Diogenes was an anarchist since he did accept no power other than the one that each one imposes upon oneself”.

The cynic finds in the “parrhesia” a method to denounce false idols and proposes a new appraisal, subverting the traditional norms.

Diogenes was an ironically timely beggar.

He was seen once begging at the foot of a statue. Asked the reason of his strange behavior, he replied: “I am practicing the art of being rejected”.

Rejection that makes possible to sculpt one’s own existence.

The dog philosophers used to put into action mechanisms against existential pessimism even affirming life itself. Thought that Nietzsche analyzes in the following fragment: **“When the siling Antisthenes cried out:” Who will release me from these pains?” Diogenes replied: “This”, showing him a dagger. Antisthenes responded: “I said from my pains, not from life”.**

To conclude, a puzzle: **When Diogenes heard that Didymus, the flautist, had been caught in adultery, he laughed saying that he rather deserved to be hanged for his name, given that it makes reference to the word “didymus”, “double”, “twin” and more particularly, “testicule”.**

Just as well, Diogenes praised these techniques out of which Freud would say much later that they are never as pertinent and efficient as when they have their roots in sexuality and more precisely, in the social repression of sexuality.

If the premise of dog philosophers was **“to invalidate the legal tender currency”**, it was not my purpose to verify the authenticity of these fragments, but to stress their **“tone”** and their **“spirit”**.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allouch, Jean

- ¿El psicoanálisis es un ejercicio espiritual? Respuesta a Michel Foucault
- La sombra de tu perro
- Seminarios: "El amor Lacan"

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de

- El coloquio de los perros

Foucault, Michel

- Discurso y verdad en la antigua Grecia
- La hermenéutica del sujeto

Freud, Sigmund

- El chiste y su relación con el inconsciente
- Cartas de juventud

García Gual, Carlos

- La secta del perro. Diógenes Laercio

Lacan, Jacques

- Seminario III La Psicosis 31-5-56
- Seminario I Los escritos técnicos de Freud

Lezcano Alicia Rita

- Hospital del alma (Trabajo)

Ramírez Marcela

- ¡¿Cervantino Freud?! (Trabajo)

Onfray Michel

- Cinismos. Retrato de los filósofos llamados perros

Revistas : Desatinos Nº 1 y 2

- La Tercera. Medellín 2005-8

Vegh, Isidoro

- Seminario "Yo, Ego, Si mismo. Distinciones de la clínica"