I was the shadow of the waxwing slain
By the false azure in the windowpane;
I was the smudge of ashen fluff — and I
Lived on, flew on, in the reflected sky.
And from the inside, too, I’d duplicate
Myself, my lamp, an apple on a plate:
Uncurtaining the night, I’d let dark glass
Hang all the furniture above the grass,
And how delightful when a fall of snow
Covered my glimpse of lawn and reached up so
As to make chair and bed exactly stand
Upon that snow, out in that crystal land!

—Vladimir Nabokov, Pale Fire (1962)

"We are fond of our symptoms!"

An epicenter is created by anxiety over the status of meaning, guarded by the demon Interpretation, which is ideology at its best/worst. This demon’s chest is covered with medals from past wars: some for valor, others for infamy. Meaning would seem to be the one protected, defended, honored, and “ oblivion” by Interpretation, but in fact the room whose door the demon stands before, refusing our passage, is empty.

"Time’s up!"

A father calls his son into his study, pulls a gun out of a drawer and tells him a story. “Son, my father took this pistol during a daring raid on shipping offices in Bremen; he kept it as a reminder of sacrifices that need to be made in the turmoil where good and evil cannot be distinguished. I’m giving it to you to preserve for your son or daughter when the time comes for them to go out and face the world.” The son gratefully accepts the treasure and leaves for his first year at college. After a month he returns. The father notices that he is wearing an expensive Rolex watch. When questioned about the watch, the son confesses: “Father, I am embarrassed to say that I traded the pistol for this watch; I don’t really like guns, as much as this gun had special meaning, and thought that the watch would be much better to pass on to my future son or daughter.” The father did not get angry. Instead, he proposed this hypothetical situation. “Look, son, some day you will get married. You will be happy for the first few years, but one day you will come home and the house will be unusually quiet. You will walk to the bedroom and open the door. You will find your wife with another man, possibly one of your good friends. So, what are you going to do? Are you going to raise your hand, tap your wrist, and say ‘Time’s UP!’”

In other words, we should choose our legacies carefully. And, of course, the main message is that we don’t have forever to do this. We approach the moment when “Time’s up!”

"People don’t notice."

In 1920, Freud made a profound discovery, that more satisfaction can be derived from pain than from pleasure, but mostly no one paid attention. A few who did realize the scandal involved and disguised Freud’s thesis with complicated technical terms. Lacan, in his attempt to rescue Freud from his followers, realized the spatial and temporal implications of the discovery, and again this discovery was ignored by most and distorted by some. Žižek and a few others noticed that Lacan, too, needed to be rescued and have over the past fifteen years attempted to lay out the bodies of Freud and Lacan for a new and more proper funeral. The event of this double funeral will be called “Finnegans Wake.”
"Renounce mastery!"

Any debate over authority of sources is really a debate over access to this authority and the "honor" it will bring. Wanting to be recognized only reinforces the ego in its demands, but this recognition is simultaneously a demand to be MIS-recognized, i.e. to remain within the (mimetic) chain of signifiers that constitutes the symbolic, but, tragically, without access to the metaleptic escape routes. Is this what you really want? If one thinks, horizontally, from one signifier to another, always postponing the issue of the signified (while at the same time claiming that maintaining the prominence of the signified justifies your position!), one will never address the role of the demon (Eros) which will set in motion the "revisionary ratios" one needs. Harold Bloom's list is as good as any other but it is not the only solution. The point should be made that Bloom, deriving his ratios through "horizontal" familiarity with his subject-matter, failed to notice the vertical dimension that was operating as a symptom to create a spatial-temporal order. Tant pis! ... but move on.

How to notice the vertical dimension? Do something idiotic. Watch Vertigo.

"Renounce ideology!"

Easier said than done. There is always a new ideology to take the place of the first, and most escape attempts are nothing more than invitations to new and worse ideologies to take the place of former ones. The conclusion that "it's all ideology anyway?" is wrong, since the role of the exception is permanent, radical, and permanently radical, which is why we have sufficient historical evidence of those who have learned to "signalize" exception and thus fly beneath the radar of ideology. That they have been successful is evident in the ignorance of art and other historians/interpreters in even noticing that this signalizing has been going on (Poe, Holbein, Simonides, etc.). The relation of signalizing to codes and ciphers is so close that some, such as Poe, have directly incorporated them into his secret messages. This "acousmatic" message to future audiences from thinkers/artists of the past is not there to be exposed as much as understood by those who would study exception in their own times.

Ideology's lock (three-part negation, denial, renunciation, and foreclosure) can be picked by following the same steps: i.e. looking for negation (as a form of denial, as when "signalizing" runs counter to a prevailing meaning-sense), then repudiating the "official view," then undermining any future domination by an official view. This takes courage, the final magical character in The Wizard of Oz (the lion), but take heart. The Wizard (ideology) is nothing but a guy behind a curtain.

"Don't throw anything away!"

Loyalty to ideology is, as is typical, staged as a (usually conscious) resistance based on a desire to preserve a tradition, as something honored or valuable rather than dominating and obscene. This is blackmail, and a last-ditch effort to use prized sources into a "human shield." But, phenomenologist–apostates (who deny Hegel and Plato) such as Hans–Georg Gadamer, Martin Heidegger, or even Maurice Merleau-Ponty can all join in the metaleptic project because they use it as much as any, even though they may keep their tricks to themselves — look at Merleau-Ponty's "flesh of the world," for example. Sources used "horizontally" to establish authority will always choose to leave out material that contradicts the "chain of evidence" from effects back to causes. Verticality introduces "loft" (space between layers of meaning) that preserves contradiction, incompleteness, and exception long enough for you to develop a taste for the unusual, the grotesque, the bizarre, even the obscene.

"Emergence works, so make it work for you."

Material subjects are both minds and brains, but our brains have already been hystericized throughout our body, so the expression, "think with your hands" or "think with your feet" is not inaccurate. Because the nervous system is a continuum, the brain does not end with the medulla oblongata or brain-stem, but continues down the spine and outwards to the peripheral senses and organs, synesthetically, especially the skin, where interactions between inside and outside create a model of consciousness (the lamella). Unavoidably, we are conditioned by chirality, the structural characteristic that makes it impossible to
superimpose anything onto its mirror image — an ultimate, radical difference inside our nature, and in the inside-to-outside of Lacan’s exigency (étimé), chirality creates subjectivity, as in the case of Magritte’s reluctant mirror. We can only approach this through RENOUNCING the ideologies that would deny/renounce chirality and FORECLOSING THE FORECLOSURE of the exception (cf. freeing the oppressed kingdom). Make double negation work for you! Harness the energy of Verneinung (as resistance), Verleugnung (the conversion of resistance to strategy), and Verwerfung (truth as emergence and emergence as truth).

It is so far unrecognized that Vico is the first modern philosopher of emergence (Plato and Heraklitus being the ancient representatives). But, metalepsis is about preserving chirality. < and > are after all the left and right hand of diegesis — another original discovery that makes metalepsis interesting for architecture. And, even Lacan’s poinçon is choric as well as chiasmatic (φ → <●>), and the subject and subjectivity’s relation to desire/fantasy critically depends on this point (Lacan’s fantasy formula: $\phi \sigma$, the barred subject’s relation to the object of desire).

Because emergence is metaleptic, you have an insider’s advantage because you are in the position to realize the chirality of emergence through the devices of reversed predication and metalepsis. Don’t waste this opportunity!

"Now is the time for idiots."

By renouncing mastery, you do not renounce the ambition to improve and even perfect yourself. You simply put the desire for recognition in perspective. Recognition is nice to get every now and then but you don’t really need it. The unrecognized genius is still a genius, even more so because recognition has not allowed ideology to appropriate any credit or subvert any claims. It has not been allowed to limit your capacity for readiness. The privacy that is a part of the definition of an idiot relates to the person, and the personalization of the theory of emergence so that you allow your bodies to “prove their point.” Vico himself advises this kind of proof, and also (it should be noted) plays the idiot to confirm future readers’ notions that he is playing a clever game.

The idiot averts the gaze of ideology-recognition by telling stories. The reason for this is that the story “has a different story to tell” with each re-telling, so in the classic sense the story reverse-predicates the story-teller. Were this not so, the rhapsodes who first sang the Homeric stories would not have been able to electrify their audiences for so many centuries. Just as there is no way to reduce a story to a summary or caption (because this re-telling re-funding would be lost), there is no way to use the logic of paraphrase or caption to “explain” anything. A phenomenon that interests you, something that is important, cannot be explained or interpreted, it can only be “retold.” This means that your “explanation” is a re-telling rather than a paraphrase or balance-sheet. Whatever your explanation does, it should re-create the same reverse predication as does its object of interest. This is why stories have a higher “intellectual value” than “interpretations.” They reverse predicate. The interpretation aims to silence other claims of explanation and, to do this, they operate in a “courtroom procedure” that reduces everything to “evidence.” There is only one kind of real evidence; evidence of the Real. (I hope this answers some questions.)

"Psychoanalysis is about the symptom."

Freud discovered his “revolutionary” idea in the 1920s, when he was sixty-four. Better late than never. This discovery effectively divided his career into two parts, a “life side” and “death side.” Each idea on the “death” side converted the ideas on the “right,” the pleasure-principle side. We can understand desire/pleasure only if we understand the role of the compulsion to repeat unpleasant experiences. This compulsion is sharable; collectively realized it becomes ideology, and the willful submission to the demands of the Other, and the enigma of the Other. Commercially realized it is the basis for our consumer society and the compulsion to continue enrichment past the point of satiety. The Other-as-enigma is summed up by the “Ché vuoi?” that is the question we ask of the Other, now asked of us but without us knowing the context or the expectation. Read about in Jacques Cazotte’s novel, The Devil in Love. We nonetheless respond, and that response is collectivized as ideology/symptom. We can find these symptoms in popular culture, as in the popular slogan-mandate, “Coke is it!”

Kunze: Emergence/y Manifesto
How do we understand the Ché vuoi? Ed Pluth, in his book on *Signifiers and Acts*, explains that the universal stages of early childhood development, the famous oral, anal, and phallic phases (by which desire is mediated and converted into something public/Symbolic), involve key shifts of direction of timing. In the oral, the child initiates the demand, but the mother’s response is a kind of counter-demand, slightly out of sync. The child does not wish to disappear simply with the satisfaction of his/her hunger, so s/he attaches to this counter-demand the idea of desire. It maintains a place in the (m)Other and also resists being completely consumed by the (m)Other’s love. With toilet training, the mother makes the first demand, which the child misinterprets as the demand for a “gift,” which is not exactly what the mother wants. She wants the “gift” to be flushed away as soon as possible. So, while the child now can identify the satisfaction of the Other’s desire with a product, he/she must be content that the product is valued in the *negative*, and that the place he/she has reserved to resist the maternal super-ego now takes on a negative quality itself. Watch Hitchcock’s *Notorious* (1941).

The whole sequence is thrown into kilter when, in the phallic phase, the child demands something of the mother but finds that the mother desires someone else, named the father. Actually, the father is “only a name,” and whatever the (m)Other desires becomes “the name of the father.” But, the point is that the child’s desire and mother’s desire are vectors heading in the same direction. The negative place the child has retained at the anal level now is preserved only in reference to the *enigma* of the Other, which comes in the form of the “Ché vuoi?” — the question that has been “turned around.” The child is now like the image of the man in the mirror painted by Magritte: a “negative of a negative.” Subjectivity from *this moment on* will be drenched by the presence of enigma in the form of Ché vuoi? This is the involvement of the subject with the desire, and the way desire is diverted into fantasy — to avoid the trauma of the Real, including the Real of the name of the Father.

There is no exception to this “rule” of subjectivity: its susceptibility to ideology, its desire to remain within the unsettling and dissatisfactory place within the Symbolic domain of social relations, and its construction of fantasies to “symptomize” the situation.

*Psychoanalysis = “getting to dissatisfaction more efficiently.”*

In a nutshell, psychoanalysis’s goal is to coax the analysand to find a “shorter path” to his/her sources of dissatisfaction. There is no weaning the subject from the death drive’s objects. That would be nice, but it’s impossible. But, the real problem is that the subject has constructed a network of symptoms connecting to this source of pleasure/pain that have become dysfunctional. The analyst helps the subject create a “short circuit” that allows him/her a more effective, and hence more controllable, relationship to subjectivity’s necessary suffering. Remember that this suffering also produces pleasure, but that the pleasure involves a circuit that returns desire to the same void, the same gap, repeatedly. With a short circuit there can be fewer cycles, fewer symptoms, and a more creative relationship to the displeasures of subjectivity.

With the short circuit, a new relationship to the Symbolic becomes possible. Within the symbolic we are trapped by the Symbolic’s unfortunate dysfunctionality. As with a dictionary, each meaning leads to another meaning that is just as incomplete; the chains of references slide over each other, never ending. The subject trapped within the Symbolic, <...>, has no access to the framing elements, so that the enigma
that appears metaleptically within the Symbolic (the sliding quality) — which we represent as \(<...\phi/-\phi...>\) or \(<...\partial...>\) — is “raw enigma,” a limit to meaning.

The subject’s short circuit as a successful analysand is equivalent to our use of metalepsis as an intellectual strategy, and to other artists’, writers’, and architects’ use of it in their works of art. We “reduce the number of steps” to our source of dissatisfaction by constructing a cipher involving the left-right logic that is able to “signalize” conditions of the extimate and construct numbers and patterns that signalize. The extimate, in short, is the co-existence of the “exterior” of diegesis and the “interior” of mimesis. It is an “inside-out” conversion that we see symbolized at “boundary situations” such as Aeneas at the gates to the underworld at Cumæ. The gate is the place for a story, in the most fundamental sense, that of “unlimited semiosis.”

**Dogs = 3 x 11 (numbers of completion/mortification)**

Thirty-three is, if anything, a number of completion. Christ was 33 at the time of crucifixion. Three of anything indicates a “full set,” as the French word, trés, testifies. Eleven adds one to the base ten, allowing (as shown by Jasper Johns’ paintings of numbers) the number 9 to “escape” and “re-enter” the number system without making a fuss. Cecil Balmond has written extensively about the properties of the number nine; and because Balmond is both an architect and engineer we can take his word that this is something we should take seriously!

So the question should be, “why are dogs and completion related?” Dogs are one of the animals assigned, in several cultures, to reduce fresh, moist corpses of the newly dead to a stable state. All cultures are concerned with this period just after death. Its instability, related to the flesh and retention of fluids, must be resolved to a dry state. Cremation is an obvious solution, but exposure, inhumation, and ritualized feeding are all involved at some level. The general rule is that an animal is responsible for this interval. For burial in the soil, inhumation, the animal is the worm or snake. For exposure, the animal is a bird. Cremation also uses birds (the Phoenix) as its mascot. Lacan called period “between the two deaths.” In terms of the uncanny, it is one of the two “polar conditions” that Ernst Jentsch cited (the other is the living being with an element of death/fate inscribed). The newly deceased subject has lost one of his “persons” (cf. Eric Santer on the “two persons of the king”) but not the other. The Symbolic person continues, and must be progressively reduced until a final point assigned to be a Symbolic death. The interval is regulated by a “number of completion,” which offers some options. Thirty-three works well because of its “fractal” status. The Cretin labyrinth, for example, is two sets of three turns. Dante used 33 verses for each of his three domains, Hades, Purgatory, and Paradise.

Dogs-in-threes guard the boundary to Hades. Remember the three-headed dog, Cerberus? Remember the 33 dogs that devour their reversely-predicated master, Actæon? The persistence of this strange myth (“Diana and Actæon”), with the “signalizing” of the names of the dogs by Ovid’s overly-detailed account in the chase scene, tells us that this is one means of saying something about the gap between predication and predicate-reversal. It is the relation between the right-hand and left-hand version of things. It is the “flesh of the world” in Merleau-Ponty’s terms. It is the lamella. It is lots of other things as well. Be nice to your dog(s) and take them for nice, long walks. When the time comes they will, hopefully, ask their 32 friends to be nice to you.

Let’s not get overly mystical about numerology here. Thirty-three means completion and dogs mean the boundary/gap/chiasm. Let’s complete the crossing, meaning (in Lacanese), “traverse the fantasy.” Let’s get our fantasies under control, slim down our symptoms, spruce up our numbers, get cozy with the traumatic Real. This is, after all, what idiots must do. Because Hermes is, among his many other duties, the god responsible for making the Big Jump, we must consult him, we must “get his number,” whether it’s 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 33, 40, or 49. Watch Hitchcock’s *The 39 Steps*. 
"We, too, are parties to a ‘silent trade’!"

Silent trade works. The parties to it are both required to be and act like idiots; they know this and do this, and the system works. Since ancient times, silent trade has allowed two or more parties to trade goods, to develop an “emergent” market with built-in safeguards and limits (unlike our own wildly speculative under-regulated markets). At a crossroads, someone kicks a stone to hit another. Then someone kicks another stone; then a “pile of stones” develops. This pile is called a Herm in Greek, hence the name Hermes relates originally to this automaton that calibrates the number of potential traders who pass by a particular site. It is an early form of market survey.

An item is left at the Herm, then the next passer-by takes that item and leaves something in return. If it is “too little” the next passer-by will notice and make adjustments; if it is “too much” then the market gets a boost (its DOW goes up by a number of points). None of the trading parties ever meets; they don’t have to know each other’s language; they attribute the appearance/disappearance of materials to Hermes, the market regulator who keeps the goods in a "pocket of invisibility" known as Hades (the word originally meant "the invisible").

Hermetic/silent trade employs the logic of "body loading" that we encountered in Apollo Robbins’ account of the pick-pocket’s art. Here, the victim’s body image is manipulated by sensitizing or de-sensitizing zones around the body that can be used to store, transfer, or replace objects of value. With silent trade, the “dead zone” is a really dead zone, i.e. the underworld. The underworld, as we know from the lore surrounding Pluto, is the source of all wealth. It is where nature goes to restore herself in the winter. It is where our souls go during dreams to "replenish themselves" with ciphers of wisdom and keys to Paradise.

We can re-purpose silent trade for intellectual projects if we think about the “pile of stones” as a “pile of topics.” It is a place of crossing, a place where "body loading," done expertly, can create sites where things appear and disappear, as if by demonic agency. Here, we must enlist the cooperation of the audience, cultivate their "ear" and "heart," so to speak, so that our mission will be a benevolent and mutually beneficial one. The name for a pile of topics is the "sorites," about which you as yet know little or nothing, I would guess. Sorites was developed into an art form by Lewis Carroll, the famous novel of the fantasies of Alice in Wonderland, a nice way of saying Hades, but with all the symptoms of reversed predication (cf. Through the Looking Glass). We even have examples in Carroll’s writing that he knew all about partial objects as the product of reversed predication: “You may have seen a cat without a smile, but have you ever seen a smile without a cat?” The smile that now "has" the cat, in contrast with the cat who has or doesn’t have a smile signalizes to the careful reader that all of the motility, scale, and identity dysfunctions that are to come will constitute an encyclopedia of metalepsis and chirality (the polarity of metalepsis, as evident in the case of the “two primary conditions” of the uncanny).

Sorites is delayed predication: <a...~a>. You can have as many elements as you like in delayed predication — <a, x, ~m, c, ~f, m, r, ~s, ~a, ~x, ~c> — but the "answer" will be the two elements that, lacking a twin to “cancel them out,” must take each other for man and wife (in this case, the r/~s). We hope they are “happy ever after,” because the other pairings are tautologies that reduce to a perfect zero, while the bridal pair are the boundary/gap personified.

Sorites is what we substitute for “rational thinking,” and in this our 33 dogs (symptoms) get reduced to a pure boundary state. We achieve a "symbolic death" in the process, meaning that we escape the ideology of the Symbolic as <...>, mimesis without the mirror-escape option, the φ/φ of anamorphosis. THIS MEANS YOU! This is a proposal for a writing procedure that reversely predicates the writer and becomes a “thinking machine,” akin to Vico’s claims for his use of his culminating work, The New Science. “New” in Italian is Nuova, related — as Vico would know as a reader of Dante — to the number 9, nova. The Nine Science: the science of dogs. The science/automaton/writing-machine that frees the writer of ideology and the sliding signifiers of the mimetic/symbolic.
If you think that you’re not up to Vico’s level just yet, consider Raymond Roussel (portrait left), who invented his own version of the Science of Nine using the procédé, the method of delaying predication by dividing a sentence into two parts, putting one half at the beginning and the other at the end, and interpolating the possibilities with a series of delayed predications in between. This is all written up in his book,

Roussel kept this compositional method a secret until the publication of his posthumous text, How I Wrote Certain of My Books, where he describes it as follows: “I chose two similar words. For example billard (billiard) and pillard (looter). Then I added to it words similar but taken in two different directions, and I obtained two almost identical sentences thus. The two sentences found, it was a question of writing a tale which can start with the first and finish by the second. Amplifying the process then, I sought new words reporting itself to the word billiards, always to take them in a different direction than that which was presented first of all, and that provided me each time a creation moreover. The process evolved/moved and I was led to take an unspecified sentence, of which I drew from the images by dislocating it, a little as if it had been a question of extracting some from the drawings of rebus.” For example, Les lettres du blanc sur les bandes du vieux billard/The white letters on the cushions of the old billiard table… must somehow reach the phrase, …les lettres du blanc sur les bandes du vieux pillard/letters [written by] a white man about the hordes of the old plunderer. [Wikipedia: "Raymond Roussel"]

I hope your anxious eye did not too quickly zip past the word “rebus.” This, according to Freud and Lacan, is the language of the unconscious, which can be simulated by creating, in works of art, an “unconscious” to be experienced collectively. (This is one of your main duties as an artist.)

"Virtuality is best when detached!"

Roussel’s other applications of the procédé (a word I hope will enter into your permanent vocabulary) involved seeing things at “impossibly far distances” or inside “impossibly small spaces.” A label on a bottle of mineral water, for example, might portray a seaside village, with a boat in the distance. Roussel would probe into the image to see, standing on the boat the captain, whose curly beard was now visible as slightly in need of a trim. There are of course acoustic means of finding, within ordinary sounds, an acousmatic content. This has been done by ingenious engineers who discovered a quick way of removing all “phonetic” elements from a subject’s speech, leaving only the sighs, moans, pauses, and coughs behind. Stitched together, these reveal a “secret self,” more emotive, more compelling, and more demonically desirable (or fearful) than the subject safely confined to the reservation of the Symbolic. This voix acousmatique roams about, finds new objects as its sources, new short-circuits to haunt us with.

The causal chain keeps shadows and reflections firmly fixed to their sources. But, as in the case of Magritte’s man in the mirror, the imagination allows for certain holidays. Outside the reservation, so to speak, the shadow may escape to consort with other shadows. Characters in one novel may get fed up with their author and look for work in other stories. This is a romantic conceit for us scientific moderns, but for magic-based traditional societies, the escape of shadows and reflections was the norm. They had to be chained, tied, secured to their owners to prevent re-possession by evil-doers. In Yoruba culture, for example, the robe of the king had a long trail in back, first to eliminate traces of his footsteps so they could not be used by magicians (a stab of a footprint would equal a crippling disease in the original owner); but, next, the idea was to prevent the body’s shadow from escaping. Without knowing the particular causal norm in use, we cannot understand artifacts such as the “king’s robe.”

Detached virtuality comes in four basic forms, which you may know from Borges’ account of them, are (1) story in a story; (2) travel in time; (3) contamination of reality by the dream or fiction; and (4) the double. Each theme can be put into the language of the other themes. The central idea is that detachment equals metalepsis: each violation of the “Cartesian normality” within the framed mimesis, <…>, engages the diegetic “exterior,” which is simultaneously an “interior of an interior,” a central void. Detached virtuality breaks all the rules of “contiguous virtuality,” the main brand used by digital models of architectural spaces. This has meant that
most discussions of virtuality in contemporary literature talk only about mimesis, not about diegesis or the possibility of metalepsis. Thus we have only half the story, the boring half. Virtuality means only a mirror reality, not the "prismatic reality" of parallax. Parallax as you know creates a dimension by which we may travel into the interior/exterior of a work that, thanks to its special cipher-automaton, affords us passage thanks to a special passe — a password that we are not aware of but use "inadvertently" — something that we “know without knowing.” You have just learned an important secret, one thing that Jeff Kipnis doesn’t know, or know that he doesn’t know, or doesn’t know that he doesn’t know (the Rumsfeld-Hegel triad). [Note: Jeff Kipnis is famous for saying that, although people call him a "know-it-all," he "really does know it all!" —If he’s reading this, he may wonder that he missed something.]

"Thought creates turbulence within the laminar flow of the Symbolic!"

Are you thinking?Probably not, if only for the reason that you just now wondered if you were. Most of us are not, most of the time, but we treat it as an insult for anyone to notice this. When we are thinking we deploy the imagination to be what we are not. This cancels the Symbolic’s program of mis-identification, by which we have sacrificed our identity in exchange for recognition, a strange bargain indeed, since like the Master and the Servant it is held together only by its ironic asymmetry (like silent trade — another case of chirality!). When you think you’re thinking you stop the train. All of the objects moving through space come to an abrupt stop. Your “now” is immediately “not now.” (By virtue of being a moment in time it cancels time’s essential dynamic.)

Why should architecture be any different from the rest of reality? If we are in the Symbolic by virtue of our castration by symbols (the king is “really” the crown and scepter, which he dare not lose), we must cast these off, at our peril, to escape the ideology of the Symbolic. We must re-attach those phalluses and sew back those hymens (this was the special talent of the famous witch Celestina). In effect, we must “reverse temporality” by which we mean “reverse the predication that is the conversion of each ‘now’ into a ‘then’.” Naturally there is a gap; and every gap must be “interrogated.”

It would be more accurate to portray thought in the "trajectory analogy” we encountered in the drawing of Mannolis Korres as a part of an extensive study of the history of that famous building. The question is: how is the Parthenon "known" through this drawing. Korres used the data of where fragments were found, where they originated, their weight, their relation to the explosion’s location and force, and the sequence of destruction to draw the pieces in mid-trajectory — quite an accomplishment even if a few details were missed! This does not correspond to our idea of a building in use, as intended, or meant to appear as such and such. The virtue of utilitas has been brought to an end; that of firmitas is in the process of redistribution. All we have left is venustas, whose Erotic and Demonic heritage funds this moment with the idea of a turbulence that “changes all the rules.” This is architecture in the moment of extreme exception.

Again, the vertical plays a key role. We think of the building primarily in terms of raising things into position. Here, they are raised again, higher, in the brutal trajectory of the explosion’s force. This is an “experience” of the building that has nothing to do with occupancy, normative functions, builders/architects’ intentions, or any of that crap. It exceeds and forecloses these meanings, yet there is a truth revealed that must be spelled with a capital ‘T’. It is not a “horizontal” truth of correspondence but a Truth of “Impossible-Real” coherence, the kind of coherence commanded by the Möbius band when it makes its twist out of 3D space into the D? space of one side and one edge: the space of the gap.
"Emergence comes in many flavors!"

The unfinished business of the last session was the assignment to read and analyze, via the calculus of predication/metalepsis, the short story of G. K. Chesterton, "The Queer Feet." The story is resonant with subtexts and subthemes: Catholicism in Protestant England; the radical conservatism of Chesterton, Chesterton's turn-of-the-century mentality fearful of anarchists; the beginning the Empire's decline .... Father Brown finds himself called to give last rights to a dying Italian waiter at the exclusive Vernon Hotel. While filling out the required death certificate forms, the priest listens to the traffic in the adjacent hallway. Waiters and guests pass each other in anticipating of an annual banquet, a meeting of the "Twelve True Fishermen" club — a presumptuous title if there ever was one! Like many exclusive clubs of the day, these oligarchs came with their own special set of fish-knives and forks, each set with a pearl of great value. The priest listens to the footsteps of these guests mingling with waiters but notices that one particular set of creaky boots walks slowly in one direction, quickly in the other. This anomaly is resolved by a "third term" that binds the universal to the particular: the knowledge that the guests and waiters are both wearing tuxedos. The waiters did not know the guests by sight, but presumed that an elegant gentleman, though dressed as they, would be a member of the prestigious club. The club members did not of course know or care about the waiters. All they saw was that any unknown person, though dressed in evening gear, would be a waiter and act as expected. Facing the guests, the mysterious composite man in squeaky boots would walk quickly. Facing waiters, he would slow his gait so that he would blend into the guests, as a "bird of a feather." Consider this unexpected connection:

The well-known Shannon-Weaver communications model, when shown fully (as it almost never is) reveals the "diegetic" role potential of noise, which can either be something to filter out or a means of amplifying weak signals. The key is the synchronicity of the two contexts of messaging, which are never precisely the same. The constant is difference and with the bi-functionality of noise (it can either interrupt or amplify meaning), the "vertical" intrusion of φ/φ and its ability to create an "inside frame," <>, amounts to a "message within a message." This was Father Brown's discovery, that there was a "feedback loop" reversing the signal with every completion of a circuit.

The fact that the solution to the riddle of this mystery story involves acousmatic anamorphosis is quite exciting. It means that Chesterton was "the man who knew too much," who without any theoretical concern for these subjects was nonetheless able to reproduce the conditions — the architecture, the narrative basis, the semiotic context — where the Vernon Hotel provides a physical model of the Shannon-Weaver model of communications: sender and receiver, linked by a series of coders and decoders and a common signal-medium to be sent and received, encoded and decoded (<>). S< ... >R becomes SENDER<encoding ... signal ... decoded>RECEIVER. Shannon and Weaver were careful to add the elements of context, which
had to be shared in some degree by the sender and receiver, and noise, which in conventional circumstances interfered with the main transmission.

Because S and R require a common context, we know that a change made to that context must, if generated from the locus of noise, would have to be shared equally to the left and right sides of the communications diagram. The “noise” in the case of Chesterton’s story is the \( \Phi / \Phi \) of the slow/fast footsteps. This noise creates an “inside frame” within the mimetic utility of the Vernon Hotel hallway: \( > < \). The space corresponding to this inside frame is Father Brown’s small vestibule, a “vertical” channel of communication intercepting the “horizontal” exchange of normative information. Because this \( \Phi / \Phi \) connects to the Master/Servant status of the Sender/Receiver of the Shannon-Weaver model, it becomes clear to the priest that the owner of the squeaky boots is a “monster” in the classical sense of a composite being able to connect the invisible realm of the gods and visible realm of men, an “angel in reverse,” i.e. a devil.

Melding Chesterton’s story with the Shannon-Weaver model has the unexpected benefit of showing that this stand-by of Positivist communications theory in fact is inherently metaleptic — so much so that Chesterton was able to “anticipate” it in his Hotel floor-plan and demonstrate metalepsis through a straight-forward trick of acousmatics.

"Learn to spell (and use) ‘chirality, ‘chiastic’, and ‘polythetic’!“

The phenomenon of “chiristic molecules” in the folding of chemical substances to create complex amino acids (olive oil is one result), the use of chiasmus in myths, fairy tales, and modern narratives where surprise is required, and the requirement of both chirality and chiasmus for multiple levels/flows of meaning — laminar strata that, even though they do not exist before turbulence must be retroactively presumed to exist (and hence the theme of trime travel!) — demonstrates rather clearly that stereognosis spans all creation and thought about creation. The emphasis here is on “create.” This is the factum of the human project, which goes back to the child’s identification with shit as a gift in the anal phase, the conversion of the small space of survival made at the oral stage by means of a difference in timing of the child’s demand and the mother’s counter-demand. The vertical intrusion that creates turbulence, \( > < \), the inside frame, will always be “shit” of some kind. It will always be hitting some kind of “fan,” as the expression has it. The noise will be turned up and a weak signal will be amplified, a “weak space” will appear “out of nowhere.” This weak space will be architecture.

There is a requisite complexity involved in the “layers” of meaning required by chirality and chiasmus. This is the overlapping of multiple channels of signification that we label “polythetic,” for unlike “monothetic flows” (single direction, involving simple causal chains), the polythetic not only allows but requires variety, complexity, and contradiction. The polythetic is able to accommodate the vertical, and hence the stochastic deployment of “demonic” intrusions that afford the amplification of the “weak signal,” the “signalizing” that is architecture.

A polythetic set is related to the delayed predicates of the “sorites” that fascinated Lewis Carroll. A polythetic set is, in narrative terms, a story; without a polythetic relationship binding signifiers in a loose, anarchic confederation of parts, making the concept of a whole seemingly impossible, the story cannot be realized. Like a journey that is deprived of its autonomy and affordance, movement degenerates into “running an errand.” Polythesis (a term derived from quantitative archaeology) means that irreducible difference (a.k.a. chirality) will become the basis for an “emergent order” within turbulence, an order that “back-generates” the existence of a laminar flow that seems to have been the proper ground and basis for turbulence.

It is out of the polythesis of the story/narrative that the strategies of “the fantastic” develop. Travel through time, the story in the story, the contamination of reality by the dream or fiction, and the double require polythesis, turbulence, and the resulting dimensionality of the vertical to create their own versions of the inside frame. These four forms are, simultaneously, the specific typologies that define “detached virtuality.” This involves the construction of an “impossible spatiality” based on the radically permanent and portable function of extimacy (inside-out conversions). Of course, all of these spatialities involve metalepsis, all involve temporal contradiction (anachronism, time travel, eternity, etc.), and all involve what Borges
summarized with the figure of the Aleph (ℵ, or better, the Phoenecian א, a literal picture of chiasmus).

"Don't ignore the readiness-value of the story!"

The themes of chirality, chiasmus, Eros (apophrades/kenosis, tesserae/clinamen, askesis, and demon) are all present in the story and the key “moment” in the story: readiness. This is something like the Buddhist idea of happy anticipation. It is a future that has “already-always” happened, a real case of time travel that made Lacan interested in the future anterior (the time by the time of which something will have been complete).

This may be too much at this point. But, often, it is necessary to carry arguments to their central pivot point in order to see how preceding elements fall into the pattern of a “constellation.” Readiness is a state that realizes ideal awareness — and ability to deploy awareness — of meaning—through—nothingness. This is the basis of creation, as creation ex nihilo, the discovery of meaning that is, simultaneously, a bringing-into-being that the things that mean (the medium of meaning, the signifiers). This is what makes glossolalia interesting and central to theories of interpretation. Once we distinguish glossolalia from "sheer nonsense," we see how non-sense is a renunciation of conventional predication ("police" ideology in Rancière’s terms) and then a restoration of foreclosure in the same spirit as Mannonis Korres’ drawing of the Parthenon.

Readiness has an important relationship to “signalizing.” What is signalizing in the biggest sense? It is the basis of intuition, the uncanny, dread, anxiety, paranoia, sympathy, animal communication, and — dare one say? — love. Signalizing, not conventional communication, is what holds the world together. Do not allow any reductionistic view of language, thought, or rationality to diminish or sideline the role of signalizing! Stories are those oral-aural events that maximize readiness. The signalizing of the story, which takes place almost entirely through metaleptic operations, constructs spaces and times within spaces and times that allow for the entry of the subject into a space reserved beyond ideology. (For a camp version of this thesis, watch Frank Capra’s 1937 movie, Lost Horizon, where Sam Jaffe plays a guru-like “subject-supposed-to-know” (Lacan’s terminology) offering the accidental visitors happiness, health, and longevity. Despite the susceptibility for polythetic signalizing to degenerate into mindless utopia (a falsification of its basic idea), the mechanical operations of the parts fits the general model. Chaplin’s films are about this readiness; so are Hitchcock’s. Watch them!"

"The uncanny of mortification is a dimension!"

In the story of Diana (goddess of the hunt) and Actæon (the hunter turned hunted) we have the signalizing of the 33 dogs named and described in detail by Ovid, following a tradition by which this bit of extra information has been passed down since the beginning of the story. Why? Thirty-three is key, the number of “mortification,” the number that on account of its three elevens points to the situation of the ‘9’, which is both in and out of the number system, although we need a Jasper Johns kind of tablet to show how this is so. We have already reviewed the rich history of numbers of mortification, which are compacted into the idea of the boundary between life and death.

It is time to combine the issue of signalizing with this schema. In the account of the uncanny coming to us from Ernst Jentsch via Sigmund Freud, the living person with an element of death (=fate), A_D, is the counterpart to the dead person which momentum has carried past the moment of literal death into the interval of “between the two deaths,” D_A. What about those sub-script letters, _D_ and _A_? What do they do and how do they do it? We know very well that they do not operate according to the rules of phonemic linguistics and grammar. They "signalize." The operate like any stochastic energy: across a field that is spatially configured to resonate with a signal that resists being located. This is a big clue! In fact clues themselves work the same way. They are not a distinct causal chain but rather a patterning. In the painting of the Assumption of the Virgin, Francesco Botticini portrays the heavens as a theater with circular auditorium seats. The ranks of angels, seraphim, apostles, etc. are arrayed to receive their ideal guest, Mary.
Richard Bernheimer has noted that this reversal of the theater’s binary logic was also the basis of Giulio Camillo’s famous “Theater of the World” (1544), which he promoted as a device allowing the user to conceive — as “memories” — of ideas that had never before been in his/her brain in any form. This claim was not ridiculous. It was based on the idea of resonance, and stochastic resonance in particular. It also seems to have made use of the idea of mortification, if not the specific number. There were seven rows and seven "columns" of seats in Camillo’s auditorium. But, 49, another number of completion thanks to the math of 7x7 and the “sigma value” of 49 (4+9=13, 1+3=4; so 4 "returns to itself" thanks to the 9 embedded in 7x7). Saying ‘4’ and ‘9’ in sigma language is like saying “heaven and earth”: four for the quadrature of the (stochastic) field of human affordance and nine for the principle of extimacy that turns earth inside out to make heaven (or, as some theories have it, hell).

The sigma of 11 is 2, of course; the theme of the double, and with the double we have the chirality of the uncanny and the uncanny of chirality. Once we identify with our mirror image, we find that there is a gap we cannot absorb. Our double introduces a space we cannot assimilate. The left and right do not "map" on to each other. Every two is also a three. As Wallace Stevens put it in his poem, “Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Blackbird,": "A man and a woman are one; a man and a woman and a blackbird are one." A subject and a subject’s reflection are "one,” but there is also the matter of the blackbird.

And who else do we know, who wrote a famous poem about a black bird?

Using sigma values (the sums of the separate digits of numbers) shows how most generations before ours have thought of the number system (despite the curators of Jasper Johns’ show of numbers paintings, who claimed there was no thought whatsoever in the painter’s mind that numbers meant anything!). Camillo’s 49 and Actæon’s 33 accomplish much the same thing: a crossing, and specifically a crossing having to do with mortification. Any crossing can seem to be about death. One dies on one side in order to be reborn on the other. But, can we convert this poetic sentiment into something architecturally useful?

Numbers like 49, 33, and 99 seem to indicate that we have reached a level that satisfies a certain need. When Actæon went back a second time into the forest, for an afternoon hunt, he violated a principle of sufficiency. He was looking for more than he needed. When he stumbled upon naked Diana and her attendants bathing in a grove, he got more than he needed or wanted; and the two violations bear a comparison. What was subtracted from Actæon as punishment was subtracted in the specific amount of 33. 3+3=6, an aliquot, another perfect number because 1x2x3=1+2+3. The other theme is three sets of eleven, something double complete thanks to the multiplication of one number of completion by another. The emblem of this is the Thesean labyrinth, the one designed by Dæadalus, which is two sets of three turns, in combination producing seven “ranks” of passageways:
This is the labyrinth plan showing the seven concentric passageways.

This is the inverse of the above, the basis of the labyrinth's circulation plan, shown as predication (<), reversed predication (>), and the "inside frame" (><) offering an escape route.

Where sigma mathematics meets fractal design, the figure of mortification, the Thesean labyrinth shows how seven and three relate. There are two "three's," an inner and outer component of the fractal design, <, >, and ><. Two threes written in sigma form are 33, and out of this we relate the other number of completion, 11. Completion equals mortification equals dogs equals the boundary conditions mediating life and death. In this space (which as the painting shows us is also a "space of reception"), we are in a condition of "knowing without knowing" — precisely the terms Camillo described to explain the enlightenment due to the user of his Theatro del Mundo. This is, formally, "kenosis" (κένωσις), the "emptying of the self and subjection to God’s will" in Christian tradition. The idea appears in multiple religions, however. Self-emptying is credited to God himself in the Zohar, the Medieval Jewish mystic document. In order to "make room for creation," God contracts, in an action known as zimzum (note how this word itself suggests reversed predication).

Chirality, chiasmus, and polythetics yield curious harvests from sites that have been plowed over and over again by standard analysis, but the biggest payoff comes when these ideas allow us to collate anecdotes (stories in stories) that initially seem unrelated and have no history of common themes, authors, techniques, or intentions. In short, we are freed of the blight of intended meanings because we have in effect constructed a "resonance machine" able to produce a new, emergent dimensionality. This is, in effect, a "thinking machine," superior to a computer in the sense that it creates more than it is given. Unlike algorithmic machine language, which subtracts a dimension as a framing basis in order to create a field for interaction, our stochastic machine language adds a dimension related to mortification—reincarnation of thought as a "body." Vico actually makes a reference to "proofs of the body" in The New Science. It is possible that we are connecting to what he meant.

"Look forward to being nobody!"

In a haunting mini-essay, “Borges and I,” the Argentine story-writer put the problem of existence in terms of reversed predication:

Spinoza knew that all things long to persist in their being; the stone eternally wants to be a stone and the tiger a tiger. I shall remain in Borges, not in myself (if it is true that I am someone), but I recognize myself less in his books than in many others or in
the laborious strumming of a guitar. Years ago I tried to free myself from him and went from the mythologies of the suburbs to the games with time and infinity, but those games belong to Borges now and I shall have to imagine other things. Thus my life is a flight and I lose everything and everything belongs to oblivion, or to him.

I do not know which of us has written this page.

To write a poem is to be written by the poem. To design and building is to be designed by the building, to be — in some quite mysterious literal sense — "interred alive" within the building. This makes sense to anyone who is familiar with Vico’s “proof of the body” or the silent language of chirality. The advantage of knowing this uncanny horror about creativity is that one can turn the reality around into a fiction that can endure because of the brackets place around fiction. Within the mimesis of the lie, one Borges can escape the other. One can be the host, while the other plays the ghost. Etymology confirms this game: host and ghost both come from *hostes*, also the root of the word hostility. *Ghost*, the flow of air can be a gasp, a sigh, or a divine wind impregnating unsuspecting virgins or wronged partridges.

In the (Yoruban) cosmogram, all things are possible, because the resonating stochastic field is, by definition, *tuchê*, affordance. Stand in the sweet spot, you know the place. It is the table in the anatomical theater, designed to flip in case the vigilant inspectors of the Inquisition should arrive. Strapped beneath to hang in readiness is the carcass of a pig; above the human corpse. In one flip, the relation between victim and fictim, the fictional victim, an architecture of inspection and identity.

In another Borges parable ("Everything and Nothing"), Shakespeare meets with God in heaven, Whom he entreats with one final request: ‘I who have been so many men in vain want to be one and myself.’ The voice of the Lord answered from a whirlwind: ‘Neither am I anyone; I have dreamt the world as you dreamt your work, my Shakespeare, and among the forms in my dream are you, who like myself are many and no one.’ Take heart. Between the everything, <, and the nothing, >, is the lots and lots <…>. Don’t overlook the trick that connects the small end of < with the Aleph, the "impossibly small opening." Or, the tip of the cone of vision, ↝.