The matheme (◇) indicates a relationship, where the relationship is problematic, unstable, and continuously open to re-negotiation. In §◇a, Lacan’s matheme for the imagination, Lacan comments that the ◇ indicates that there can be ‘a hundred and one’ possibilities.

My version of matheme involves the ambiguity within the two axioms of the calculus of George Spencer-Brown. These axioms initially seem to endorse the notion of a ‘transitive’ space, where actions have predictable effects, such as crossing over a boundary and then back, with the result of being in the original space. In the calculus, however, it is the bounding condition imposed by inquiry, observation, and perception that complicate this transitive interpretation. On a spherical surface, axioms can reverse; transitive space becomes intransitive, simply through the operation of an ‘unexpected’ final bounding action.

Such a final bounding condition can be easily demonstrated:

1. It’s raining again.
2. It’s raining again, she said.
3. It’s raining again was what she said whenever she began to cry.

In the first statement, the statement corresponds to the ‘diegetic reality’ of a story in which an audience is completely engrossed, forgetting that it is a story. In the second, we are alerted to a frame constituted by a narrator, a basis for observation, a point of view, memory, and summary. The third is a ‘thesis-like’ statement where the frame is an imaginary ‘if statement’ with a defined precondition and outcome. Any of these framing operations could exist in any other, as implicit conditions imposed on the contingent reality of the context imagined by the listener.

The call (ᵅ) and the cross and re-cross (ᵫ) are mathemes. The original axioms are:

1. a call and a call again can be represented by a single call.
   \( \text{ᵅᵅ =ᵅ} \)

2. a cross and a cross again are equivalent to no cross.
   \( \text{ᵫᵫ = \text{null}} \)

In certain conditions, these axioms can be inverted:

3. a null and a null again can be represented by no null.
   \( \text{null null = null} \)

4. a cross and a cross again can be represented by no cross.
   \( \text{ᵫᵫ =ᵅ} \)

How does this happen: if the topological ‘ground’ of spatial division is spheroid, that is, if any point is definable as a center and there is no bounding circumference.

\( \text{ᵅᵅ} \) is the condition of ‘nobody’, the doubling which is also an (idiotic) cancellation, as in ‘yeah, yeah’ (meaning ‘no’) or in the literary use of the (literally) doubled name, Humbert Humbert, or the ‘figuratively’ doubled name, the Homeric ‘Nohbdy’ (used as an adjective and a proper noun). Cases of antinomasia, a name to indicate a universal property (“You’re no Bobby Kennedy!” or, reversed, “Here comes Mr. Know-it-all”).

This is related to the condition of the ‘defective narrator’, the point of view constructed to make another point of view available to the reader/audience. The defective point of view is
interpellated by the ‘ideal’ point of view, but is not aware of this. The other point of view works like a ‘conscience’ or ‘voice of conscience’.

\[ \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{r} \] is the condition of the uncanny, where a motion does not achieve the customary space-time result of displacement, as in dreaming of running ‘in place’, being unable to escape or the opposite condition of moving cautiously but having distance collapse in an immediate confrontation of some feared object. The remainder (\( \mathcal{r} \)) is a surplus/lack that is itself a ‘working matheme’, unsymbolizable, incapable of any fixed determination or meaning. In Lacanian terms, this is the ‘lamella’, or ‘not-yet-dead’, the ‘organ without a body’ (inverse or negative propriocept).

\[ \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{r} \] is the intransitive ‘flip’ or twist of space where a spatial operation (‘crossing’ taken generically, as representative of turns, crosses, etc.) does not produce the customary result (\( \Box \)).