



IX SCHOOL MEETING – EPFCL, 23 JULY 2026, SAO-PAOLO

## Pass to the analyst: aporias of the testimony

### Prelude 2

#### Passe to the analyst: what is not aporia

In his prelude to our meeting of the school, Phillipe Madet has justly focused on the three structural aporias of the testimony, elaborated by Lacan in the discourse to the EFP of 1967, culminating in the conclusion: “aporia of the report”.<sup>1</sup> And Phillipe asks: “Does this imply a necessarily aporetic pass to the analyst?”<sup>2</sup>

Based on this, I would like to suggest the following: for the guarantee of the pass not to become necessarily aporetic, it cannot be based on structural considerations alone.

How to comprehend this, since Lacan himself, in the same text, comments that in the dispositive, it is indeed the “*analytic structuration of experience*”<sup>3</sup> that we authenticate, which “*conditions the pass to the act or to the desire of the analyst*”<sup>4</sup>?

But structuration is not structure, and necessarily includes the *effects* of structure, which are to be differentiated from structure itself with its logical contradictions and impasses.

What are the effects of the structure? Following Lacan, we could name them: the cut and the hole, or the point of the lack in the Other, which he writes with the matheme  $S(A/)$ , and that designates the forclusion of the signifier of sex in the Other.

In the text ‘How to recognise the Conditions of the Act’<sup>5</sup>, Colette Soler directs us away from the structural traits, and towards the clinical manifestations produced, sometimes, at the end of analysis, according to Lacan, and that respond to it (to the structure): assurance and certainty.

She suggests the following formulation:

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Lacan, *Discours a L’EFP du 6 décembre 1967, Si9licat 2/3, Seuil, Paris, 1970, pp11*

<sup>2</sup> *Phillipe Madet, Prelude to the School Meeting, 2026*

<sup>3</sup> *Discoures a l’EFP, Lacan, pp1*

<sup>4</sup> *Les conditions de l’acte, comment les reconnaître ? Colette Soler, Rencontre internationale d’Ecole, Buenos Aires, 28 et 29 août 2009*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*

*“They are positions of the subject within the structure, and even affective postures responding to it, which thus indirectly testify that the structural elaboration has been pushed to the point of glimpsing the hole—I would readily say, to the foreclosure of the object or of the real. This is why, I believe, Lacan assigns to the cartels a task of authentication, not of listening, deciphering, or construction. This posture is one of certainty, not belief, against the background of the impossible to know—certainty being, by definition, the psychic translation of a foreclosure.”<sup>6</sup>*

A foreclosure is a position of certainty, and certainty is not aporia...  
So, does the passant share a common trait with psychosis? If certainty is, “*by definition*” the clinical manifestation of the structural effect of a foreclosure, is it the same foreclosure in both cases? What risks does it carry for the jury in the task of authenticating the testimony?

I leave this question in suspense, only to return to a short comment by Colette Soler that could possibly orient us in this question, by a surprising homology she draws between Cantor and the child-interpreter <sup>7</sup>: both are confronted by foreclosure- albeit not the same one- and both respond to it by “invention”:

*“It is the best use that can be made of a foreclosure, make it function as a starter for the invention”.<sup>8</sup>*

Daphne Tamarin

February 2026

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>7</sup> Colette Soler, *La infancia con Cantor*, 1994

<sup>8</sup> Colette Soler, *Declinaciones de la angustia*, curso 2000-2001, pp 209.