Jacques Lacan articulated his theory of four principal discourses in 1970, in *L’envers de la psychanalyse*, Seminar XVI. Two discourses could be said to be drawn from empirical situations: the setting of the analyst’s clinic and the university. The discourse of the master undertakes the logic of Hegel’s parable of Lordship and Bondage, from his *Phenomenology of Spirit*. The hysteric’s discourse seems to relate to the famous malady that is often identified with the rise of psychoanalysis in 19c. Vienna. Despite this variety and unevenness, all discourses rely on the parsimonious cakewalk of four terms across a fixed field (left): (1) the barred subject, $; (2) the master or master signifiers, $; (3) $, knowledge, as a “causal chain” or sequence of signifiers, sliding and self-referential for Lacan; and (4) the enigmatic objet petit a, ‘a’, the “object-cause of desire which, for Lacan, is undefinable and related to the gap or void, which in the death drive is the compulsive destination for return. The elements always retain a constant sequential order. As a sequence, they “rotate” against a fixed quadrated background whose four regions — agent, other, production, and truth — seem to suggest activities (agency, production), roles (the Other), and values (truth). This cumulative variety and inconsistency makes interpretation difficult at best, but it also holds open the mathemes for a kind of polysemity that is essential to discourse. Because there is no limitation or restriction of terminology, discourse itself can show off its capacity for unlimited predication, reformulation, and self-reference.

Is some other visualization possible? Since discourse is, if anything, about framing in spatial and temporal forms, where parenthetical relationships are set up and then violated, would it be possible to convert the standard mathemes of Lacanian discourse to a “calculation of predication”? Furthermore, would it also be possible to use the logic of frames, meta-poetry, to explicate and extend the discourses where they relate to spatial conditions in architecture, art, and landscape as well as temporal conditions in literature, poetry, etc. — or, more productively, to do away with distinctions between space and time as well as distinctions made within space and time, such as gendering, qualification, and valuation, to uncover more fundamental processes lying beneath the fluidity of appearances?

This experiment begins by equating the < of predication with both the “vertical” (numerator and denominator) structure of Hegel’s parable and the “horizontal” left-right, “spectacle and audience” structure of Lacan’s mathemes. The numerators on the left and right (agent and other) form the principal framing elements, which can be taken as either spatially contemporaneous or temporally sequential, as in origin and end. The denominators (truth and production) occupy the interior: agent<truth...production>other. This is put forward as a first trial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agent</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>truth</td>
<td>production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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$$ S_1 \rightarrow S_2 $$$$

At the level of fantasy, $S_1S_2$ is the myth of honor that drives the systems of symbolic relationships based on prestige and status. Reversed predication of the same elements leads to the irony by which the servant, $\$, derives from production the pleasure of the master’s ignorance. The ‘a’ “automates” the master-servant system.

$$ S_1 < a \ldots a > S_2 $$$$

The calculus reveals that the hysterical subject is reversely predicated by the system of mastery that establishes itself through organization of pleasure within the field of signifiers/knowledge, thus engendering an eminently “reality” as a proof. Where $S_1$ is the Name of the Father, $\$ enacts re-naming/mask.

$$ S_2 < S_1 \ldots > S_2 $$$$

Rather than $\Phi a$, ‘a’ functions as the “chê vuîut”? reversing desire as desire of the enigmatic other, the “truth” of the university who, presenting equality with $\$, functions through fantasy to deliver ideology rather than knowledge. Mastery predicates subjects in hierarchies of “achievement” (degrees).

$$ S_2 < S_1 \ldots > S_2 $$$$

The project of analysis is to decode the field of signifiers, to trace $S_1$ as ideology to the unconscious desire of the Other. But the analysisand may reversely predicate the analyst by converting a/$ to a $\Phi\$ of falling in love, where $\Phi$ is free choice and $\Phi$ is fate operating within choice. Removal of the $\Rightarrow$ is the last impediment to a successful conclusion.

$$ S_2 < S_1 \ldots > S_2 $$$$

NEW IDEA FROM THE CALCULUS: The field of production contains the “emergent” factor of ideology, as the convergence of $S_1$ by $S_2$ (reversed predication: effects for causes). This “haunts” the master-servant system.

$$ S_2 < S_1 \ldots > S_2 $$$$

NEW IDEA FROM THE CALCULUS: The field of production (subjects enchatned by the promise of mastery) exposed to the surprise of knowledge that “does not know it knew in the 16c.!” This is an invasion of a canonical order by the religious ecstatic: unpredictable, hysterical, madly in love with $\ldots$ God = reversed predication.
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what are the possibilities?

With only the idea of replacing the "spacings" and subordinations of the mathemes with calculus predications, what are the possible outcomes? The most radical seems to be the potential claim that (Lacanian) discourse is metaleptic. In the A<…>B form, which locates the four elements and positions of components of discourse, this says nothing about the essence of metalepsis, the "extimiate" inclusion of the frame elements, A and B, into the interior of ‘x…y’, as a >< element, a so-called "site of exception." This goes beyond discourse theory per se, but it possibly engages Lacan’s theory more deeply, by bringing out the essentially metaleptic quality of discourse in its full cultural effects. A and B are converted into the form of φ and -φ — the "phallic" forms that can be considered as: (1) the enigmatic "Ché vuoi?" of the Other; (2) the anamorphic theme of appearance and disappearance, presence and absence; (3) the effects of delay, as in the key delays of the oral, anal, and phallic drives; (4) the partial objects associated with those drives; or, especially (5) the dynamics of the drives Lacan added to Freud’s three, the gaze and the acousmatic voice; and (6) the factor of three-fold negation in the maintenance and reversal of ideology. In our construct of a "Pyramus-Théseis Operator," we have speculated that A<…>B is always in some way acousmatic — that there is always a minimal element of ventriloquism. Not only did thematizing the acousmatic through the Pyramus and Théseis help see sexuality in a new light, it allowed us to see the architectural/spatial implications of sexuality, via Lacan’s concept of the not-all and the rule of castration, where (those who choose to call themselves) men identify with the continence of the boundary whereas (those who choose to call themselves) women are never completely interpellated by this (ideological) restriction.

The advantage of conceptualizing the A<…>B of the Lacanian discourses with the Pyramus-Théseis Operator is that discourse can recover its acousmatic/ventriloquistic dimension and connect to two components of metalepsis theory: (1) the revisory reading of Aristotelian’s four causes as a model for recursion in discourse’s division content (énoncé) and act (énonciation) and (2) the advantages, enjoyed by the P-T model, of relating directly to the “chirality designs” of texts and works of art that use chiasmus to re-distribute their effects to produce a “stochastic resonance” rejoining elements functioning as halves. Chirality’s usefulness is clearest in the example of Simonides’ story of the invention of artificial memory, where every element of the first half of the tale relates in an uncanny way to the elements of the second half, where the remains of dead guests need to be identified for proper burial. In this story, we are close to the themes of twinnship (cf. Castor and Pollux and their key role in city foundation), shamanistic materialism (cosmograms, healing magic, etc.), and theories of “collective memory” (cf. Maurice Halbwachs).

The experiment is risky but the payoff would be enormous. The key resides in how the “extraneous” function of Eros (φ/-φ) can demonstrate recursion in the quadrilateral Lacanian discourses. Is there or isn’t there efficacy in discourse? Is there or isn’t there the acousmatic voice (ventriloquism) in discourse? Is there or isn’t there a basis for connecting discourse to the (poetics) of chirality via the structure of metalepsis? The claim should not be that these are original questions, never before asked; but that these questions, and many answers, are already present in some form, and that the calculus “anticipates” their presence by trying to reach the same connections through an inherently “idiotic” and mechanical means — i.e. the parsimony of a reductive system. One could say that nothing new will be known through such a demonstration. Others might recognize that the “idiotic simplicity” of a calculus was exactly what Lacan had in mind with his observation, about the “stupid smile on the face of angels.” Jouissance works in mysterious ways.

The simple reversal of the calculus bracket uses the extimate to cover cases of the uncanny (fate, “between the two deaths”), the double, and the effects of the gap between the two positions: delay, desire, the death drive, etc. The negative status of the gap sets up the calculus for inclusion of stochastic and acousmatic effects, making the Pyramus-Théseis Operator inherently acousmatic, as in the story of these two lovers.

horizontal forces

… are those that carry diegesis forward in the “normative temporality” established by the conventions of the frame: A<…>B. Operating invisibly within this horizontality are the inclinations that invisibly draw the narrative towards a “clinamen” where a point of exchange establishes a site of exception. Vertical force is generated by the attraction potential of delayed predicates whose mutual pull creates a scissors action: from → to Λ. The apex, a point of exchange (><) is the “master signifier” that coordinates the reversed predication of all the sequential delayed pairs. The horizontality of agent and Other and Truth and productivity in Lacanian discourse are consistent with the Symbolic register: they cannot signify the Real, but internal echoes and inconsistencies “signalize” the presence of the Real as vertical, a signaling that is introduced “stochastically” and intensified as noise isolates the ultimate “password,” ><, a swerve or clinamen as summation of the paired but delayed reversed predications.

vertical forces

… are those that constitute a contraction of “askesis” (<...<) in response to the haunting of Eros/damn. Where horizontality depends on the continuity of virtual spaces and times constructed within the conventions of the frame, verticality detaches virtuality’s “pairs” (body/shadow, waking/sleeping, reality/fiction) so that predicated pairs achieve equality — i.e. reversed predication. Askesis and Eros operate in the same direction but are fundamentally opposite vectors. As φ and -φ respectively, they cultivate vertical energy that is akin to the anti-gravitational pull of a flame. The ultimate exchange anticipated by this pull results in “apo-phrades,” the voice of the dead, e.g. prophecy, which both predicts the future and re-interprets the past, in the form idealized by Lacan as the future anterior. The clinamen is both central and peripheral, and its position within the work of art draws from the ability to function as interior or exterior, a “Hermes” or “Hestia.” Traditions of these “gods” is accounted for in the Lambda model.
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