The story of the invention of ‘artificial memory’ has been recorded by Cicero and Pliny. Simonides, a poet on the Greek island of Ceos, was hired to deliver an encomium for Scopus, a wealthy politician-athlete after a wrestling victory. To prevent backlash from the evil eye, Simonides included lines acknowledging the (appropriate for wrestling) twin gods, the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux. Scopus took offense and announced that he would pay Simonides only half his fee — he could ‘go to the gods!’ (i.e. ‘go to Hell!’) to collect the remainder. At the banquet, Simonides had memorized guests names based on the technique of loci (L.) or topoi (Gr.) — memory places fixing each name by associating it with the guest’s place at the table. Before long, however, a message came that there were two strangers who wished to see Simonides outside. When he answered this call, however, he found an empty street. Did the strangers vanish? Before he could go back into the banquet hall the building collapsed. All inside were killed. This ‘fake call’ outside had saved his life. Families gathered to pull their relatives’ corpses from the rubble. A proper burial was essential for the welfare of the soul of the deceased and prosperity of the family as well. But, the bodies were crushed beyond recognition. Simonides memory trick, however, saved the day. By memorizing places as means of recalling names, he was able to identify the victims and allow for their proper burial. Scopus, who had told Simonides to ‘go to the gods’ himself could now go.

Frame analysis shows how the anamorphosis of the banquet hall relates, as the accounts insist, to the theological logic of the sacrifice of a twin to insure ‘full coverage’ of lordship-bondage on the cosmic scale.

**énoncé (utterance):** The ‘dropped out’ element able to function as a (literal) automaton is the method of memory places. Names are assigned to a mental location, from which the mnemonicist can retrieve them when needed. Simonides in this case may have used the banquet hall itself, turning the space into a ‘memory machine’.

**Frame Theory Standard Paragraph:** Combining the Lacanian idea of ‘exhibition’ (exhibition) with the (also Lacanian) distinction of énoncé (enunciation) and the act of speech (enunciation), 1 a **visual protocol** identifies vectors of perception, virtual movement, partial objects, and such standard visual landmarks as the point of view (POV) and vanishing point (VP). Critical to this protocol is the system of two frames, F1 and F2 (encadrement), demarcating an ‘external reality’ outside the framed field (R1) and some inconsistency or anomaly within the framed field — a defect (Δ) that constitutes an inside version of reality (R2). The visual protocol aims to show how the imaginary operates within the symbolic by allowing the construction of fantasies (the ‘structured imaginary’) about how a ‘disguised’ subject may experience enjoyment directly (= Real). Frame Theory argues that these relationships can be observed in films, paintings, architecture, literature, and landscapes, etc., where frames manage actual and virtual crossings that allow for the fantasy’s contrasting components of anxiety and separation. The visual protocol is derived from the ‘calibration’ of Lacan’s enunciation theory with the Aristotelian causes, supplemented by the ideas of automaton and tuché, natural accident and human affordance.

1 ‘Enunciating/énoncé’ refers to Lacan’s distinction between the speech act and the literal contents of words, meanings, and grammatical/syntactical relationships (énoncé). The extimate affects this distinction directly. Effect become cause and is associated with the ‘unconsciousness’ of the partial objects that form the basis of Aristotelie’s two ‘chance’ causes, automatton and tuché.