

QUID AMOR?

Giacomo B. Contri

Introduction to the 2018/2019 Symposia Series of the *Società amici del pensiero* “Sigmund Freud”

September 2018, Milan - Italy

Translated from the original Italian by Luca Flabbi, Glauco M. Genga, M. Gabriella Pediconi

The birth of the word “love” is not necessarily good news, as it introduces the temptation to split the experience between love and law, substance and form, concrete and abstract, heart and mind, interior and exterior, emotion and representation:

It is a matter - as in a divide and conquer - of personal life in its relation with collective formations.

Decency should concern love, not the sexes.

The word “love” is not a primary word; in the best of cases it is a pleonasm, a fungible synonym.

It presupposes immediacy (as in “falling in love”), secondary importance of the act, witchcraft (as in love seen as a resulting from a spell or even an evil eye), “givenness” (if we want to use a philosophical surly word):

the word “love” does not typically designate the competence of an art that happens through work (I suggest to reformulate *ars gratia artis* as *amor gratia artis*), nor it is linked with the satisfaction of outcomes resulting from an elaboration; the word “love” typically gargles itself with the word “happiness”.

“Love” has been successful as a word: it is the word of the aspiration to an illusory success, the word defining the misery of the Platonic love, itself the child of two deprived parents.

However, we can avoid getting rid altogether of the word “love” by directing it to designate the meeting or appointment. Appointment that becomes in this way both a regime and an art applicable to any levels and situations. It is an idea almost completely absent from the current poor practice of language:

this regime of the appointment is not subject to the disappointment of illusion.

When used to describe “falling in love”, or in referring to disinterested gifts or charity, or in politics, the word “love” is used and abused. At least, when the capitalist production system exploits salaried workers has the decency to not referring to “love”. In the regime of the appointment, each partner only exploits the other partner's investment in herself: It is a favor with profit.

The question “quid amor?” (what is love?) must be associated with the question “quid ius?” (what is law?). The second question is traditionally entrusted to the philosophers of law (not to the jurists), while the former to literature and songs.