



Original artwork: Glauçia Nagem – “Falatório 2” / Poster design and artwork: Maurício Simões / Web designer: Ilana Chaia Finger

## *Prelude 7*

### *Aggiornamento*

At the end of her argument inviting us to gather in Sao Paulo in July 2026, Colette Soler suggests that the work we will do there will have the nature of an *aggiornamento*.

We can ask: why an *aggiornamento*?

And what does it imply?

The usual meaning is “a bringing up to date”, for example, of a theory, practice, or institution. Significantly the word is preserved in its original Italian, prompting an association to Vatican II, with its aim of bringing the Catholic Church into modern times. For them, the stake was nothing short of existential.

We can perhaps find an existential stake in what Lacan describes in 1969, in the *Compte Rendu* of his Seminar on *L'acte psychanalytic*. There he speaks about “a whole indoctrination, regarding psychoanalytic titles” within the IPA, an attribution of hierarchical titles without guarantee. And the

reason he gives: failure to know about, failure to be “at the time” of the psychoanalytic act.<sup>1</sup> This type of threat to psychoanalysis is easy to verify in places where “subtypes of psychoanalysis” (relational, contemporary, ego psychology, self-psychology) have taken root.

Hence the lynchpin importance of advancing our knowledge about the psychoanalytic act, the *sine qua non* for any praxis that could be called psychoanalysis, that would *be* psychoanalysis.

The continuous work of the School, with its seminars, meetings and cartels, makes these advances and does so in relation to the existential stake.

For example, the concept of neutrality, introduced by Freud in various contexts, reveals itself as inadequate to describe the position of the analyst in light of the act. Even when defined as the non-substitution of the analyst’s truth for that of the analysand, it does not account for what the function of the analyst *is*, his function as semblant of *objet a*. New signifiers are called for, adequate to the analyst’s function, signifiers such as abnegation and the silence of the analyst, as developed by Colette Soler in her book, *A Clinic of Exception*,<sup>2</sup> signifiers that can come closer, in light of the act.

As we prepare to gather in São Paulo, for a work that might have the nature of an *aggiornamento*, could there be something more, having to do with our approach to the work?

In the clinic, we are used to listening to the analysand’s speech from a position of not-knowing, of stepping back, “with everything to learn”,<sup>3</sup> our own truths suspended, our own jouissances renounced.

In our axes of study, in relation to a concept that belongs neither to Freud nor Lacan, namely Edmund Bergler’s “benevolent neutrality”, we are directed to read, not his theory but to be open to the allusions, what “plays beside”.

To be up to the time of the act, in the work of interrogating our ethics *and* the others, are we not called upon to do something like that?

Devra Simiu

Washington D.C., 03/20/26

---

<sup>1</sup>Lacan, Jacques. (2001). “L’acte psychanalytique: Compte Rendu du Séminaire 1967-1968”. in *Autres écrits*. Paris: Seuil, p. 376.

<sup>2</sup>Soler, Colette. (2022). *Une clinique d’exception*. Paris: Éditions Nouvelles du Champ lacanien.

<sup>3</sup>Grosman, Adriana.(2026). “On the act: Not-knowing about the act”. London Forum International Seminar of the School. February 22, 2026. Unpublished.

