**BoLaGRAM: Symbolic, Imaginary, Real**

“BoLaGRAM” (“boundary language diagram”) is an analytical method for parsing the imaginary as generated from the distinction of enunciation into the material énoncé and performative enunciating act. This division corresponds to Aristotle’s “efficient cause,” but a suppressed/dropped-out element functions as automaton, the Aristotelian element of natural chance. This is the center to which the dynamics of the framed field returns in a motion of analepsis (recovery) after a turn constructed through metalepsis (metonymy of a metonymy) a double negation that emphasizes material cause. The subject/subjectivity is barred through devices of anamorphosis that construct an “impossible-Real” point of view within the visible field where an internal blindness/visibility constitutes a defect (δ) that offers a means of escape. R1 and R2 plot the line of this escape, beginning with metalepsis and proceeding analytically to recover concealed elements until the destination point, aᵣ, is reached. Structured enclosures (⊂) are sites of δ and metalepsis, R2, but the turn is often represented in relation to the POV aspect of ω.

**Frame Analysis:** The subjective distinction is always a double, two frames that open up a space between them that is sustained by the phenomenon of double inscription of the uncanny (Ad→Da) and other modalities of double negation, including the metalepsis (metonymy of a metonymy) that will act as the internal “tell” or escape hatch redirecting subjectivity to the original position from which enunciation divided into (literal) signifier, the “artifact,” and action, or “representation” (Lacan: fantasy, the imaginary). The image-nature of the imaginary invites analysis through optical/acoustical analogies, i.e. frame analysis diagramming. The formation of fantasy within the imaginary follows the “Rule of I to A”: a linear narrative or sequence is revealed to have an internal fold that relates its “recto” version to a “verso,” or (more accurately) an “obverse” where double negation (<>) preserves truth-value (>). Double negation can be enacted using motility, scale, or identity in variable proportions.

**Background:** The subject is “inscribed” by the other (this is the primary action that we call “extimate”). That is, the subject desires what the Other seems to want the subject to desire. But, since the Other is a construct of the subject, this inscription is double, but only in its negative (unknown/unknowable) form: objects and other subjects “in the world” are made incomplete (“partialized”) in that they represent the impossible-Real at the material level. The Real is “that which resists symbolization,” and the rule that privation converts to prohibition makes that Other has a demonic quality corresponding to the subject’s inner void. The ultimate privation, death, is converted into a domain based on prohibition (judgment, trials, etc.), thus the relation of the underworld and heavens to the subject’s ethical standing (an intensified relation to an Other).

**Applicability of the General Model:** The “Borromeo knot analogy” of the Lacanian system is recursive, self-contained, and fractal, in that any two rings have an identical relationship to the third element. The frame diagram, which emphasizes subjectivity’s relation to the split function of enunciation, must simultaneously demonstrate the effects of double inscription and the extimate. This forms the “empirical basis” of frame analysis, where theory may expand into the rich domains of folklore, the arts, literature, and popular culture. Although it is possible to connect individual components of Lacan’s theory to examples in culture, frame analysis allows for the collation of examples within a unified (diagrammatic) field. Comparison of examples to each other with “minimal theoretical interference” promotes the development of theory entirely within the range of material examples but allows a consistent application of theoretical terms to regulate descriptions and comparisons. The “polythetic method” (which allows for missing links and does not demand “local” resolution) uses dialectic exchange between the “purely empirical” data and the “purely theoretical” evidence of the Freudian-Lacanian clinic.
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