In the assignment to “construct a cube representing your idea of the seminar” (Alexandria, October 1, 2015) the word “cube” has a first, obvious meaning. It is the six-sided geometric solid we associate with spatial extensions, à la the Cartesian x-y-z orthogonal dimensions. It stands for the dimensions as a progression, from point to line to plane to solid. We think of space itself as “cubic,” can we think of the cube itself (to use the seminar’s justifiably famous procedure of reversing predication) the cube as “space itself”? Just as Descartes used the cube to recall his narrative of point-to-line-to-plane-to-space, we used cubes to recall narratives, these narratives came along with the cubes, as is the custom in “critiques.” The narratives formed, rhetorically, around the anxiety generated by any question or command … Ch’è vuoi? What is it that the “Other” wants, that it structures my desire?

The Italian gesture associated with “ch’è vuoi” is instructive. It’s made by bunching the fingers and the thumb, facing upward, and rocking the hand back and forth. It says, basically, “why the hell are you asking me to do something that you expect me to fail to do, without telling me what you really want, and then counting me responsible for this ‘forced choice’?” That’s the essence of the standard architectural critique, eh?, the creation of an enigmatic Real that seems impossible to reach, against which any actual reality is to be judged to fall short. This is the “Peter Eisenman unfinished circle,” the 359.999… or so that requires just a bit more — a utopian supplement — to reach perfection. Since none of us knows how to create this utopia, we can get really good without ever closing the gap!

It doesn’t take too many Lacanians to change this light bulb. Even half a Lacanian can tell you that the Master plays the role of the exception to the phallic rule in order to impose it on everyone else “who wishes to call himself a…” (in this case, architect). I say “himself” to draw attention to the fact that this is also the main rule of the sexuation of “those who would wish to call themselves men” who are required to live beneath their symbolic role, assigned in the very manner of the ch’è vuoi. The Big Other, who does not obey this rule, the φ as it is designated, is the exception, 3, to what all others (V) are asked to do. You change the Lacanian light bulb by pointing out the feminine rule: “not all of the woman is subject to φ.” The corollary of this is that there is a space remaining after the phallic rule that is the “impossible demand” embodied by the ch’è vuoi. This small space escapes the anxiety that is the main product of the impossible requirement to fill the gap that no one can fill (because this gap exists only through the fictional superiority of a Big Other). The Big Other is what we call the “unreliable narrator.” The audience sees that there is more to know than he tells us.

I would add at this point that University Discourse, another light bulb requiring an indeterminate number of Lacanians to change it, puts this other behind a curtain, like the Wizard of Oz, and that, all around us, we have the idea of the critique turned into a global institution. So, this is not an “abstract consideration” but rather a political inquiry. What cube can “represent the seminar” is asked, at one level, within this political inquiry as an example of the anxiety that comes with the abjection of the φ, what is technically identified as symbolic castration — castration by the symbol, not a surgical procedure put into some metaphor. But, this exercise is an attempt to get out of the box that the assignment assumes to exist. Although a certain “obedience” to the assignment is expected, there is also the expectation for a certain act of liberation. This could be a refusal to follow the rules, an artful pretending to “forget” or “not understand” the rules, or a magic act that turns the rules on their head or holds up a mirror to the rules to show how they prevent the very thing they demand.

Better, however, is the strategy of reverse predication that has already been demonstrated to some extent in the cubes that were presented. They all tried “not to be a cube” while at the same time revealing the essence of the cubic. They were “not cubes” by twisting, deforming, hiding, disguising. These evasions sought an essence that could be said to be either (1) a utopian completion of the imperfect circle or (2) a recall pulling the problem into the solution. Effect 2 is preferred to effect 1, because it evades the Big Other’s ch’è vuoi. The crucial consideration is that, in the realization of full, three-dimensional space, the “fourth” dimension intervenes. Our understanding of space is a cultural and individual construct requiring motion, time-specific engagements, or even just the muscular anticipations of time-specific engagements, as with the eyes’ “grasp” of objects through parallax and “pulling focus.” Neurologically, we do not perceive this fourth after the third has been “extruded” from the two, x-y-z, but rather we insert the fourth between dimensions 1-2 and 3: 1-2-4/3/. The proof of this is simple: different cultures make this insertion in different ways; different sexes make it in different ways; different individuals and even different states of minds of individuals make it in different ways. "Space" is not a constant but rather the result of processes and engagements that both take and make time. It is simply not true that we can consider time and space separately, except through metaphors that magically "disengage" the fourth dimension’s presence in the third. In reality, space is constructed with the Gegenstoss, the recoil, of time on to space. Hegel’s Absolute is in front of us, every moment of every day.

The failure to achieve solution 2 (pulling the problem into the solution) results when the belief in the utopian solution seems to offer a place, a job, a club membership (φ). Typically the Big Other — Eisenman certainly fits the bill here! — makes this offer. It is a standard rhetorical strategy of ch’è vuoi: a demagog uses binary signifiers to rally disciples and give out symbolic assignments. We feel “honored by the invitation” and the self–value it seems to confer, a sense of being "chosen," but the trick is that we are chosen BY some Big Other who will always make the switch, continually exchanging solutions for new “problems.” We have confess that we ourselves maintain the superiority of the Big Other through our endorsements and priviledging (footnotes, bibliographies, lecture invitations). The Servants, Hegel teaches us, keep the Masters in power — for selfish reasons! But, this is not a love we can build on.
1 / The supplement. We don’t get Big Others without the supplement that is native to our networks of symbolic relationships and the need to “add one thing more.” The causal and other chains need various kinds of supplements by the manner in which they generate more questions with each answer, and their “global” need for the Ultimate Supplements, God and Death/Apocalypse perhaps, to provide the end-points framing these chains. One name for the supplementing process is sorites, a process we can model using the standard format of the predication, which for the visually-minded, is the frame. To frame something, something else must be excluded (the occultation of the maker by the made). This exclusion is like the aphanisis (disappearance, also eclipse or rather re-assignment of desire) of the subject in the act of symbolic castration by the phallic law, φ, the “impossible demand” of the Big Other. The Hegelian asymmetry of love relations between the mouse, dog, and “kat” of George Herriman’s Krazy Kat comic strip, which ran in Hearst Syndicate newspapers for over three decades, illustrates how the Symbolic (the dog, “Officer Pupp,” as representative of the Law) maintains an impossible-Real demand on Krazy Kat, who is in love with the mouse Ignatz, whose intended object of hate, a brick tossed at the Kat’s head, is interpreted by the Kat as a love message. The Kat is not fully interpellated by the dog’s legal system, although the mouse is frequently arrested for throwing the brick. Instead, the Kat as feminine not-all (pas tout) is able to read the “impossible” message of the brick. It refers to the love note originally written by a lover-mouse to an Egyptian ancestor, wrapped around a brick and tossed on to the pedestal where the ancient Kat was worshiped. The guard, a dog (ancestor of Officer Pupp), interpreted the note/brick as a terrorist attack and arrested the mouse. But, the Kat immediately knew of the mouse’s love and passed this knowledge down generations of kats to Krazy, for whom the recognition is the resonant acousmatic apophrades (voice of the dead) that speaks of kenosis, a message of love that reaches past and through the jouissance of symptoms (produced by life within the ideological Symbolic) to the jouissance of … true love?

Certainly we can (because Herriman can) talk about this connection as a dimension. Herriman’s tossed brick is the ACT of this dimension, underscoring the idea that this dimension must always be enacted. It is an action that automates a primordial connection of love. It “cuts through” other spatialities to hit the kat in a special way, depicted by the orthogonal angle made by the impact of the brick on the Kat’s head: “pow!” for the pain of impact, a ♥ for the direct result (Gegenstoss) of recoil, from zip to jouissance.

We should not underestimate the fact of this “ethnography” of Lacan: the fact that the option to move past psychoanalysis’s treatment of the symptoms of our maladjustment to subjection to the ideological castration of the Symbolic is not an abstract matter. It is not assigned to the issue of the depth dimension by us, capriciously, through some abstract argumentation but, rather, from examples that “naively” employ these necessities of subjectivity in art. They are “true” because they are effective in making works of ours art funny, or beautiful, or awful. This is our “proof of the body” — finding truth “out there,” not inside abstract systems.

Krazy Kat shows us that the impossible demands of the Other (the police-system of Officer Pupp) offers a way out, a way of responding to a dimensionality beyond the ideological construction of depth through frames that have excluded the mouse’s love. The brick is thrown along the special curve of jouissance, a depth that creates a special kind of cube, a cube that is, specifically in our example, heart-shaped.
2 / Anxiety. Anxiety is such a customary component of the university, and of architecture schools in particular, that it seems unnecessary to bring it up as anything conceivable like a “variable.” Critiques in fact serve to focus and intensify anxiety, and so, also, “assignments” that demand, in an enigmatic way, a response to the “Ché vuoi?” of the pedagogical Other. There seem to be few ways to avoid anxiety, which of course is the ideological trap-machine of the University as discourse. Remember the form of the University discourse's Lacanian matheme? It’s S2/S1 → a/$.

Or, the Symbolic (as “knowledge”), behind which a Big Other (“master signifier”) pulls the strings, resulting in a presentation to the subject of an impossible demand (a, the objet petit a, or “object-cause of desire”) in the form of “Enjoy!” — i.e. the subject’s enjoyment is reversely predicated; the Big Other will “enjoy the subjects through the subjects’ inability to know what it is they are commanded to enjoy. They will “go to classes” and “get degrees” without knowing what it is they are supposed to do, or why it benefits them, although they pay increasingly high costs for these “pleasures.”

This surreal illogical logic is condensed in the architecture school critique. The critics “stand behind the curtain” to show a project’s deficiencies. The rule that the Symbolic is “always in need of a supplement, is proved by the critics’ customary demand that “something more should have been done.” Nonetheless, students are enjoined to Enjoy! the process of production though it is undermined by the enigma of various Big Others — examples they have never heard of, authorities that are unintelligible, concepts that are not fully explained.

There is however an alternative that has been around for over 2500 years — the response of painter Parhassius in his contest with master-artist Zeuxis. Zeuxis produced a trompe-l’œil depiction of a bowl of fruit. As an added surprise, a passing bird flew into the wall, breaking its neck. The judges were impressed. Parhassius, however, painted an image of a curtain, which the judges took to be nothing more than a curtain covering his project before its presentation. While Zeuxis had fooled a bird, Parhassius had fooled not just humans but humans who were expert at judging art, experts who regarded curtains as nothing more than props required by the critique. Once Parhassius pulled the enigma of the Ché vuoi? into the field, he gained access to the ideological set-up and went past it. Zeuxis used the dimension of depth to demonstrate his recognition of the “reproductive” role of art — to duplicate what the viewer expects. The delay caused by the judges waiting for Parhassius to “pull back the curtain” showed how the dimension of depth was temporalized from the beginning. Gegenstoss, recoil, was realized with surprise when the judges discovered that what was constructed could be deconstructed. Where Zeuxis took critical anxiety seriously, Parhassius “turned it around” and showed it off from an “orthogonal” point of view. Like the “orthogonal” view of the “powl/♥” of Krazy Kat’s concussion, we see anxiety as the fuel of the ideological process and are able to move past it, from jouissance1 to jouissance2. In other words, “fuck the utopian promise of the 360º!”

3 / Labyrinth and Temple. Angus Fletcher, writing about Edmund Spenser (The Prophetic Moment, 1971), pointed to the primary binary signifier of architecture, the temple vs. the labyrinth. Put briefly, this is the basis of the oppositions between the formless and the perfectly formed, the material and the ideal, the accidental and the divinely intended. How should we approach it? Fletcher is careful to note that these are not polar opposites. In the most critical sense, the temple and the labyrinth have an implicit identity as well as an antagonism, and
in Hegelian terms, we would have to say that “labyrinth/temple” is the fundamental antagonism — the radical split — that gives rise to all subsequent architecture. It is in the “contingent versions” of these subsequent architectures that we draw our empirical ideas of labyrinth and temple, justifying a model of logical opposition. But, if we understand the nature of the binary signifier correctly, we restore the one term to the other, in a relationship of pure antagonism, out of which each opposed position seems to emerge rather than oppose.

The labyrinth is something that exists particularly because of the denied dimension that would have allowed a plan view. The labyrinth has a plan — but, the point is that the plan is radically inaccessible. This means that even when we have bird’s eye view of a labyrinth directly below of us, we still do not see what makes the labyrinth a labyrinth. This is true of all the readers of the Thesean labyrinth who have failed to notice that it is a 3-base fractal. The labyrinth’s “true plan” is the temple invested within its folds, the “pure event” of the panic induced by its turns.

The flatness of the labyrinth — its “refusal” to be understood as a plan “seen from above” — forces the dimension of emergence to be the temporalized fourth dimension that, emergent from the flattened passageways, gives rise to the temple as the occulted element. Just what is the temple in these terms? The answer is hidden in the etymology of the word itself, the √TEM, Sanskrit for “division” (×). We can re-imagine the labyrinth–temple as a composite, a flattened domain of pure movement “raised” orthogonally (this is one of the meanings of the phallic signifier, φ) to a dimensionless point of crossing. This is the portal of Borges’ Aleph, a bright point floating in the midst of ordinary space that opens to a spatio-temporal plenum in which all times, all places can be found in a cosmic treasury. Though both labyrinth and temple can be envisioned as distinctive building types, their singularity and twinship reproduce the condition of James Joyce’s coined term, “twone.”

4 / The Labyrinth–Temple and Sorites. In relation to signifying chains, which are structured as sorites (a collective entity realized, at an indefinite point, through a process of absolute recoil), the labyrinth and temple function as the ultimate framing elements. They both collectivize the problem of the supplement — the fact that any signifying chain, S2, is “that which stands in need of a supplement” in the sense that words are defined by other words, which are defined in turn by other words, etc. On one end of the signifying chain, the labyrinth takes up supplement as a subtraction negating both quantity and quality. It is a void that, like the cliff of the well-known “Road Runner” cartoon, suddenly removes support. Until Wiley Coyote acknowledges this void symbolically, however, he remains suspended in air. The signifying chain’s
momentum supports him past this moment of “literal death.” The Real does not take effect without a symbolic recognition of negation.

What happens between suspension and fall is, in Lacanian terms, the period “between the two deaths,” observed in all cultures as a period of morning during which the family pray to guide the soul of the deceased to a symbolic death, a state of “pure bone” cleansed of all flesh. The Symbolic’s recognition of that which is its Absolute Other is Hegel’s “Golgotha,” a recognition of negation as pure distinction.

The temple seems to be the antipode of the labyrinth, but in effect it is the same Absolute. The difference is that the labyrinth models extension as a temporal wandering, a back and forth that is the essence of palintropic temporality; in contrast, the temple crystallizes time in a palintonic tension, held in place and suspended in time by pure opposition. Although labyrinth and temple, as limits bounding the start and finish of the signifying chain as sorites, seem to be excluded by the chain, they equally embody the chain’s internal tension between palintonic and palintropic time. With each dialectical movement from cause to effect to cause, etc., the “tonic” tensile force of a dynamic moving “now” holds past, present, and future in fixed positions. An analogy would be that of traffic along a super-highway, motionless from one vehicle to another while speeding past the landscape, converting the road ahead to the road behind. Just as the labyrinth could be seen as the reversed predicate of the temple, the simple binary conceals a gap between the two positions. If the labyrinth could be compared to two-dimensional sense experience — a “facing” of the world via a subject-object distinction — the flatness of this face gives way to a crystalline solid Real (“temple”) through the agency of an idealized movement represented as this gap: a “pure turning” that in myth and folklore are condensed into images of wheels, hinges, but also “curses” (= turns) that use speech and ritual to effect a transcendent, super-symmetrical relation of cause and effect.

From the wheel of Fortuna to the ritual encirclement of cities either to destroy them (the Biblical Jericho) or strengthen their defenses, the pure turn takes place in its own counter-intuitive dimensionality. In Stanley Kubrick’s 1980 film, The Shining, the hotel chef Dick Hallorann recognizes that the new caretaker’s son Danny, like him, is clairvoyant. While explaining details of the hotel’s maintenance to Danny’s parents, the chef “turns” to Danny to offer him ice cream but this gesture is invisible to the parents. In effect, the chef turns into the interior of a dimension occulted within the functional space-time of the hotel. This anecdote goes further than simply illustrating the recognition of the labyrinth–temple dimension by popular culture to show that popular culture also “gets right” the essence of this dimension as a “turn into an occulted interior that is simultaneously an exterior.” The labyrinth’s inside and the temple’s outside are constructed as a gap that is pure rotation.

A simplified way of describing the labyrinth–temple reversed predicate–with–gap would be to say that the standard Cartesian series of spatial dimensions (point, line, plane, solid) is actually interrupted between the stages of the plane and solid. The revised sequence reads: 1+2 (sense experience), 4 (the temporalized gap), 3 (as solid space that accommodates movement in specific “cultural” ways). Because we know that lived space is variably conceived, that space is space only through the process of “subjectification” by experience set within the
frames of cultures, groups, and individuals, we cannot speak of any “objective space” as a template against which “personalized” spaces differ. Because the fourth dimension — the temporalized gap between predicates and their reversals — intervenes between sense experience and the potentiality represented by spatial depth, every space is in effect singular. Personal spaces are not “derived” from an objective, material space “out there.” Rather, there is no space without the quality of affordance (tuchē) that is added by the gap, an “orthogonal” dimension connecting the labyrinth with the temple. This affordance exists for all living, perceiving beings but the human world is qualified by the Symbolic, which “delays” the three-dimensional Real, allowing the Symbolic to “over-run” it in the same way that Wiley Coyote is able to hang suspended in space before falling past the edge of the cliff. This is the basis of the belief in the soul’s ability to survive literal death, figured by cultures as a period of mourning but also by popular culture as the “death dream.”

The temple emerges from the 2-space of the “labyrinthine” sorites that has “preserved” each cause and effect through self-cancelling predications. This is the meaning of Hegel’s term Aufhebung, the main function of the dialectic. The dimension that “raises” the temple out of the labyrinth is thus not equivalent to the dimensions that construct 2-space (i.e. Cartesian x-y dimensions) but, rather, the dimension palintonically formed out of cathexis/anxiety (past/future) that orders the contents of the unconscious (“implicit” contents within the labyrinth). The templum, as pure distinction, “empties” the sorites by allowing its past to overrun its future. The investment of cathexis is “foretold” in this fold of time over itself, and anxiety is “released” — fear (Angst) is converted to weightlessness. Flesh as weight is lost; flesh as ornament is restored to its pure structure (Golgotha).
The dialectic of labyrinth/temple is played out ethnographically through the “theory of the four humors” (blood, fire, water, earth) based on combinations of hot/cold and wet/dry. The logical opposition of temperature and moisture, however, is out of sync with the seasonal cycle of spring (warm and wet), summer (hot and dry), fall (cold and wet) and winter (cold and dry). The adjusted order creates a wet line linking blood of spring and the phlegm of autumn, and a dry line connection choler with black melancholy. The wet line serves as a horizon of life and death, where flesh becomes a binary of heavy and light. But, because the “choleretic” life of the top of the cycle occults its shadow below the horizon (“between the two deaths”), the “hot-dry” sorities held in tension by cathexis/anxiety is haunted by a second labyrinth that constitutes its “fate.” This fate is revealed at the point of resurrection, at the apocalyptic last day.

Representation of the unconscious as a “cube” forces a comparison with fractal structure where the whole (the “spatial” structure of the unconscious) is retained at the level of any “event” that is a composite of cathexis and anxiety. Cathexis in turn is the 2-space (planar) ordering of interest, while anxiety is the “emergent” temporalized depth dimension. Just as the soriteses of Lewis Carroll “occult” a predication amidst a seemingly random series of statements, the “labyrinth” of the unconscious is able to occult a corresponding convergence (n/n’) within its predications. This convergence functions as a pivot or “pure turn” (trope) whose symbol is a circle or sphere and whose temporalized emblem is the annual cycle. The Greeks marked this point as the gap attended by Hestia and Hermes, goddess of exchange with the dead (manes) and god of exchanges (“silent trade”) of the living. Exchange equals the “pure distinction” of n/n’, the point of kenosis that is “freed of its content.”
The rule derived from the Event Dream (thanks to Pavel Florensky’s *Iconostasis*) is this: “What is stored ‘spatially’ in the unconscious must be recovered ‘temporally’ as a narrative” — a shift from palintonos to palintropos. This rule requires a model of triangular accumulation of content (above, left), with each element having, thanks to the binary cathexis-anxiety, a narrative vector automatically attached. (The automaton, in fact, is the coupling of chance and determinism that makes this happen.) Thus, the event of the event dream is, necessarily, both first and last: first as the effective cause of the dream, last as the terminus of the narrative sequence that has already been constructed — a past which “rushes across” the future in a moment of absolute recoil. The ethnographic payoff of this model is to be found in an explanation of the role of flesh in the system of humors. Once the humoristic system was adopted to the seasonal order, flesh’s moist nature aligned it with the “wet line” connecting the humors of blood and phlegm (warm/wet with cold/wet). Warm flesh is not simply the anima enlivened with animus (spirit) but flesh that has become weightless and “spiritual.” This is the appearance of the “spiritual body” of resurrection, or in less religious terms, the Platonic body that embodies perfect form, i.e. beauty that dazzles. This is the flesh of art, philosophically specified by Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s “flesh of the world” (*The Visible and the Invisible*, 1968) — a flesh, we should note, that comes with its own form of jouissance. The horizontality of the wet line is significant. It is the fluid connector between the “daemonic/erotic” element of melancholy and the ascetic/defensive position of choler (hot/dry). The zenith is “angelic” in its association with power and light. The nadir is the dark melancholic angel depicted by Dürer in his famous engraving of 1514. This is possibly the reason why the flesh of art is inseparable from the humor of melancholy: delay is required, so that quickness — literally, life — may be born “out of nothing.” Festina lente!
5 / The Vertical. It would be impossible to think about the “middle” without thinking about standing, rising, ascending, or — leaving the earth — flying. This is one way to break the deadlock of the x-y-z idea of the cube, i.e. to see the fourth dimension, the in-between, \(\sqrt{4}\) between 12 and 3 as dimensions’ “numbers,” as dynamic rather than static. Standing has particular relevance to human sense experience and action in the world. Simultaneously, the human stands and frees up two hands to establish a chiralistic relation to the world which now appears as limited by a horizon. This is “stereognosis,” literally a knowledge of the world known through halves. We could further relate this to the tesseract that are given meaning by being broken in two. Standing asserts relations with other things that rise and stand: the celestial parade of stars, the sun and chasing moon. An anxiety is added, that of falling, and the equation of rise and fall become that of comedy followed by tragedy. Gaining a shadow by balancing one’s vertical body is paid for, eventually, by reunion with that shadow, the death-double of life’s upright stance. When one falls into one’s shadow twin, one becomes the shadow; the shadow then asserts its dominance and allegiance to the horizontal earth.

In *The Symposium*, Socrates recounts that his knowledge of love came from Diotima, who advised him that, on account of Eros’s problematic birth, Love cannot be said to possess any one side of a binary (beautiful/ugly, good/evil, wise/foolish) because “he does not possess but rather desires” (Paul Friendländer, *Plato, The Dialogues, Second and Third Periods*, 25). The in-between is not a third position in the middle between the two positions of binary predications, as Pérez-Gómez seems to say in *Built Upon Love* (15). Despite his recognition of Eros’s always “being in need,” the idea of a “mean” between two opposed states of any binary is converted into a paradigm: “it is obvious that Eros stands here for a superior form of humanity, the paradigm of the architect/philosopher” (15). A few centuries later, Pérez-Gómez notes, Vitruvius endorses this view in his concept of the architect–philosopher who combines the powers of a sorcerer, sophist, and lover who seeks wisdom in words and wonder in deeds. Indeed. This is a “third position” outside the two compromised positions of the binary, in no uncertain terms. It is a position rather than a motion. Let me point out the problem to any reader who does not already see it.

The conversion of the in-between of Socrates’ Diotima to the utopian superhero sets up a new vocational goal. To build one must first be a virtuous genius. We have encountered this figure before. This is the superhero, Howard Roark, in Ayn Rand’s *The Fountainhead* (1943). What is wrong with Roark is not so much that he dismisses any who do not buy into his neo-con absolutism, but that he is set up as a *master mediator*, a “third force” in between the compromised positions that palintropically vie for dominance. This, Hegel would say, is the position of the “beautiful soul” of Schelling: the position of “standing apart,” while letting others commit errors that will be condemned in advance.

Roark’s standing–apart and standing are not the same thing. Standing, the vertical desire that will complete the cube of the Real, is dynamic, not absolute. (Understanding how “absolute,” meaning unchanging perfection, can be transformed into Hegel’s Absolute, which is pure dynamic distinction, *is* the art of reading *The Phenomenology of Spirit*.) Like the *mons delectus* (labyrinth + temple), it participates in the horizontality of reversed predication: standing depends on striding, the
alternation of the left and right foot (cf. Rodin’s sculpture of St. John the Baptist, above). The stasis of Shelling’s and Pérez-Gómez’s standing–apart, is identical with the defensive *askesis* of monasteries and literary utopias requiring defensive distance between their perfect order and the world. Standing, in definitive contrast, requires the sorites–like alternation within the Real of the Symbolic, the Symbolic’s continual need for supplement. Vico cited this in his concept of the certain (*il certo*), that which arising out of the error of binary opposition, must be fixed by ritual, sacrifice, and the dances, songs, and masks that these require. The poiesis of these creations — Vico’s *factum* — do not cancel error; they sublate it in the pure Hegelian sense. Error is occulted but preserved. Poiesis makes the palintropic alternation within the binary into the True of palintonic ascent. The monastery has used horizontal distance, compressed as wall and threshold, to provide the illusion of secure insulation. Within such defenses, the superior is worshiped as a purity. The beautiful soul is the static but impossible: perfection of the ideal, embodied but on account of its embodiment, unreachable. In practice this is the postponed “only if” position of ideology: society (or architecture, in our case) will be perfect “only if” it purifies itself of its corrupting elements and practices. The condition of longing implicit within the idea of Eros is converted to the ideological “forced choice.” The new binary moves the middle to the *recto*, the *verso* of which is that which must be foresworn — instrumentality, Cartesianism, Enlightenment rationality, in Pérez-Gómez’s case. Eros in other words has lost its relation to ascent with the conversion to a utopian “third position.”

Whether it’s house-raising (vernacular, community-built) or land-raising (the “song lines” of Australian Aboriginals) or cosmic sky raising (Nazca lines, above), what is up must be put up through movement on the ground that, in circles, loops, spirals, folds, and other tricky patterns, establishes the pattern that does the trick of the φ, the \( \sqrt{4}/. \) The Yoruba practiced magic using “cosmograms” drawn with invisible vertices were amulets, charms, and medical substances buried inside floorboards, behind panels, and inside door jambs. The invisible force field established sweet spots where the victim or beneficiary of their curses or blessings would receive the maximum effect.

What is the “point of view” of such orthogonal chanted ascents? Certainly it’s not the aerial camera or bird point of view. In every sense, it’s a Real infinite, a point associated with the sharp end of the cœlum, which means both “heaven” and “wedge.” This was the point of *ingenium*, Vico tells us. Located in the blue of the sky, it was not just a blue field but an intense, energized and energizing portal: the so-called “eye of Allah.” The diagrams of the alchemists give the impression that this was fixed at the literal top of the solar system. It is important to think of it not in literal but “anagogical” terms: a point that is portable, mobile, anywhere and everywhere. The nadir is in effect perfectly above any point on earth. Its field, the pure blue of the azure sky, covers the earth because the zenith is a potential Real for any point on the earth.

Standing–apart does not link the palintropic alternation between the predications produced by experience with the palintonic ascent to a higher order that realizes the Real that was implicit within that alternation. It looks for some-
thing else, some other way of doing business. Vico’s way (and Merleau-Ponty’s, and Hegel’s, and all the cultures who understand the vertical as the \(\sqrt{4}\) of any substantial, full reality) does not demand this third utopian (and, hence, ideological) ideal. It is willing to “get its hands dirty” with predications and predication reversals — i.e. the sorites of “one grain more” and “one hair less” — that allows the past to slide over the future in a moment of \textit{absoluter Gegenstoss}.

What happens with Eros? Must we accept the account of a single Eros, forcing us to merge it with the utopian third position standing apart from the palintropic pile of predications? Or, may we not use the tradition coming from Hesiod and earlier versions of Eros, coupled with the Classical account of Eros’ birth from two contentious parents, to conclude that there are two \textit{Eroi}, two births of Eros, two “mothers” of these births, and two forms of desire — \textit{jouissance} — related to this twinnship?

What we know in a positive way (+/+)) blocks out what we don’t know. We are unaware of it in any terms of sense certainty, but our unconscious nonetheless retains it, as a surplus of this first positive knowing, a knowing that has been guided by interest (cathexis). We “know it without knowing it” (–/+). Our dreams and doubts signal the presence of these “kenotic” contents, and create anxiety over the unknown, an anxiety that intensifies in a concern for boundaries (+/–). One response to this anxiety is retreat, askesis. The unknown’s unpredictability forces a contraction, and the architectural form of this contraction is the wall.

The unknown known still remains, however. Its –/– form is able to cross boundaries (an alliance with Hermes) so that walls are powerless to keep it out. It appears “in the midst” of secure interiors, positive thoughts, positive daylight. It is the “darkness shining through the light” that Joyce wrote about in the Nestor chapter of \textit{Ulysses}:

Across the page the symbols moved in grave morrice, in the mummery of their letters, wearing quaint caps of squares and cubes. Give hands, traverse, bow to partner: so: imps of fancy of the Moors. Gone too from the world, Averroes and Moses Maimonides, dark men in mien and movement, flashing in their mocking mirrors the obscure soul of the world, a darkness shining in brightness which brightness could not comprehend.

The inversion of John 1:5 is a reverse predication intended to bring about the realization of a duplicitous middle term, a Janusian bifold, a past running across a future. The dance of symbols is promiscuous. Their meaning assigned by convention slips away as the letters themselves change partners (men and mien) in mummery, creating echoes and random rhymes. Beneath the S2 of the symbolic chain is an S1, a demonic master, master signifier, two-faced, two-birthed, two-natured.

Vico says that there are two Dianas (§528); what are we to make of this? Diana is “Djana,” the feminine of Djanus or Janus. So, of course, there must be two. One, he says, hides in the forest, where invisibility protects her virginity. Occultation takes its model from this Diana/Djana, whose location cannot be set in terms of the map coordinates by which the hunter Actæon finds all the game that time permits. Djana’s grove is a surplus, a zenith that is above any and every point, because the nadir of the azure is a hinge permitting the azure field to cover the earth and still be a point, within the glowing triangle, \(\Delta\). \(\Delta\) is the antipode of \(\delta\), symbol of difference, shift, and turn (trope). The nadir’s hinge-point is Hades, where all Psyches must go to be transformed through a “labor of the negative” (Apuleius, \textit{The Golden Ass}). When knowledge of what we don’t know that we don’t know returns from –/–, it does so with the retroaction (palintrope) of its negative stay in Hades, the place of occultation. Joyce, in \textit{Finnegans Wake}, reverses another predication common to museums: “mind your hats coming in, mind your boots going out.” Has no critic noticed this inversion, that boots must be scraped of mud before entering, and hats must be picked up on the way out? The \(\delta\) of the palindrome guarantees invisibility, Eros’s trick, apparently for all time.