There are multiple approaches to what we call "reversed predication." In the simplest terms, reversed predication is the switch between what is defined as an inside and what is co-defined as an outside. In the case of a frame, the contents of the frame is exchanged for whatever is outside the frame. Where the terminology is of “figure and ground,” the attention normally given to the figure is given to the ground.

The aim of this review is to emphasize the idea of a calculus of predication. Calculus has a specific meaning here: it is a set of rules governing relations that can be described in terms of framing. These include anything that can be considered a “predicate”:

- **Sets**: the things that belong to a group, as in the example of books in a library or rooms in a house; moments in an hour, hours in a day, days in a year, etc.
- **Functions**: things that can be transformed in a uniform way, as in F(x) = y. Here, ‘y’ might be a mathematical instruction, but it is also possible to think of function as other kinds of transformations.
- **Dominance**: in the common case of a figure-ground distinction, visual material surrounding an object of interest is subordinated, put into the background.
- **Relation**: akin to the idea of function, a process can be said to apply to a number of objects or items, as in “I like any animal for a pet as long as it doesn’t bite.”
- **Succession**: each moment "succeeds" the previous one, the present "eclipses" the past. In counting, a higher number follows and surpasses a lower one.
- **Cause**: in the assignment of cause to effect, the cause may be seen to "be superior” to its effects.
- **Hierarchy**: organizations organize themselves in terms of power relationships, typically defined by a branching out of authority from a center. A president has vice presidents, who have executive managers, who have assistants, etc.
- **Concentricity**: is a visual model of succession, dominance, and hierarchy where the last enclosing circle contains all others.
- **Attributes**: color, weight, size, and other qualities are said to “belong” to an object or person; any attribute is anchored in whatever possesses it.
- **Quantities**: qualities that can be measured along continuums can be regarded in any of the above relationships: bigger, lighter, happier, stronger, etc.

For all varieties of cases, the same symbols will be used to indicate predications. In texts, reference to the graphic shorthand for the “container” will be Γ. Relations will use parentheses wherever possible: present(past) … future(present(past)). When graphics are used, expressions look like the calculus invented by George Spencer-Brown in his *Laws of Form*:

```
contained  container
```

As with Spencer-Brown’s calculus, sequential or successive relationships can be graphically represented through concentric containment“:
The value of this style of graphic symbolization is that it can easily depict the phenomenon of “reversed predication.”

Succession and dominance relationships imply a linear continuation, from, say, smaller to larger, on to largest. This relationship is converted by reversed predication. The “end” becomes the “beginning” in an action comparable to recursion. There are multiple forms of this, and all of them contribute to the topological condition of this “re-inscription.”

The Gapped Circle: Imagine moving in what seems to be a straight line of travel but encountering a point that is identical in an uncanny way to a point previously left behind. This is the recursion experience put into the form of a travel experience. The wanderer has thought him/herself to be making progress but in fact has been “traveling in a circle.” When recursion occurs, the realization is that a fractal order has negated the usual scale separations that maintain strict ordering from small to large, low to high, inner to outer. Travel or motility dysfunction produces scale dysfunction, and both in turn lead to an identity dysfunction as the origin is encountered in the form of an end.

Reversal: recursion in itself brings about a primary condition of “reversed predication.” Rather than inscribing the exterior into the interior, as shown above, a simplified diagram can be used:

Extimacy: Jacques Lacan’s term for the “intimate external,” complemented by the “objective subjective” which was the hallmark of Louis Althusser’s internal void created by interpellation. “Subjective objects” are the “partial objects” identified by Freud (breast, feces, phallus) and extended by Lacan to include the gaze and the (acousmatic) voice.

Self-reference: claims are deemed to be fallacious if they refer to themselves in the process of describing some matter of fact, as in the famous case of the Cretan Liar, who in saying “All
Cretans are liars,” undermines his authority. If he is not a liar, then he is; if he is a liar, then he’s not, etc. The square wave defining the truth-table values for this situation \( (p \Leftrightarrow q) \) leads to the phenomenon of visual oscillation between (usually two) points of view, or ...

**Anamorphosis**: commonly known through Baroque art examples of images embedded within “normal” images frontally viewed, which are visible only from an oblique vantage point. More generally, anamorphosis has to do with how two “visible domains” may compete with each other as a result of shifting points of view, often very small.

**Moiré**: the square wave also generates the visual phenomenon of the moiré, the pattern that emerges when two (usually geometric) patterns are overlaid; often the same pattern is overlaid with its copy. It is the emergent quality of the design that appears out of this interference that relates to reversed predication.

**Frame suppression**: the frame is considered subordinate to what is framed, in the sense that it is present simply as a device, a mechanical means of limitation and presentation. However, the frame can be thematized within the representation, creating a “square wave” result that destabilizes the distinctions between the frame and the framed. When it is claimed that any drawing on a sheet of drawing paper “already has four lines,” this is what is involved. These “first four lines” are both a part of and not a part of the “drawing,” i.e. the blank page before any mark has been made.

**Fourth wall**: in theater and film, the boundary between representing and representation is called the fourth wall. When a film depicts a film being made, or a play has a play inside it, as in the famous case of *Hamlet*, the fourth wall can be represented within the main illusory space.

**Obversion**: like extimacy, this is the “return of the repressed” — the re-assertion of what was for some reason suppressed, dropped, forgotten, or excluded. The obverse is a consequence of seeing representation as a process of putting a “face” on phenomena, of taking a view, of portraying a situation.

**Partial objects**: defined above as the "clinical substances" that have a "life of their own" outside the bodies that produce them, a broader range of objects, taken from a generalized peripheral *terra incognita*, retain their extra-territoriality even when brought into a domesticated interior. These are related directly to the phenomenon known as ...

**Between the two deaths**: the symbolic survival of the mortal subject after the literal moment of death, generalizable as the life of an "organ without a body," a partial object that, having lost its conventional "sustaining" context, continues to function. In the ethnography of “between the two deaths,” the wandering soul finds rest in a symbolic death after a period of judgment and quarantine. Similarly, objects following this model have a similar etiology, and are seen to require care, provoke defense, or otherwise engage a discourse or narrative.

**Master signifiers**: are, in one sense, effects that have become causes. This reversal creates circular forces that sustain the master signifier (a "material universal") that seems to be sustained by its own irrationality. An example is the shark in the film *Jaws*, the element of animality that cannot be explained or controlled, which succeeds in determining the actions of others.

**Discourse/Conversations**: Two interlocutors constitute a system of continually reversing predications (speaking and listening alternate), and in this most fundamental case demonstrate what might be called the first “axiom” of reversed predication calculus: that there are, as a consequence of any shift between polarized conditions signified by predication, two additional conditions: (1) the state of the listener that must be imagined by the speaker; and (2) the state of the speaker that must be imagined by the listener. Because each conversation
is not just a reversed predication but a reversal of a reversal, the calculus must accommodate itself:

Sex: As Freud said, the minimum number of “persons” present in any sex act is four, a “literal” couple and the individuals imagined by each, the ideal other whose affection they seek and whose love for them is the occasion for wonder. At only one step of awareness higher, each love can imagine that the other imagines them in the same way …

Love: Mladen Dolar has observed that, while there is no love that does not presume free choice of each partner for the other, the couple nonetheless regard their meeting, and their success as lovers, as a narrative determined by fate. This engages both of the primary conditions of the uncanny as defined by Ernst Jentsch (1906), Freud’s primary source in writing his famous essay on Die Unheimlich (1919). These poles are (1) the case of the living person haunted/constrained by an unseen power, which we may label Ao, and (2) the dead person who has “forgotten to die,” and continues past the literal death and must be settled by a symbolic death, which we may indicate by the mirror designation, Da. The psychoanalytic patient’s last defense against discovery is to fall in love with the analyst. This presents love as a “forced choice” that threatens to foreclose analysis radically. Just as love and its psychoanalytic subject constitute a remainder to the process of ideological extimacy (“interpellation”), the love transference of the analysand constitutes an attempt to do away with options by presenting love as a forced choice; and, to continue the theme of the exception, the fully realized subject’s survival depends on this “remainder of a remainder.”

Diagram:

**IDEOLOGY:**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{subject} \\
\text{The Other creates a void at the center of the subject, which becomes the locus of the enigmatic desire of the Other:} \\
\text{small remainder} \\
\text{PSYCHOANALYSIS:} \\
\text{analysand} \\
\text{subjectivity=unconscious}
\end{array}
\]

Interpellation leaves a remainder, the basis for a “psychoanalytical subject(ivity).” This becomes the forced choice introduced when the analysand claims to fall in love with the analyst, as a “last ditch effort” to avoid terminating analysis.
Here, subjectivity is first created out of the interpellation/reversed predication of ideology. But, this process is not complete. There is a remainder, a part of the subject not entirely subverted by ideology. This remainder is the "psychoanalytical subject," and the clinical procedure of formal psychoanalysis takes the form of a discourse that addresses the question of the subject’s desire. In the briefest possible terms, the subject has desires s/he takes to be his/her own, but in fact they are desires of a (constructed) Other, whose enigmatic demands leave the subject with a void that cannot be filled. (This, too, is related to the "gapped circle" representation.) Psychoanalysis forces the subject to “be true as to one’s desires,” using the Lacanian formula for the discourse of analysis:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a} \\
\downarrow \\
\$ \\
\end{array}
\]

Roughly translated, this means that desire (a) occupies the place of the AGENT, for which the OTHER is the barred subject ($), the psychoanalyst in some sense who is barred not by a simple line but by the lambda (Γ) that maintains an “orthogonal” relationship between the patient’s representations as symbolic/conventional while they at the same time produce surpluses in the form of an “acousmatic” and metonymic "signalizing" of the unconscious. The analyst’s horizontal relationship to the subject’s representations of desire and vertical relation to the “master signifiers” (S1) of the unconscious (effects > causes) unlocks the hold the subject’s desire has over discourse, S2. The analyst’s Γ construction unlocks a symmetrical Γ in the analysand’s representations, located in the position of TRUTH. The analysand, in a last-ditch effort to avoid this unlocking, presents a as the forced choice of love as reversed predication: free choice and determinism combined. Because the master signifiers occupy the position of PRODUCTION, it is their ability to reverse predication more than any literal content that the analyst must detect. These reversals then act like a Rosetta Stone for the subject’s utterances.

Freud's "four person minimum" rule of love relates directly to the four terms of the discourse of analysis, making Dolar’s point all the more critical. Falling in love is at first a predication, one loves his/her "object of love." But, quickly, love becomes "falling in love with love," and the lover is possessed by "love itself." This reversed predication (the lover becomes the victim, the Other, rather than the agent) divides attention between the horizontal tuchê (affordance) of accidents and encounters relating to the enigmatic desire of the beloved, a, and the vertical awareness of the irrational obversion of effects for causes, “automaton,” a reversed predication process that produces the “impossible-Real” demands of love.

These S1 demands can themselves be reversed, but only if the metonymic process of their creation can be reverse-engineered. This is the “master fractal,” the ultimate remainder and resistant kernel, that opens up the impasse of falling in love by restoring the chain of signifiers, S2, from beneath the cipher imposed by a. S2 becomes the “nature read as if an open book” (Galileo, Il Saggiatore), i.e. the world as word, the ultimate reversed predication.

**Death**: Greek mythology in particular abounds with references to left-right (“stereognostic”) motifs. Perseus slays Medusa, and Asklepius draws blood from her corpse. The sample of the left side proves to be a deadly poison, that from the right can restore the dead to life. The simple configuration of left-right alternatives would be static. In nearly every instance, we see that “interrogating the gap” leads to the next story or reveals the truth of a backstory. In Asklepius’s case, the continued narrative is detailed. Zeus had killed Apollo’s son Asklepius, for his interest in “the black arts.” Apollo, in revenge, killed the Cyclops, “beloved of Zeus.” For this murder, Zeus condemned him to a term as a mortal servant in the household of Admetus,
who treated his divine guest with such courtesy that Apollo, once released from his term of service, promised Admetus eternal life if he could find someone to take his place in Hades. Only his wife, Alcestis, agreed; but this was a controversial sacrifice. The wife was the family priestess in charge of the hearth spirits, the Manes, ancestral gods of the husband’s family. She was both an “insider” and “outsider” in her own family; thus her service as proxy was not clearly officially sanctioned. Hercules visits Admetus at the time of Alcestis’s funeral but is kept in the dark about who has died; Admetus’s excuses compound the ambiguity of the Greek wife’s status; he puts Hercules off by saying that the funeral is only for “a family servant” — and he is not lying! When Hercules finds out the truth he rescues Alcestis in time; she had not yet become a fully installed spirit. Her ability to return to life reflects the left-right reversed predication permeating the whole tale, beginning with Asklepius and Medussa.

**The unconscious as discourse:** Cultural practices demonstrate the utility of reversed predication and the “gap of interrogation.” Out of these phenomena come the categories of the uncanny, but also the genres of virtuality developed to thematize the uncanny in terms of the four themes of the fantastic: travel through time, the story in the story, the double, and the contamination of reality by the dream. It is possible to go further, to speculate that these four forms in fact give rise to Lacan’s famous four forms of discourse: the master (story in the story), the hysteric (the double), the university (travel through time), and analysis (contamination by the dream). Even if there is no causal link, the discourses’ formulæ reveal much of the inner essence of the fantastic genres and their virtual space-times. In contrast to conventional virtuality, where the visible is connected to the invisible via contiguity strategies, fantastic virtuality is “detached.” It is about the independence of connected elements (body and shadow or reflection) or unexpected contamination of unconnected elements (the dream becomes reality). In all cases, the calculus of concentric containment reveals a recursive connection of inner and outer.

The virtuality of the genres of the fantastic return to the theme of the “partial object,” the “subjective objective.” Here, the unconscious is not an inner essence of the subject as individual, but the materialization of the gap, and the gap in relation to desire, of the external world.

\[
\begin{align*}
S_1 & \rightarrow S_2 \\
\$ & \rightarrow a
\end{align*}
\]

master-servant

\[
\begin{align*}
S_2 & \rightarrow a \\
\$ & \rightarrow S_1
\end{align*}
\]

hystera

\[
\begin{align*}
a & \rightarrow \$
\end{align*}
\]

analysis

\[
\begin{align*}
S_2 & \rightarrow a \\
S_1 & \rightarrow \$
\end{align*}
\]

university

Table: the four Lacanian discourses, showing elements (S1 “master”; S2 “knowledge”; a “object-cause of desire”; $ “barred subject”) rotating against four set positions (Agent, upper left; Other, upper right; Production, lower right; Truth, lower left). The “bracket term, the position of the Other, is proposed as a key linking the discourses to other four-fold systems (virtuality, enunciation, fourth wall, etc.). The bracket links the horizontal functionality of the formula with the vertical, the term “next in sequence.” The four forms can each be seen as cases of reversed predication, with the bracket terms serving as the “interrogated gaps.”
The element identified with the arrow bracket (upper right corner) holds the key to the relationship between the Lacanian discourses and the four forms of the “fantastic virtuality” of detachment. The bracket element in fact is the “Other” that facilitates the detachment (or contamination). In Analysis, the analyst maintains a horizontal attention to the analysand while detecting the “acousmatic” contents of his/her speech. In the Master-Servant, knowledge horizontally supplies the master (or mastery) with goods and services, but the actual production is pleasure, possessed only by the servant/servitude.

Hysteria offers the means of parsing the effect-for-cause reversed predication of the master signifier, horizontally re-mapping the hysterical subject as a field across which functions, identities, pains, and pleasures change places. Vertically, these exchanges project a knowledge beyond the aspirations of normal mastery, a *kenosis* that explains the pleasure-for-pain experienced by the hysteric. The university engages the broadest concerns of learning, for it is a relation to a legacy (S2), which commands subjectivity to Enjoy! vertically, dividing/barring the subject/subjectivity in relation to a past that holds enigmas of truth. This is not a factual truth but the Vichian *vera narratio*, the “true narrative” of thought itself, contextualizing any sequence along the chain of signifiers, meaning human thought from beginning to end. Knowledge, in any instance or chain segment, contains an acousmatic presence of this *vera narratio*. Its object-cause of desire, a, commands a schizoid, hysterical enjoyment, a cyclone that swirls around issues of what is missing: negation.

Analysis offers the most obvious connection to virtuality. Even in Freud’s thought, the role of the dream in its relation to the unconscious was central, and “contamination” amounted to the illicit “re-entry” of form into itself. In contrast, the most difficult correlation is with the discourse of the master. The key here is to see the bracketed position of the Other, knowledge (S2). The fantastic theme of the story within the story is a case of violating the rules of concentricity. A novel depicted inside a novel, a film being made of the making of a film, etc. upset the transitive distinction between fiction and reality. We see characters inside a fiction who go between fiction and reality just as we in the audience are doing. The fourth wall is turned to the side, so we see both in section view. We see the villa in section, its *prima nobile* occupied by masters and their guests; the cellar and attic stories are the workplace and sleeping place of the servants. These latter zones are invisible to the masters, yet they supply goods and services out of their invisibility; things “suddenly appear.” Within these goods and services is the pleasure of the servant, something that cannot be grasped by the master. This gives the servant perverse superiority over the master (☞). The servant story “estimates” into a container for the master, thanks to the bracketing of knowledge.

Hysteria makes similar use of the S1, master signifier, which becomes the means of converting pain to pleasure, body interiors to external bodies, high to low and low to high. S1 facilitates the virtuality of the double, the identity that trumps the subject by presenting itself to itself. Instead of the classical A=A of identity we have A<>A, the subject who is “more in himself than himself — i.e. the interpellelated subject with a void at its heart. The dramatic version of the double is the hysterical twin, the key to foundation rituals required to secure spaces of cities, households, tombs. To the left, horizontally (in the Lacanian formula), is this twin. Below, vertically, is the knowledge of good and evil that, as in the case of Eden, was the key that unlocked the a-temporal unconscious of the Garden. As always, the object-cause of desire (the fruit of the tree of knowledge good and evil, in the case of Eden) is the antipode of this master signifier, He Who Cannot Be Named. When S1 is high, a is low. No wonder that God and the serpent of Eden were portrayed as opposed forces. But, in their opposition, as with the diagonal opposition of S1 and a, are the opposition of the king and the fool, the silly brother who is slain for mocking the boundary drawn by his serious twin. These doubles hold the key to spatial security. They rule, by virtue of their twinship, the upper and lower regions...
in rotation. This is the virtuality of the double, a kind of cancellation of \( \mathbb{C} \) through the gapped circle, \( \mathcal{O} \) (also abbreviated as \( \Omega \)).

From the contamination of the dream of analysis, to travel through time of the university, to the story in the story of the master, to the double of hysteria, we have matches that transform our ideas of virtuality as well as discourse. Yet, implicit within the discourses function in relation to the extimate, there is an implicit relationship between the “internality” of the subject and the world that becomes the language of the subject’s unconscious. This can only be done through virtuality, and the virtuality required is the “detached” virtuality of fantasy, where reflections disobey their owners, the deceased continue to speak and act, where we confront our doubles along the road to Samarra.

**Enunciation and the causal chain:** The uncanny is normally not a part of any theory of discourse, causality, or virtual space or time. Only in the last case, virtuality, does the necessity to account for “detached” virtuality engage the world of magic, which is of course all about causality. Taken seriously as not simply a collection of superstitious practices, magic, in its essence as reversed predication linking the present with the non-present, the living with the dead, the present with the future and past, and the securing of prophetic guidance, constitutes a kind of precursor and superior to the modern system of efficient, final, formal, and material cause. The link can be found in Aristotle’s two “supplementary causes,” automaton (natural accident) and tuchē, human affordance/opportunity. The former is “vertical” in its “out of the blue” aspect. The latter is horizontal in that it exploits adjacencies and tangencies ... things "lying at hand." Automaton and tuchē fill out the half of Lacan’s enunciation theory, whereby the psychoanalyst had divided the interests of énoncé (the grammatical relations, the conventional contents of communications) from enunciating, the performative act. Efficient, final, formal, and material cause construct the grammar; automaton and tuchē construct the performative.

We should pay particular attention to the arrangements made in each of the Lacanian categories of discourse (hysteria, master-servant, university, analysis), which seem to accommodate this double functionality. In particular, the place of the Other has worked as a “bracket term,” channeling horizontal relations with the Agent, the term to the left, into vertical relations with Production, the term directly below. This reveals that the Other is the locus of reversed predication, the channel by which the subjective interior of the Agent/agency finds its correlates in the externality of objects and materials. The four “modalities” of the four discourses suggest that this can be done in four (but not limited to four) ways. The key to these modalities, and the key to their relationship to the eximacy of enunciation, lies in this pivotal hinge-term. For hysteria, the pivot is S1, the master signifier, which becomes the conversion factor.

Conversion can be portrayed through the analogy of the circuit. A conversion of the current’s polarity is achieved by a switch that has two parts, one to convert positive into negative, another to convert negative into positive. If one part is removed or disabled, the circuit is “intransitive” and unstable. This instability amounts to a gap in the circuit, a point at which an irrational “third polarity” may be introduced. This is the point of extimacy, where an internal void or error may be connected to an external anomaly, as is clear in the case of prophecy (the connection of tuchē to automaton, in Aristotle’s terms).
In the discourse of **hysteria**, S1 is this locus. It converts the +/- of the subject/agency’s claims of pain into the S2 set of signifiers that “maps” (interpolates) these reports to a new set of topological affordances. Thanks to this pictorial knowledge, the cause of desire can be identified. For the **master-servant** discourse, where the concentric virtuality of the story in the story is most expressive, the pivotal term is knowledge, S2. Marx’s theory of use value versus exchange value comes into play, but with a deeper understanding of exchange applied to the conversion of labor itself. The laborer’s (hysterical) suffering is the engagement Marx celebrated as the satisfaction of craft. The master in effect “knows nothing of this”: the S2 factor is horizontally expressed in the negative.

The **university** discourse’s hinge element is a, commonly taken to be the command to Enjoy! But, this is an enigmatic command, one that subjects the subject, $, because it includes no specifics on what is to be enjoyed or how. In effect, it is the Other that enjoys the subject (or subjectivity), who in the university is the medium of Production. Knowledge “enjoys the subject” in a Vichian sense: discourse itself generates a subjectivity — **specific forms of subjectivity**, to be precise — that obvert the individual’s usual sense of who is speaking. The subject is spoken through language. The virtuality of this discourse, travel through time, is the popular culture hallmark of the university as a means of connecting to the authority of the past. Names inscribed in the stone of buildings on campus are one sign of this reverence to the conversion of subjectivity through discourse. With a as the pivotal Other, realization can only be made through a “proof of the body,” cited directly by Vico:

§345 Thus the proper and consecutive proof here adduced will consist in comparing and reflecting whether our human mind, in the series of possibilities it is permitted to understand, and so far as it is permitted to do so, can conceive more or fewer or different causes than those from which issue the effects of this civil world. In doing this the reader will experience in his mortal body a divine pleasure as he contemplates in the divine ideas this world of nations in all the extent of its places, times and varieties. [Emphasis mine.]

Again, Lacan “proves” Vico by correctly locating the element of the Other, the pivot or gap in the discovery process. The time-travel virtuality of the university is, after all, Vico’s hallmark. If Vico corresponds to the university, then Lacan should correspond to analysis, where the pivotal position’s term is $, the barred subject — in which case we should ask, “barred by what?” The clinic of psychoanalysis is the disciplinary regime imposed on empirical investigation and theoretical speculation. It can neither “swerve to the left,” as Slavoj Žižek has characterize it, by over-identifying with the subject-as-victim (this would be giving in to the final threat to analysis, love-transference); nor can it “swerve to the right” by asserting an over-arching organicism, as did Carl Jung. Either swerve forecloses analysis. Each is a version of “falling in love with love,” i.e. becoming the target zone of a reversed predication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>discourse</th>
<th>virtuality</th>
<th>enunciation</th>
<th>“bracket term”</th>
<th>fourth wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hysteria</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>S1 as OTHER</td>
<td>obverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[identity dysfunction]</td>
<td>[short-circuitry]</td>
<td>[master signifier]</td>
<td>[Magritte mirror]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master-servant</td>
<td>story-in-story</td>
<td>formal</td>
<td>S2 as OTHER</td>
<td>frontal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[scale dysfunction]</td>
<td>[emblematta]</td>
<td>[knowledge]</td>
<td>[face to face]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university</td>
<td>travel in time</td>
<td>final</td>
<td>a as OTHER</td>
<td>right side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[motility dysfunction]</td>
<td>[motive/demand]</td>
<td>[&quot;proof of the body&quot;]</td>
<td>[radical historicism]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: Correlations of discourse. Each of the columnar conditions involve presentational or performative conditions presuming a predicative content, observer(s), and a mediating screen. The systems of four thus are themselves doubly predicated in that Lacan’s formulæ for discourses create symmetry opposing Agency and Truth, on one side, against the Other and Production, on the other.

The virtuality of the clinic is the dream that contaminates reality, but this contamination is the basis of analytical study. If the analyst succeeds in being able to read the ciphers of the unconscious, the dream, then the subject/analysand may complete analysis without the foreclosure of falling in love with the analyst — a “forced choice” that uses the forced choice of all falling-in-love, the combination of fate (we were destined to meet ...) with accident and free will. In love’s enigma, automat (as destiny) and accident (as tuchē) are dominant. The clinic corresponds to a discourse that has taken charge through protocols enacted through the causality grounded in enunciating by means of the stream-of-consciousness interview of the subject. In simplistic terms, association is pure tuchē, affordance made by random unconscious connections of one thought with another. Through this, the unconscious “speaks” with ciphers, as a kind of automated, “acousmatic” voice. Contamination is like an infectious plague whose examining physicians are at risk of catching. They must elude the cyclical conversion factor by strictly adhering to clinical protocol ($). They must avoid being the “hot detective” (Sam Spade) and remain the “cool detective” (Hercule Poirot, Sherlock Holmes).

By now it is clear that automat and tuchē constitute a kind of trading floor in the market of the unconscious. Affordance links subjectivity to the material world, offering it choices and opportunities. This vector of tuchē seems to mean something in a vague way. Rather than having definitive reasons, these choices “signalize” some hidden intent, which remains formless at the conscious level. The unconscious “returns” this intent via the function of automat, which combines the senses of randomness and machine-like control. This is not a speculative model but one that, in data-mining procedures, track consumers’ on-line activities and “return them” in the form of advertising generated from algorithms. The same track-and-return strategy is used by algorithms designed to buy stocks and securities in financial markets. Because the time interval is so small (6–9 nano-seconds), the response of automat to the tuchē of choices makes the former almost “implicit” in the other. You are who you are almost before you are, so to speak.

Enunciation theory helps clarify this automaton-tuchē model of the unconscious in relation to the causal chain.
Efficient cause may be seen as a pure division initially separating the énoncé, the semantic contents and their grammatical structure, from “enunciating,” the communicative act considered as pure performance. The performance works like a vector, orthogonal to the main, conscious dimension of the causal chain, a line that leads to a product materialized for some purpose, some “final cause.” Every type of discourse (university, master, hysteric, analytical) employs the causal chain as something that is “made to be broken.” The break comes with the repeated inability to incorporate the traumatic Real within the system of signifiers linked by cause and grammatical relations.

Returning to the impasse created by this break, we can see how the Real, which can be related to historical traumas experienced by the subject, is also created by and through normal everyday experiences. The Real, topologically, is tied to extimité, the inside-out transformations by which the subject’s innermost interior is identified with the most abject or resistant aspect of externality. Extimité can be regarded in two forms, although technically speaking it doesn’t make any difference whether we see it as an outside-to-inside process, as in the case of ideological interpellation, or an inside-to-outside process, as we find in the phenomenon of the partial object. Extimité transformations always involve the uncanny, always involve the virtuality of detachment. The polarity of extimité becomes the polarity of these materializations and can be seen in popular culture manifestations.

The hallmark of these is a criss-cross, a “double inscription. In the case of the uncanny, extimation results in the primary categories articulated by Ernst Jentsch: (1) the deceased who does not realize he/she is dead; and (2) the living person drawn to a fatalistic end by unseen forces. The undead zombie brings double negation into focus. It is neither dead nor alive; it creates a “third option” out of the condition of life-death as forced choice. Out of this third option comes the Lacanian interval of “between the two deaths,” observed by all cultures through religious conceptions of the soul’s survival after the body’s literal death, requiring a period of sympathetic guidance to a symbolic death. The living person drawn to death follows the model developed by the popular story by John O’Hara, “The Appointment in Samarra.” A servant fearing that death is trying to catch him flees to Samarra, the town that Death had set in advance as a meeting place. The use of the subject’s own freely made choices to set in motion the machinery of fate is an ancient theme, as the play Œdipus Rex makes clear.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{ALIVE} & \text{DEAD} \\
\hline
A_{\text{DEAD}} & D_{\text{ALIVE}}
\end{array}
\]

Double inscription is a fractal of double negation. It doubly negates at the “scale” of the primary opposition of Alive and Dead, and the categories created by this double negation are also doubly negated, and even incorporate double negation as a dramatic-performative logic. Although the causal chain may be seen as rational and progressive, it is no more or less rational than the organic cycle of life ending in death, a cycle we complete by placing birth at the origins, raising the question of reincarnation. This person-scaled cycle can be generalized to any phenomenon that has a beginning, middle, and end. This temporal sequence is nothing more than a boundary drawn that can be as easily obverted/extimated as any other, and reincarnation is the first obvious result. The other results follow the double inscription model of the uncanny, superimposing the models of the conscious/unconscious (and, hence, causality) at the same time.

When the act of enunciation “drops” or “suppresses” its performative component in order to articulate a grammatical, well-formed chain of causes leading from effective contexts to final intentions to formal products, the sub-territories of tuchë and automaton have been
automatically created. Our access to this basement of the chain of causes is through the one cause type that is also suppressed, material cause. Material cause is created out of a denial that maintains a minimal independence between what something is and how it is. A message written in blue, red, green, or black type still “says the same thing,” even though some will point out that the change in colors may influence our reception of that message. To use the example preferred by Aristotle, a statue of Apollo would still be Apollo if it were carved in wood rather than marble, although we might prefer one to the other. By putting a wedge between intended identity and the means by which identity is achieved, meaning can be said to succeed or fail to convey the proper intention, to have greater or lesser effectiveness. Material cause secures, for the chain of causes (S2 in the discourse formulæ), a margin and a marginality. This marginality divides into two main sources, natural (automaton as accident) and human (tuchē as affordance, “making the wrong choice”). This marginality is the medium of the “third space,” the escape from the choice forced by extimity, a space that, between the options of reversed predication, constitutes an escape clause.

Material cause — the physical means of assembling things intended to have certain functions and identities — is “self-suppressing.” Just as a furniture maker may sand the wooden parts smooth to remove any signs of tooling, he/she may also wish to conceal the tricks of the trade used to fit together joints that are both strong and invisible. The orthogonal angle between material cause and form is the means of this concealment. It allows material cause to “play out” the general orthogonality/concealment of the enunciation process. The pantomime of the worker was famously exploited by Marx in his development of labor as the central generative feature of capital. Vico used the same pantomime to develop the idea of autonomous thought, both reactive and constructive as it developed its three key forms in the minds of humans who, in perceiving the external world, were actually constructing themselves.

Material cause’s advantage is that it is, well, material. It can be empirically observed. But, what we see in these observations is highly elusive. How, for example, can we interpret choices made in the process of creating form? We must also construct an “unconscious” for final cause, in which the role of the bricoleur is an option, where “elective affinities” can create social and material contexts in which accidents play key roles. Equally, we may wish to see how certain trends forced an “inevitability” on what is otherwise a process of free choice. Why did Philip Guston “grow out of” his abstract expressionist phase into a moral-pictorial genre? The specter of Worringer’s thematization of alternating periods of objectivity and subjectivity looms, but the existence of historical cycles cannot be dismissed, nor can they be resolved by appealing to the evidence. The gap will always be present, will always be the subject of interrogation, and will always resist this interrogation. The gap is about the inability to reduce the Real to the Symbolic, on one hand; and the Imaginary’s impudent seeming insistence to reconstruct this inability in terms of fantasy — in particular, the uncanny component of fantasy.

**Fractals, Lacan Style:** Without moving too far from the problems set up by discourse, the causal chain, and the uncanny, the question of Lacan’s three-fold “Borromeo knot” of the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real should be considered.

The aim of using the Renaissance emblem of the Borromeo knot was to show how the Symbolic (language as a chain of signifiers), the Imaginary (fantasy constructions), and the
Real (traumatic-resistant "performatives") are related not by any system that can be described projectively but, rather, "topologically." The knot will fall apart if any one ring is removed. The "last" ring lies on top of its predecessor but beneath that predecessor's predecessor. The Lacanian system is a case of reversed predication as it is portrayed by Spencer-Brown's symbol of recursion: \( \square \). We should note at this point one key trait. Recursion allows for any amount and any kind of predication between the "first" and "last" boundaries. The "inner-most" is an abstract location, just as the outermost is a mechanical "n+1" event.

This is the strange expandability of Lacan's system, which keeps it from being reduced to any single formal description. This fractal quality is also its "Vichian" quality. Vico coined the term "ideal eternal history" (ideale storia eternal) to mean a pattern that could be found in any human thing, at any scale, at any period. In other words, the origins of humanity in a "mythic mentality," able to imagine the sky as the expressive skin of a god who intended to say something by creating signs within its plenum, also contained within its mythic logic the story of which it was a part, at the larger scale of human development from mythic, to heroic, to modern modes of thinking. The "story in a story" is Vico's "master-servant" virtuality, put in ethno-philosophic terms. Lacan has managed the same thing, by deploying extimité to develop a variety of structures and, at the same time, demonstrate the exceptions to and margins within and around those structures.

We must face the fact that the Borromeo knot's three elements could as easily be a pile of rings, all lying loosely on top of each other but with a final "lock," a re-entry of the form into itself. Lacan in fact used examples of just such structures. Yet, the extension of the Borromeo ring with additional rings does not change its logic. There are, "forever and always," only three rings to the Lacanian circus — the Symbolic, the Real, and the Imaginary — just as there are, forever and always, only three parts of reversed predication: the predication, its reversal (which taken alone constitute a "forced choice" of interpellation), and a gap. The gap creates a swerve in what we might analogize as a Lucretian "even flow of atoms" through a void, and this swerve in turn creates a "site of exception," a turbulence functioning as a site of discovery, escape, invisibility, and kenosis. It may be romanticized in ways, such as René Daumal's unfinished novel, Mount Analog. Or, it may be the basis of grand poetic projects, such as Dante's Divine Comedy. The fractal aspect of the relationship of the Symbolic, Imaginary, and Real lends itself to any and every play of the mind. Is there any way to approach this scale dysfunctional expandability?
Psychoanalysis begins with the materiality of speech (slips of the tongue, pauses, etc.) to discover the vocabulary of the unconscious, the algorithm by which the unconscious “contaminates” reality, like a dream. The analyst regards the analysand’s conscious intentions as constructions, but maps the failures of these constructions to calculate the original “orthogonality” of efficient cause, reverse-engineering it in the face of the analysand’s final resistance, love-transference (forced choice).

The hinge-term of psychoanalysis is the analyst, serving as $. The subject is barred in this case by the need to listen passively to the analysand’s chain-of-consciousness associations, paying particular attention to the errors, gaps, slips-of-tongue, etc. that constitute the unconscious’s “signalizing.” As the analyst listens, the unconscious becomes aware of its audience and may in fact begin to refine its articulations beneath the cover of errors and omissions. The code translating these attempts to communicate directly, without the analysand’s approval or recognition, are the $S_1$ master signifier(s) that convert effects into causes. In such a situation, it would be impossible to say who is speaking and who is listening. The analyst is in some sense serving as the eximated unconscious of the analysand.

At this point, it is necessary to recognize and state clearly what the analysand’s chain-of-consciousness associations exactly are. In the most basic terms, they are predications: assertions of some sort or another, “randomly” brought forth in no particular order, structured by no obvious intentionality other than tuchē, the opportunities of adjacency, coincidence, and uncanny resemblance. We use the discourse of analysis to carry out this inquiry because it is the one that isolates and thematizes this chain of associations the most clearly. The other forms of discourse also involve these “formations of tuchē” in harder-to-recognize ways.

**Sorites:** The discovery and development of the psychoanalytic method by Freud was not instantaneous. It grew out of clinical experience supplemented by Freud’s reading and travel experiences. His archaeological interest in Rome, his collection of ancient artifacts, and his growing view of culture as neurosis on a collective scale set the stage for his famous method of analysis. In particular, an essay by Giovanni Morelli, on the importance of “insignificant details” in determining the authenticity of paintings, alerted Freud to his “garbage heap” view of the unconscious. This was a revolutionary discovery. Rather than accept his patients’ representations directly or literally, he saw that their unconscious employed the negative to conceal, within everyday communications, coded messages that relied on denial, omission, accident, (dis-)placement, and (mis-)recognition to achieve meaning.

A comparison with the idea of predication is useful. Where ordinary language could be described a series of predications (statements about things, conditions, other subjects, etc.), the unconscious uses this series, but in a comparatively perverse way. Lacan’s claim that the unconscious is “structured like a language” is true if one pays attention to the word
"structured." Structure may be described in many ways. The analogy of predication however goes to the heart of how structure may be "employed in reverse" to create the conditions of extimacy that Lacan identified as essential to the unconscious. Lacan used the idea of predication without naming it, in that when predication is reversed it creates the topological conversions that he claimed functioned as the unconscious’s inside-out methodology.

The Freudian-Lacanian clinic, as well as other kinds of psychoanalysis, are based on the prone analysand, encouraged to speak freely, forming associations without attention to historical or logical order ("free association"). The style of speech during analysis was compared to James Joyce’s development of the so-called “stream of consciousness” writing, where readers were confronted with disruptions of linear and logical chains by jumps, gaps, and unusual juxtapositions in the text. These predications, produced in a linear chain, frequently repeat elements that are themselves predicated by other elements. There is no perfect matching of predications with predicators, but in general the process produces raw materials that might be re-assembled in a logical order, as a series of concentric frames, each element predicating the previous one. Representing this alphabetically, 'a' is contained by 'b', which is in turn contained by 'c', and so on.

The critical issue is how the "last" element relates to the "first." (Note that the actual presentational order may begin and end with elements that are not "structurally" first and last.) This is the principle of extimacy — i.e. how the unconscious constitutes a "closed and curved" system, a unity of design able to incorporate any empirical content of the senses’ experiences. The system in this case is based on each element’s service as both predicated and predicating: something that contains something but is in turn contained by something else. This series of consecutive predications thus has a symmetry based on the presence of pairs, each "cancelling out" or "balancing out" the other. The other issue, revealed by this cancellation process, has to do with the remainders or exceptions, which will be made evident through the cancellation, or balancing, procedure. The calculus demonstrates this process of re-ordering and reduction:

In line one, the analysand’s free associations are shown as a series of unordered predications. Bracketed terms are "contained," or predicated, by the term that follows them on the right. (If the predication is negative, the bracket is omitted.) Predication reversal is "delayed" in that a term that is predicated at one point may be a predicator of something later on (line 2). The series is made to reveal its concentric structure through a process of cancelation. Each predicating term is matched with its predicated twin and removed from the series (line 3). However, there may be surplus terms that are not removed by this process (line 4).

Lewis Carroll used this very process to construct riddles employing the logical form of "sorites." Sorites is a kind of set phenomenon, where the collective identity of the set is seen
to pervade all of the individual elements, even to the point where only one remains after a process of reduction. A “pile of sand” is thus said to exist, even when all but one grain has been removed. The objection that a single grain cannot possibly constitute a pile is countered with the argument that it is impossible to identify the point at which the pile ceases to be a pile. Carroll presented his readers with a series of nonsense predications, such as “When I detest an animal I avoid it,” mirrored in statements where one element is repeated: “I detest animals who do not take to me.”

The key to concentric structure is the psychological condition of the joke. When a joke begins, there is a verbal trigger that functions like “Once upon a time ...” in a fairy tale. The expectation is that the joke will be a puzzle, but the puzzle will have an answer that appears evident suddenly, and that the fair joke will have provided the jok-ee with sufficient evidence to realize the answer before it is given. This is the joke’s concentricity, its obversion. The last enclosing boundary, the punch line, will return the structure to its interior, its origin point.

Similarly, with the sorites, the “last element” will return to an origin, which for the unconscious is a primary predication; but first the order of free-association predicates has to be re-ordered, and that is the function of the pairing process, whose ideal order is: (((…(a)b)c)d…). Once this order is discovered, the exceptions — remainders, residuals, anomalies, etc. — can be identified. The calculus has shown how, in terms of a topology of territories and enclosures, the psychoanalyst’s procedure works. But, in practice, there is something more. The analyst is able to detect two things through the skill of listening: (1) a symmetry that arises out of the random (“stochastic”) ordering of the analysand’s presentation; and (2) “sentences” or, rather, “predications” that constitute the unconscious’s “signalizing—at-a-distance” — the metonomy, or rather “metonymy of a metonymy” (metalepsis) that is the language of the unconscious’s “contamination” of waking life by its dream, also a “story within a story,” also a “double” of the consciousness’s ego persona, also a complete disaggregation of the temporal order with the portable fractal by which the last predicating element ties into the first.

We must return to the main reversed predication model at this point to identify a key component of Lacan’s contention that the “unconscious is structured like a language.”

In the well-known experiment devised by Alan Turing, a human subject sits on one side of a screen or curtain, while on the other side is either trained human assistant or a computer programed to respond to the subject’s questions. The subject tries to determine whether the voice from the other side of the curtain is human or a computer; if he/she cannot decide, Turing claimed this to be evidence that computers could think. This contention has been, I claim, misinterpreted. It is usually taken to mean that computers, whose calculations have advanced to the point where they are able to mimic human thought to some degree, are allowed a rather low standard by which they are credited with intelligence. By “lowering the bar,” not only are computers credited with the ability to think, but the corollary, that human intelligence itself is “nothing more” than computation, is said to be proved. This two-part argument is wrong, both because the curtain constitutes something other than a screen filtering out the normal cues and rich overtones involved in any normal human
communication; and because the vector of communications has, in the claim that computers have intelligence, been reversed.

In the notation of reversed predication, the case can be rectified. We must “interrogate the gap,” that is, focus on the middle term that has allowed predication to reverse (i.e. the machine to “speak”). This gap is the curtain. Lacan has already singled out this function, in his retelling of the story of Zeuxis and Parrhasius. These were two painters in ancient Greece, whose competing skills were to be decided by a contest in which the artists were given two portions of a wall and invited to paint their best murals. A contest can itself be represented as reversed predication, two elements in balanced opposition, with the aim (final cause) of a victory of one over the other.

The contest structure, shown in the upper right, is expanded to show the symmetry of the two painters’ murals, the enforcement of secrecy between them, and the position of the judges. Zeuxis painted a bowl of fruit so realistic that a bird passing overhead was attracted to the grapes and flew into the wall, breaking his neck. This demonstration of Zeuxis’s perfected naturalism seemed to seal the case. When the judges turned to Parrhasius’s entry, they waited for him to pull back the curtain but the artist did not. Demanding that he delay the process no further, the artist revealed that his painting was, in fact, of a curtain. Parrhasius won through an analogy comparing Zeuxis’s naturalism, which had fooled a bird, to Parrhasius’s rhetorical trick, which had fooled the expert human judges. The curtain accomplished the same thing for Parrhasius that it had for Turing. It provided a “minimal delay” in the predication process — a delay just long enough to allow the representation process, i.e. the painting viewed by an audience — to curve and complete. The “Turing sentence” of the Zeuxis-Parrhasius story was the realization that the curtain was not a “material accessory” (material cause) of the painting but in fact a trigger for a more successful cognitive event: the attribution of reality based on the recovery of the element repressed at the very beginning — the structure of the contest and the requirement of symmetry, delay, and final, resistant predication, a remainder that constitutes both a beginning and an end of the process. The Turing sentence is, indeed, irrefutable evidence of intelligence, but the intelligence does not belong to consciousness, it is a product of the “unconscious” that has been extimated to the object, the curtain, creating a Lacanian partial object, or case of intimate externality. Note that there are two simultaneous and critical components of the Turing sentence: (1) extimation, the transfer of the unconscious to an external-objective site; and (2) the creation of a resistance, a "site of exception," that adheres like an aura to this site, an aura that is maintained, typically, in some negative way, e.g. by concealment as in the case of the curtain.

The Art of Memory: Extimation and the site of exception, the two ingredients of the Turing sentence, allow us to see just how widespread reversed predication has been in key points of history where the unconscious has demonstrated its “structure as a language” in the open air of landscape and architecture. These media are significant because they offer the broadest range of "performatively affordances" — a means of combining time and space in diverse ways,
with the means of developing, and later disrupting, a causal chain. We expect Turing sentences (and the full paraphernalia of reversed predication) to be found wherever a site is claimed on behalf of religion, as is the case with foundation rituals for cities and houses, or wherever place and thought come into distinctive relationships. This goes beyond the usual idea of “sense of place,” which piles predication on predication with the aim of creating a loose amalgam of qualities constituting vague identity. What is lacking here is a structuring process, the very thing that has made the examples we shall cite here evidence of a real functioning of *topos* as both a “place” for thought and a “place” in geographic/architectural terms. A short list of such *topoi* includes: Hermetic (silent) trade, festival architecture, the use of *topoi* in films, paintings, and fictional narrative, ... and the invention of artificial memory.

The key example that expands the Parhassius story to a larger collection of evidence is the story of the invention of artificial memory by Simonides of Ceos. The story is retold by various ancient authors, the most popular versions coming from Cicero and Pliny. Simonides was a “poet for hire,” engaged by Scopas, a wealthy politician on the occasion of his victory as a wrestler, to write a commemorative poem to be performed at a victory banquet. To protect his client lest his boasting attract the evil eye, Simonides included a passage honoring the twin gods, Castor and Pollux. Scopas objected to this, however, and refused to pay Simonides the half of his fee that had been “squandered” on praising the gods. In parting, he cursed Simonides by telling him to “go to the gods” (i.e. “go to Hell”) to get the rest of his fee.

Midway into the banquet, Simonides received a note saying that two strangers were waiting outside, wishing to talk with him. When he went out to the street, no one was to be seen; but before he could return to the banquet, the hall collapsed, fatally crushing Scopas and all the guests. Even though the call outside was a “false alarm,” it had saved Simonides’ life.

When relatives of the guests arrived to claim the bodies (for anonymous burial would jeopardize the souls of the deceased), they were horrified to see that their family members had been crushed beyond recognition. But, Simonides had employed a trick to remember names of guests as well as his own recited poem; he had divided the hall into “memory places” to serve as a system. He remembered the guests names by where they were sitting. This place-based method allowed him to recover the names of the dead by determining the position where they were recovered. The grateful relatives compensated him generously, making up for the lost half of his fee. And, Scopas’ curse, “to go to the gods,” was ironically turned back on the curser himself.

The most referenced modern commentator, Francis Yates, has noted none of these symmetries that tie this story about artificial memory to the technique’s actual operation. In terms of reversed predication, however, it is easy to see how extimation and the creation of an external “site of exception” work in the story and in the method.
The diagram of the Simonides story is nearly identical to that of the Zeuxis-Parhassius story. Scopas, like Zeuxis, is engaged in a contest; his original win however will be converted to a loss, with the collapse of the banquet hall. Simonides’ efforts come in two parts: (1) his “failed poem” resulting in his fee being reduced by half; and (2) the exchange outside, in the negative form of meeting two strangers who were not to be found. By this combination, the ruined hall became a “site of exception,” allowing the dead to “speak their names” (apophrades) in order to be buried. The symmetry of these predications, and the return of the final element to the origin of the story, the reversed symmetry of the wrestling contest, reaches a QED with its own Turing sentence, the names predicated by places.

Subsequent diverse applications of the method of memory places works within the reversed predication paradigm. Predications continue, seemingly at random (tuchê). All the while, the unconscious automates a re-ordering and reduction, aiming to produce a “Turing sentence,” a final summary predicate that allows for the extimation of last to first, inside to outside. We are entering into a subject of great antiquity, where the theme of stochastic resonance has been traditional, although modern treatments have ignored this property. There are two reasons why resonance should be restored. First, this is a process by which weak signals are amplified by the presence of noise. This illuminates the metonymic aspect of the unconscious’s process of “signalizing,” which is the idea of meaning at a distance. Second, it also engages the idea of the voix acousmatique, an element within ordinary speech, but — drawing from the origins of this term, where it designates the off-screen voice — simultaneously “too close” and “at a distance.”

The key terms, resonance and distance, bring memory fully into its spatio-temporal aspect. This was nowhere more famously developed than in Giulio Camillo’s L’Idea del Theatro, a text portraying itself as a handbook to a built project, a 7x7 grid of topoi arranged in the form of the auditorium of a theater. Richard Bernheimer has brought this subject into focus through the metaphor of the celestial “theater” witnessing the Assumption of Mary from her tomb.¹ No aspect of this original moment should be discarded. With the fixed point of the tomb corresponding to the small stage of Camillo’s proposed theater, the idea of earth’s spatial-temporal singularity, expanded with numerical specificity and consecutive order (“consecution”), provides evidence that the idea of resonance — with full implication for the memory and imagination regarded as “neural networks” — based on the kind of resonance created by sorites (delayed predication).


What is at stake: the technique of artificial memory employs ancient, possibly shamanistic, methods and concepts of eschatology. As the Simonides story makes clear, this religious function is central to the collection of components that serve a mechanical automation of memory (automaton) based on contiguity and consecution (tuchē). As the related tradition of the Assumption indicates, all elements of reversed predication are present: concentric enclosure, scale dysfunction (fractalization), inscription/recursion, extimacy, and a gap, developed as a portal.

With so many clues in place, the memory theater offers a means of corroborating ideas across a broad span of history. What is immediately clear is that memory has formed a part of a tight matrix involving communication with the dead (apophrades), automation (creation of an independent means of randomizing thought — “delayed predication”), tuchē (deployment of some field of contiguous relations, such as a forest, theater, or banquet hall), and the creation of a dimension able to transcend the “terrestrial” spatial and temporal ones (and, hence, uncanny formation of the four forms of detached virtuality). In short, the memory theater offers a means of confirming the number and relation of topics of reversed predication; it is the “historical laboratory” for empirical investigation of this critical idea.
Predication in Space and Time: Askesis and Daemon

Let us return to the calculus of predication, which appears when written to be an enclosure of one space by an angle representing a complete square or circular demarcation. The enclosing space can itself be enclosed, creating a set of concentric figures. This series can be regarded as a sequence of moments in time, where we call the series “consecution” (continuation of consecutive order). Like the pages in the book of a journal, we are normally allowed to return to previous pages only “symbolically.”

Simultaneity can be shown by enclosures placed side by side. And, in everyday experience of space as both a map of simultaneous relations, we see a mix of concentric containment (spaces within spaces) and simultaneity (spaces next to spaces). When space is experienced, however, consecution dominates, and a return to a space creates a circle in one set of dimensions, the map, but a straight line in journal terms. When a return is made, the space is in one sense the same, in another sense different. This effect is magnified when the place of return has elaborate structures of its own, both real and imaginary, as in the case of “home.” The mixture of imaginary, symbolic, and Real, as Lacan would put it, means that the place required by a “map-view” circular return — completely allowable because of the principle of simultaneity — is undermined by the “journal view” operating simultaneously at different scales. Reversed predication is almost always the consequence of returning home because the balance of journal and map cannot be stabilized. The dreams of home mix with the actualities, and dreams inside dreams contaminate realities inside realities.

Consider a classic example, Victor Fleming’s 1939 film, The Wizard of Oz. In the film’s short opening story, Dorothy, an orphan being raised by her aunt and uncle on a farm in Kansas, runs away with her dog after the school mistress threatens to have the pet destroyed. She encounters an itinerate performer, Professor Marvell, who persuades her to return home because her aunt is ill with grief. When Dorothy gets back to the farmhouse, however, an approaching tornado has scared everyone into a storm cellar, now locked from the outside. When she takes refuge in the farmhouse, it is transformed by the cyclone into a viewing-machine. Her window becomes a screen “onto which” the collected contents of the vortex float past, without anxiety or distress.

Dorothy has returned home but found that it has reversed its predication relationships. The material house that was dominated by personal experiences now itself becomes an enclosure, and the flip gives the house, as material cause, access to a tuchê of images arranged within the vortex. The tornado delivers her to Oz, where her journey/trial is automated, again, by a spiral, the Yellow Brick Road,
which she must follow. During this journey, reversed predication animates normally inanimate objects: machines (the Tin Man) and apotropes (the Straw Man); and gives determinative “will” (although imperfectly) to “wild” beings (the Cowardly Lion). This series of reversed predications culminates with the encounter with the Wizard, whose reversed predication employs the traditional curtain. His wizardry depends on the “Turing sentences” he is able to create with smoke and flashes of light from behind his “automaton,” an effects machine concealed behind a curtain.

*The Wizard of Oz* example demonstrates two things. First, it is clear evidence that reversed predication is the stuff of popular culture. Its operation and results are easily understood within the range of sentimental interpretations and temporary beliefs in uncanny beings and magical actions. Within the suspended disbelief conditions of the work of art, the “once upon a time” effect gives reversed predication full privileges. In their magnified form, these reversed predications relate meaningfully to common shared experiences, such as the disappointments of homecoming (“You can’t go home again!”).

The work of art is itself a reversed predication, allowing the everyday to be held in check for a *specific duration*. In Lacanian terms, the Symbolic is eclipsed by the Imaginary, where we see, even in genres not classified as “fantastic,” the four devices of the fantastic (travel through time, story in a story, the double, and contamination of reality by the dream) magnified, articulated, and ordered within a unifying narrative. The “gap” component of reversed predication is condensed within frame conditions, which can be suppressed (realism) or engaged (surrealism, a-temporality, fantasy, “iconicity,” etc.). When we experience art, we are simultaneously inside its fantasy structures and outside, our literal material status “deadened” by convention (the audience must remain quiet, receptive). The gap however means that the barrier insulating the work of art’s Imaginary from the audience’s symbolic relations (placed on hold by the structure of the auditorium) is akin to the gap insulating the analysand and analyst in the consulting room. The consecution of art experiences present themselves to the audience-analyst, with the chance that the analyst may discover the “master signifiers” (S1) that unlock the “automaton” of the unconscious, the production machine that has *carte blanche* to “contaminate” the contents of the everyday (S2).

Here, the gap has real and obvious meaning. It is the bar of the barred subject, and this bar is in fact the angled bar (Γ), the joint capable of bounding space and time through concentric enclosure, consecutive series, and recursive re-entry. The audience of *The Wizard of Oz*, stands like Dorothy and her companions, paralyzed by the fearful illusion of sound and light. The curtain makes this possible. Pulling back the curtain exposes the *automaton* that has been running this show. It reverses the predication. The tyranny of the Wizard now becomes supplication: he must ask the four to “do him a favor,” and — precisely like the analysand confronted with the end-game of psychoanalysis and unconsciously afraid of discovery — presents this “favor” in the form of a forced choice: the team must destroy the Wicked Witch of the West (the “impossible-Real”) or remain in Oz forever (foreclose all further reversed predications). We can re-write the barred subject as the analyst of analytical discourse, faced with the task of de-coding an encrypted message, one in which the translation algorithm is itself a part of the message.

\[
\$ = \overline{\$}
\]

The forced choice repeats the logic of the home-coming, in which Dorothy has found a farmhouse “animating” the vortex of the tornado. She has found the house predicating the idea of home, rather than the correct “domestic” predication of house by home. The uncanny results, Oz, are however domesticated through successive reversed predications, allowable
following the privileges of suspended disbelief. We may extend this transformation of the “hinge term” of the Lacanian discourse of analysis to the other three discourses. In order, they are: S₁, hysteria; S₂, master-servant; a, university. In hysteria, it is the master signifier that must reversely predicate; in the master-servant, it is knowledge (the network of symbolic relationships, i.e. the inversion of the “superiority” of the master over the servant); in the university, it is desire, which converts temporality/history to enigma.

In the discourse of analysis, knowledge (S₂), is the “dropped out” element of the causal chain, the element that, by virtue of its suppression, is able to function as unconscious automaton within the field of affordances/contingencies (free choices) the analysand believes to be rationally made or circumstantially determined. We can return to the causal chain model to see how the “hinge terms” generate distinctive “dropped out” elements that constitute the automat for the four discourses. Automaton can be understood in both senses: (1) as that which seems to be purely the result of natural accident, Aristotle’s original meaning; and (2) as a precise machine determining “fate-like” structures in a stochastic, metonymic way over the contingent field of tuchē. In this way, the causal chain is always “in flight” or “in contraction” (askesis), from a “demon” — which historically has designated both an unpredictable supernatural force and a determinative mechanism.

Askesis and demon are the names of two of the ratios used by Harold Bloom in his early study, The Anxiety of Influence. Although Bloom directed his six ratios to the problem facing the young poet as an initiate oppressed by the accomplishments of the past, the “great poets,” the theme of anxiety transcends this study’s specificity. It relates, for example, to the lack of anxiety of the objects held in suspension in the tornado’s vortex in The Wizard of Oz. This is the same lack of anxiety that Freud noted in dreams of flying, where the dreamer wonders why floating/flying, now so easy, was not realized before. That flying is also an obversion of the condition of the lungs (air contained by a body > body contained by air) shows additionally that loss of anxiety is related to an act of reversed predication.

The causal chain “contracts” meaning as it leads from efficient cause’s suppression of a key element (which we can relate to the forms of discourse because of the “rotating” elements, S₁, S₂, a, $) to the “final” (intentional/conscious) “formation” of (previously formless) materiality. Note that the category of “the formless” constitutes a case of Hegelian Aufheben, the identification of a key substance through an act of negation. As material is converted into intended form, it is its form-less-ness that is “left behind.” It is precisely this formlessness that has been captured by artists such as Gordon Matta-Clark in his disassemblies of abandoned buildings. This is the art of the remainder, the surplus, the marginal, metonymical detail (Fr. “cut”). Aufheben, the discovery of this negation — which in analysis is the detection of the stochastic signal, the voix acousmatique within the analysand’s chain-of-consciousness predications — leads to the key (S₁) unlocking the automaton. It pulls back the curtain on the Wizard; it deciphers the “Turing sentence.”

We can summarize the role of the hinge term, the “dropped out” element that becomes the automaton/demon of the causal chain in its retreat (askesis). The realization that any concentric/consecuted chain (“delayed predication”) can be expanded into a causal chain:

... invites a more informative notation that specifies how the hinge term of the discourses identifies the element that will be “dropped out” in the enunciating/énoncé distinction of
efficient cause. The dropped-out term constitutes the gap that is to be "interrogated" as the autonomous function within discourse in its four modes.

The shifted emphasis of each of the four discourses engages a "primary virtual modality" based on the forms of detached virtuality, derived from the four forms of (uncanny) fantasy formation. By these, the subject is able to avoid or sustain the over-presence of the Real. This is the meaning of Lacan’s matheme for fantasy, $\diamond a$. The poinçon, $\circ$, is a sign of extimacy (both $\langle\rangle$, a scale dysfunction) and negation (the poinçon, "punch," as cancellation, as in the conductor’s punching of the train ticket).

Remember that it is the "hinge term" for each of the four discourses that designates the "dropped out" gap-term. This is key in showing how "Turing sentences" can be developed in a variety of ways, how "curtains" can take on various forms, and how reversed predication can operate within space, time, or both to effect the $\diamond$ relationship between the subject and the subject’s desire. The conversion chart looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>HINGE TERM ($\Gamma$)</th>
<th>“DROPPED-OUT” TERM ($a$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>master-slave</td>
<td>$S_2$ — signifying chain (knowledge as knower)</td>
<td>$$ — divided/barred subjectivity &quot;servant as automaton&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;pregnancy&quot; as absent presence&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hysteria</td>
<td>$S_1$ — master signifier (effect for cause)</td>
<td>$a$ — extimacy, holes in space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;whoever desires, desire possesses&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university</td>
<td>$a$ — object-cause of desire (desire that desires)</td>
<td>$S_1$ — enigma of past knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>$$ — the acousmatic audience (stochastic noise becomes signal)</td>
<td>$S_2$ — automated/coded signifiers &quot;return of the suppressed&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;letter always arrives at its destination&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This "master table" shows how discourse, causality, reversed predication, and virtuality involve the fundamental transformation that occurs "at the portal" of the work of art. Here,
... where the function of the *poinçon* becomes, as Lacan described it, “one of a number of relations” — a portal, which comes with the polar options to suppress the role of the frame (realism) or engage it in recursion (iconicity) define a range of combinations in between, where the virtualities of the ◇ detach and re-attach domains that are separated by predications, where predication may be delayed extensively (the sustainability thesis of *A Thousand Nights and One Night*), and where gaps may be constituted out of a variety of “formless” materials, made enigmatic through their detachment.

[UNDER CONSTRUCTION]:

**Frame analysis:** [the consideration of the fourth wall conditions within the general causal chain.]

**Chiasmus in literature and the arts:** [Poe’s and others’ formal structures of extimacy.]

**The number nine:** [Mathematical considerations of reversed predication.]