

Published by:

NEWPHILSOC PUBLISHING

BIFRÖST HOUSE

27 MYRTLE GROVE

SWANSEA

SA2 0SJ

UK

web: <http://www.newphilsoc.org.uk>

e-mail (Enflame): philoEditor@gmail.com

e-mail (General): philoSecretary@gmail.com

e-mail (Sales): philoSales@gmail.com

Newcastle Philosophy Society is a Registered Charity for the promotion of
Philosophy (Registration Number 1106082).

This is a critical / scholarly / creative work
intended solely for educational and academic uses.

Edition 1 first published June 2011.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue entry for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-907926-13-6

Copyright © Patrick William Jemmer (2011)

Introduction

“Mathemegenesis = Psycho-chaotic Semiotic Sorcery?”

This study summarizes my investigations into the development of a “Rhizaleosemiotic Calculus” which develops Lacan’s work on the Borromean Knot of the Real, Symbolic, and Imaginary registers, and its implication in the chaotic dynamics of Sexuation. It is stimulated by three important threads in the trajectory of my own personal development. The first (the “Imaginary”) is my background in applied mathematics, particularly my PhD and Postdoctoral research in quantum theory (at the Universities of Cambridge, Birmingham, Exeter, Oxford, and Sussex in the UK), and more recently my teaching and publication in dynamical systems and chaotics (at the University of Northumbria). The second (the “Symbolic”) is my longstanding interest in language study, which has evolved into my investigations of “subcreated” languages, and the development of a meta-language (“Aleolinguistics”) for the description of their creative development, as a member of the Philological Society and the British Association of Applied Linguistics. The third (the “Real”) has involved my training, practice, and writing centered on creativity and psychotherapy, and my election (in the UK) as a Member of the National Council of Psychotherapists, the National Council for Hypnotherapy, and the Complementary and Natural Healthcare Council, and as a Fellow of the Royal Society for Public Health, and the Royal Society of Medicine. These interests unite for me in the Borromean Knot of philosophy, mythology, and creativity, about which I have learned a great deal as an active member and Trustee of Newcastle Philosophy Society.

We begin from the realization that even though everyone is born into a world already-constituted through actual, everyday, specific languages, these do not themselves structurally cause the ex-sisting Unconscious, although they do mirror its structures. In terms of the

operation of such languages, “messages” are self-referential, both in form and in content: changes in content relate functionally to, and are influenced by, changes in basic modes of expression and vice-versa. This leads to chaotic evolution in languaged communication and in personal psychic individuation. Whereas as a structure, language exists independent of anything else, speech requires, and sites, both a speaker as the Subject who expresses Desires, and a listener as the Other who recognizes those Desires. Lacan linked his idea that language creates and maintains the Ego with Freud’s association of the Ego with delusion, hallucination and “Subjective-oblivion.” Indeed arbitrary Symbolization can never adequately express an individual’s infinitely complex inner dynamics. In trying to communicate using “empty signs” language disintegrates into an unbounded void in which the fragmented speech-Subjects lose themselves forever. Moreover, the success of language as a tool for aiding manipulation of the world leads to an attitude of “phonocentrism,” whereby human beings separate living, dynamic processes from dead, static concepts, as expressed by the equation “reification: words = reality”.

The Symbolic register defines and organizes the Subject through infinitely-recursive “Semiotic Web” of language – it reflects Peirce’s “symbol” and Saussure’s “signifier.” The Symbolic determines Subjectivity; the Imaginary is an effect of the Symbolic. Lacan was thus careful to differentiate “Self = Me” (the “Subject of Being” which is located in the Imaginary register) from “Self = I” (the “Subject of Language” which operates in the Symbolic register). The “Mirror Phase” of development establishes a dialectic between Imaginary “Ideal Ego” and Symbolic “Ego-Ideal.” As a result of this contrast the infant at first feels a rivalry with the Self-image. This “alienation” or Symbolic identification with an external Image illustrates the importance of the visual field, and reflects a generalized developmental principle, since it enhances the organism’s repertoire of behavioural possibilities. The Unconscious is composed

of chains of discontinuous Symbolic elements. The elusive Real, by contrast, is pre-eminently “pre-representable,” “anti-linguistic,” and “extra-Subjective” – it is the “impossible” traumatic sphere where words fail – and it disintegrates if one attempts to access it symbolically. The un-Symbolizable Lacanian Real circumscribes the possibility of Truth and can only be accessed retrospectively once Truths have been discovered at the Suture-points of different Discourses. Language is thus involved in each of the Symbolic, the Imaginary, and the Real registers. Therapy seeks to use language in its Symbolic aspect to change to the client’s perceptions of the dependent Imaginary images, and thus change the client’s Subjective experiences.

This hereditary Lack of the God-signifier is manifest in the subsequent human “psychic sickness” of “Original Sin” – which leads Humanity on a constant, painful and winding “search for meaning” after its banishment from the creative power of the Paternal Name. The “Big Questions” regarding identity constantly arising in the human psyche drive people to anchor their personalities around “Phantasy Objects.” In the Imaginary register, the image of this Phantasy Object is the “Object-little-a” – it is the Other’s “lost Object” which depicts the “absence of Subject” with which the Subject nevertheless paradoxically constantly tries to Self-identify, but always in vain. The Imaginary Father is a constructed ideal or anti-ideal Phantasy father-*imago*. The Object of the most important form of Lack, namely Symbolic Castration by the Agency of the Real Father, is the Imaginary Phallus. The cultural, Symbolic Object-Big-A represents radical alterity in contrast with the illusory alterity of the natural, Imaginary other, the Object-little-a. We could say that whereas Wishes are conscious, Desires are unconscious Wishes for which “Object = Lack.” This Lack is represented by Object-little-a, not in the sense that Object-little-a is the “attractor” and end of the dialectal, socially-constructed Desire, but rather in the sense that it is the “Object-cause” of the Desire. The only

escape from this frustrated metonymic Desire-chain, is when a Desire-signifier “crosses the Bar” using metaphor and becomes a Desire-signified.

The Phallic Law controls the Subject’s Desire through the “Œdipus Complex.” This in turn drives the Desire to perfect the world as an Imaginary image, thus condemning humans to a dangerous, eternally unsatiated existence in which unfettered Symbolic magic can bring forth warped imaginations into the world. This attempt towards safe stasis is expressed through “word and image blocks” which manipulate consciousness, and embalm us in conventionalized and paralyzing “double-bind” behaviour-patterns. Limiting personal and cultural mythologies are seen metaphorically as broken fragments of ancient evil enchantments manifested by certain regressive and repressive Symbolic-patterns or memes. If we define pleasurable “Plaisir” as arising from a decrease in stored psychic tension, then we can contrast this with painful “Jouissance” which arises from an increase in psychic tension. The result of this transgression is a painful overload of psychic energy, which is called “Jouissance”. Blocks to psychic development are also represented as Jouissance. Desires, always unsatiated, are one way of controlling Jouissance. In successful psychic maturation, Symbolic “Castration” allows “expulsion” of Jouissance, and the introduction of necessary Loss, in an evolution to psychic equilibrium.

Individuals of either sex or gender can function by the logics either of “male-Sexuation” or of “female-Sexuation.” In male-Sexuation there exists the “Primal Father” whose Name induces phallic-Jouissance in all other men and male-Sexuation in the absence of the Real, which is thus “Conservative.” Female-Sexuation obeys an entirely different (and “far more difficult”) logic, invoking non-phallic-Jouissance or supplementary-Jouissance which does not “exist” (it “is” not), but rather which is said to “ex-sist,” and as such is “lawless” and “unspeakable” – it

“re-sists” in the Real, and thus causes “Friction.” This gender-dichotomy is “naturalized” into an identification of Phallus and penis, although there is no reason why, under different prevailing dichotomy-conditions, alternative “naturalizations” into identification of the Phallus with quite different Symbols might occur. The idealized male role involves total union with the Symbolic, and internalization of the signifier. When neurotically repressed, the Name’s function breaks unconsciously through into the Symbolic in speech. In psychosis the Name undergoes “Foreclosure” from the Symbolic; and in “successful psychosis” various Objects are “Named” to form a new unanalyzable topological Object. This is a fourth ring, or “Sinthome” of pure Jouissance which re-un(it/ti)es the triadic rings of the three Registers – whether these be fragmented body-images (in the Imaginary); linguistic symbols (in the Symbolic); or exaggerated excitation-levels (in the Real).

In terms of a Complexity Theory description of Psycho-chaotic Semiotics, we start from the aleostate form of the discrete logistic equation which relates the aleostate of the Ego-state energy at discrete timestep to that at the previous timestep, by means of changes mediated in a particular language. The relative degrees of openness or closedness of the system give different degrees of “Friction” in psycho-chaotic individuation. The Phallic Function expresses the way in which changes in the Ego-energy tensor are related to changes in the Imaginary-Symbolic. When the Gamepath is “Conservative,” or “Frictionless,” Rhizomatic recoupling through the Real has no effect. The male-Sexuated individual is the plastic-artist constantly at work manipulating the Symbolic “Phaneron” in an attempt to recover the Foreclosed “Paternal Name” which exists as a constant Lack or Hole in the Imaginary-Symbolic representations of such an individual. When the Gamepath is “Nonconservative,” or “Frictional,” the operation of the Phallic Function gives rise to non-phallic-Jouissance or supplementary-Jouissance. In male-Psychosis, individuals seek to “plug” the “Superego

Name-hole” by the Unconscious Foreclosure of a Non-infinitely-extended proportion of Symbolic-Imaginary Ego-tensor-variation into the Real (leaving a restricted proportion in the Symbolic-Imaginary), with which they seek to balance the effect of the Lack of the Paternal Name.

The divided-Subject is thus split by the Phantasy between necessary, logical Truth, and contingent, alterable Knowledge. The structure of the Phantasy is that Drive divides the divided-Subject from Desire; and that the Truth of Desire is actually exactly the divided-Subject’s incompleteness, inconsistency, and Undecidability. Moreover, acceptance of this non-Subjective Knowledge actually de-Subjectifies the client, in a process called “Subjective Desensitization.” We might well ask how these therapeutic understandings regarding the “quasi-mutually-exclusive” Truth of Desire, and Knowledge of Drive, can ever be coupled to achieve satisfaction of Drive with the concomitant introduction of the minimum of *Jouissance* into the space of Desire. One answer is that the Object-little-a (which, although the Object-cause of Desire, is not itself the unattainable Object of Desire), provides the motivation and frame for the circulation of Desire. Full-speech identifies with its Object and unites Subject with Desire; Empty-speech in contrast alienates Subject from Desire. Empty-speech can itself bring forth Truth about Desire; and between Full-speech and Empty-speech is a continuum, although fundamentally, Desire can never be fully spoken – there is no such thing as “Truth, whole Truth, nothing but Truth.”

Lacan’s breakthrough was to see that to disavow the parasitic Symbolic is an “attempt at the impossible” and leads to our becoming trapped in a mirror-world of Imaginary depiction, where depth of interpretation is impossible, and only one, superficial, authoritarian viewpoint prevails. In terms of the magical “psycho(a)logical” search for creative growth, analysis obeys

an “aberrant logic” or “(a)logic” which seeks to reunite Word with Image in the hope of transcending the constitutional human condition of signifier-Castration. In a carefully-controlled therapeutic dialogue, the therapist first acts as listener to the client’s speech; the therapist then sends the message in inverted form back to the client, allowing the Subject to recognize, and name, its own Desires. This is the utterly horrific analytical moment at which a client grasps the paradox of the inadequacy of language, as symbolized by the logically and visually impossible “circular square.” Rather than pursuing an ultimately futile attempt to reconcile the two sets of opposing characteristics, their fundamental differences are acknowledged and celebrated, and these are instead synthesized. The necessary “price” for this transformative therapeutic transaction is that individuals disconnect from the need for autoerotic relations with their own bodies, thus allowing them fully to partake of language’s paradoxical symbolic freedoms. We are once again back with Eve in Eden, she who obeys her instinctive drive to transcend abstract, mundane, manufactured, simulacral fantasies, and rather immerses herself in concrete, instantaneous, unknown reality, regaining true sustainable life, and synthesizing methodology with wisdom.

Acknowledgements and Disclaimers

I wish to thank the “*Enflame* Newcastle” Series Editors responsible for this Number, Dr Roy Sturgess (Chair, Newcastle Philosophy Society, and former Head of History at Sunderland University), and Dr Joel Yoeli (Trustee, Newcastle Philosophy Society, and former Consultant Clinical Psychologist based at Newcastle upon Tyne UK Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service). They have both given me immensely valued friendship, support, and guidance, as well as highly useful encouragement and critical and constructive input in completing this work. The idea of exploring “Mathemegenesis” was suggested by Dr Paul Attinello, Senior Lecturer in ICMuS in the School of Arts and Cultures at Newcastle

University, and Jungian-Analyst-in-training. My own study, practice, and development in psychotherapy over the past ten years have been graciously supported throughout by my Clinical Supervisor, Mr Joe McAnelly BA (Hons Psych), MNCP (Acc), MNCH (Acc), MBACP (Acc), MBPsS, MPNLP, MISMA.

Thanks are also due to Dr Nuria Lorenzo-Dus (Reader, English Language and Literature, College of Arts and Humanities), Director of the Swansea University Language Research Centre (LRC), and to Dr Cristina Izura (Lecturer, Psychology, School of Human and Health Sciences), for affording support in completing this project. I am grateful to Swansea University Research Forum (SURF) for electing me to a Fellowship in order to allow me to share these ideas at the “Research-as-Art Competition: Capturing the Diversity and Beauty of Research,” held at the University on 24 June 2011.

I also wish to thank Dr Anna Shane of the San Francisco Society for Lacanian Studies, editor of the online journal “The Øther,” for taking the time to read and give feedback on my work. I feel her comment that the “...work is clearly interesting but it isn’t strictly Lacanian” should stand as a highly pertinent “*caveat lector*” to all those chasing their unattainable Desires in approaching this (re)(de)(con)struction of Lacanian ideas in the hope of reconnecting with the Real and generating new and icon-breaking Significations.

I would really like to give more, very special personal thanks to Janet and Dave in Newcastle (as well as all my other friends in “NPS”) for their loving friendship and support, and to Mum and Tommy in Swansea for theirs.

Dr Patrick William Jemmer

Swansea: 24 June 2011

Contents

1. Unconscious Scaffolding	15
2. (Re)(De)(Con)struction	16
3. Möbius-Signification	17
4. Registering Lacan	19
5. Psycho-chaotic Semiosis	20
6. Object-Big-A \diamond Object-little-a	22
7. Imaginary Reflections	23
8. The Symbolic and The Real	24
9. Language's Edge	26
10. Of Desire and Purification	27
11. Loss / Lack / Desire	29
12. The Emergent Subject	31
13. Signification Veiled	32
14. The Real of Eden	33
15. The Fall into Symbolization and the Prohibition on Images	35
16. Cast Out from the Real	36
17. The Genesis of Jouissance	36
18. The Birth of Human Phantasy	38
19. Jouissance: Nature and Nurture	40
20. The Paradoxical Logic of Sexuation	42
21. Simply Insatiable Male-Sexuation	44
22. The Complex Ex-sistence of Female-Sexuation	45
23. Sexuation and Desire	46
24. The Phallus: Having and Being	47

25. Ego-Misrecognition and Subjective-Oblivion	49
26. Aleolinguistics	49
27. Psychotherapeutic “Truths”	51
28. Symbolic Force	53
29. On Psychosis and “Sinthomatologie”	54
30. Dialectical Logistics	56
31. Psycho(a)logical Autopoiesis	58
32. Conservative Male-Sexuation	61
33. Nonconservative Female-Sexuation	63
34. Psychosis: An Attempt to Regain Paradise	65
35. The Problematics of (Post-)Structuralist Analysis	67
36. Mathemophilia	68
37. Gödelic Undecidability	70
38. Achieving the Impossible?	71
39. Analysis and Atheistic Spirituality	73
40. Self-Recreation as God-Images	74
41. Semiotic Sorcery	75
42. Passion <i>avec</i> Altruism	76
43. Sign(if)ying – Imag(in)ing – S(ens)ing	78
44. The Scapegoat-Magus	80
45. The Synthesis of Methodology and Wisdom	81
Summary	83
References	89
About the Author	115
About Newcastle Philosophy Society	116
About <i>Enflame</i> Newcastle	118

1. Unconscious Scaffolding

Our point of departure is the recognition that both Freud and Lacan describe Psychoanalysis to be the “experience of the impossible” – together with the acknowledgement that Derrida defines Deconstruction in exactly the same terms [0]. The problem then is to understand how ideas arising from psycho-linguistic (re)(de)(con)struction can be applied to the intuitive and uncognizable terrain of the Unconscious; and how this gives insight into the structure of the mind, and its operation in a particular social order. After Freud’s initial revelations, the next step in so-doing is to realize, as Jung did, that the Unconscious functions in terms of metaphors, signs and symbols which, in Jungian terms at least, mediate the Ego's journey in acknowledging its Shadow, developing its Anim [1], incorporating Complexes constellated around Archetypal Images, and finally individuating as Self. Lacan, in his acknowledgement of language’s, and the psyche’s, semiotic complications, turns away from a scientific-materialist approach and adopts instead a “pseudo-Structuralist” viewpoint in which the central tenet is that complex, hidden, language-like structures form the “necessary and sufficient” framework of the Unconscious, which arises from the “pure logic” of signification [2], [3]. He stresses that, in this sense, the Unconscious can be considered to be structured “like” (French – “comme”) a language, although not “by” (French – “par”) language [4], [5], [6]. This means that rather than being a conglomeration of primæval Archetypes, it is structurally as highly developed as the Conscious. Nevertheless, the use of “comme” makes a space between language and the Unconscious [7]. Even though everyone is born into a world already-constituted through actual, everyday, specific languages (French – “langues”) such as English, French, or German, these languages do not themselves structurally cause the existing Unconscious. Language and the Unconscious are analogous and inextricable, and function in parallel; but they are neither equivalent nor related through cause-and-effect. In this sense Kristeva tells us that the Unconscious is much more like the “supra-linguistic” or

“trans-linguistic” or “ultra-linguistic” notion of “langage” as the overarching and abstract structural system of syntax and style which governs various discourses (such as the poetic, scientific, or religious) [8]. This work summarizes my investigations into the philosophical foundations of Lacanian theory and the development of a “Rhizaleosemiotic Calculus,” stimulated by my background in applied mathematics research (particularly quantum theory and chaology), my interest in language study and linguistics (especially Aleolinguistics and subcreated languages), my training and practice in psychotherapy, and my “bridging” interests and writings regarding philosophy and mythology in these contexts [9] – [20].

2. (Re)(De)(Con)struction

Let us start from Dennett’s scientific-materialist approach to the problem of linguistically-mediated behavioural regulation within the individual [21]. He believes that the provision of “linguistic scaffolding” helps human minds to optimize the ways in which they generate, store, transform, and simplify information, in ways comparable to those in which a computer’s software optimizes the performance of its hardware. Internal or external dialogue serves in attention-focusing, action-controlling, problem-identifying, sequence-structuring, and error-preventing, in addition to its usual role of information-transfer. Consideration of the possible mechanisms by which these functions occur, naïvely leads to the supposition that well-defined external language is used simply to translate underlying conceptualizations and internal representations whose primary expression is as propositions in a putative internal “Mentalese” language [22]. Dawkins, quoting Dennett, singles out humans as subjectively experiencing thought as a culturally-evolved, linear, linguistically-encoded “stream of consciousness,” in the sense that Joyce attempted to verbalize in his seminal works [23]. Lacan seems to agree with this, since although he denies the existence of a “meta-language,” he does agree that the act of fabricating writing from language is a means by which thought-

processes can evolve [2]. In this vein, Lacan noted that in Joyce's "faunical" and "linguistically questioning" [24] writing signification is constantly "(re)(de)(con)structed" – signifiers collapse, mix, and recombine – and could be said to "stuff" the signified [6]. Here I introduce the term "(re)(de)(con)struction" [25], [26], [27], [28], in order to expand Derrida's conception of "deconstruction" and use the term (with a nod to Phillip's playful term "Derriduction" [29]), and to Derrida's own "mischievous" use of language and to his "witty strategies" [29]. This emphasizes the tensions between cooperating and competing transformative processes which simultaneously "construct – destroy – restructure – reconstruct – deconstruct – redestroy – redeconstruct" in the neverending chaotic-semiotic dialectic of meaning-making [30]. Rabaté describes Joyce – that "aspace of dumbillsilly" (from French slang – "espèce d'imbécile" – "stupid idiot") – as being the "first writer to teach psychoanalysts how to read" [31]. In fact, for Lacan, Joyce constructed his very Ego by means of his writing, which sought to integrate the entire world through language [24]. However, Lacan also describes writing as "precipitation of the signifier" into linguistically unnecessary symbols [2]. Rabaté decries this attitude of "phonocentrism" [31], whereby human beings separate living, dynamic processes from dead, static concepts [32]. Zerzan equates the advent of writing (and reading – about four thousand years ago) with the reification of reality into fixed "things" and the attendant functionalization of qualities and relations [33]. Dowd expresses this process in the equation "reification: words = reality" [34]. For Zerzan, as for Freud [35], written language in particular is the oppressive mechanism by which an enable élite established civilization and forced it onto the stubborn masses.

3. Möbius-Signification

Lacan goes on to propose a radically different, asymmetrical, form of signification from that described in the Classical Saussurean sense. Lacan's approach to the psyche might be seen as

more similar to think of Derrida's semiotic (re)(de)(con)structive approach to language, in urging a revolutionary "topological" approach to symbolization. We recall that Saussure's model of meaning-making posited an infinitely thin, two-dimensional "plane sign" with two separate surfaces (representing signifier and signified) which was oriented to place the privileged signified uppermost. Derrida's revolutionary model twists the strip by 180° and then joins opposite edges together, to produce a new three-dimensional object with only one continuous "non-orientable" surface – what we might call a "Möbius-sign" [36]. Similarly, for Lacan, Signifier and Signified are separated by an un-Signifiable "Bar" (the "Phallus") over which the Signifier slides metonymically, fundamentally confounding Signification and confusing language and communication [4], [5]. In this way, Evans suggests, Lacan reveals his embracing of beautifully irrational, anti-scientistic, neo-Romantic, Surrealist leanings [37]. Eco [38] described the mystery of infinite Möbius-semiosis in terms of a cosmic "onion" of meaning, centered everywhere and bounded nowhere. He states that the blessing of those "initiated" is that they can, and should, ceaselessly exfoliate this onion, thereby forming endless new interconnected paths of signification from the "peel" [38]. In Lacanian topological terms this exhibits "extimacy" or "external intimacy" and it is well able to represent signification as a tortuous, "ex-centric" process [39]. It is now possible to "trace" a path down the centre of the strip, from a starting point in the signifier, all the way round the strip, passing through the signified, and returning smoothly to the initial point. In the vicinity of any particular meaning, two possibilities can be distinguished, but, globally, the meanings blend together – and these "local meanings" are only separated by the time taken continuously to traverse the signification. The inescapability of the Trace and the interminable twists and turns of semiosis can be further demonstrated topologically. For on attempting to cut asymmetrically with respect to the path just described, right around the Möbius-sign, and hence resolve the Gordian problem, the twisted loop does not fall apart

intro two separate loops, but rather forms two smaller interlocked strips – one a Möbius-sign, and the other a doubly-twisted non-Möbius-sign! On cutting along the symmetric line, the result is a single long non-Möbius-sign. There is also an inherent “handedness” in our new chiral Möbius-signs [40], which depends on whether there is a “jump to the left” or a “jump to the right” [41] – clockwise is distinct from anticlockwise. We can here make a connection with various “bivalent” optical illusions such as the Necker cube, the candlestick-faces, and Wittgenstein’s duck-rabbit which contain simultaneously the One and the Other, and which facet is perceived is dependent on the observer’s perception [42]. And if we allow a Time-warp to transport us backwards into our (Collective) Unconscious we find resonances with the self-consuming Ouroboros (from Greek “ουροβόρος όφις” – “tail-devouring snake”). This serpent is the ancient Egyptian symbol for eternal love and immortality [43], and in Jungian terms represents transformation and individuation via resolution of paired oppositions along the Ego – Self axis [44]. Lacan saw how this continuous Conscious-Unconscious topology leads to the collapse of binary oppositions such as – Inside / Outside – Love / Hate – Self / Other – Truth / Image – Master / Analyst [45]. This insight creates the therapeutic space required to cut through the Borromean Knot uniting the Registers of the Real, the Symbolic, and the Imaginary, so allowing us to Traverse the Phantasy [46], to accept Subjective responsibility, and to acquiesce in the innocence of the Other, the Object-Big-A in the Loss of the Imaginary Object of Desire, the Object-little-a [47]. All of these issues will be discussed in detail below.

4. Registering Lacan

In the light of this, Lacan’s pronouncements on novel conceptualizations such as “Language – Letter – Speech – Writing” are understandably highly complex. Indeed, Lacan himself claims in “Seminar XX” that his writings in “Écrits” [4] were intended to be approached

more as “mystical texts” than as books on therapeutic method [6]. However, in “The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious, or Reason since Freud,” he set out the crucial importance of interpreting what he called the “Letter” of unconscious communications, which is allied to the (re)(de)(con)structive Différance and Trace [4], [5]. Lacan’s insistence of the centrality of the Letter stands in contrast to Jung’s attention to Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. In “The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis” [4], Lacan went on to replace Freud’s somewhat static triadic psychic subdivision into Id, Ego, and Superego with the more dynamic linguistic signifying processes of Imaginary, Symbolic, and Real, each of which defines a Register of experience, and whose interplay mediates and reflects the process of human individuation through language. Loos begins her discussion of the three Registers by investigating the significant yet independent “daily senses” in which the terms “real – imaginary – symbolic” are used. For example, we commonly say that people might try to avoid the “real world” – that children might have “imaginary friends” – and that we might experience “symbolic moments” [48]. She points out, though, that these “mundane” usages are quite distinct from Lacan’s technically complex usages in defining the “slippery border” between the internal and the external, and between the various “intrapsychic realms” themselves, in terms of language, sound, and image. Kittler, for instance, equates the distinction between Real and Symbolic with that between “matter” and “information” [49].

5. Psycho-Chaotic Semiosis

Now, Lacan took the stance that “external” conscious communication is indeed predicated on the foundational “primacy of the signified” – on “saying what one means” [50]. This is illustrated particularly well in Lacan’s psychoanalytical commentary [2] on Barthes’ study of the Japanese language in “Empire of Signs” [51]. In Barthes’ opinion, the preponderance and complexity of Japanese affixes, enclitics, functionalities, and particles, leads to utterances

which are saturated with caution, circumlocution, hesitance, and insistence. Whereas Western languages can clearly express meanings as dense as neutron stars, and can be used as objective tools in linear, rational discourse; Japanese exhibits an excess of Subjectivity, and meaning evaporates into vacuous gas-clouds which might only be useful in conveying divergent, poetic impressions. In trying to communicate using “empty signs” the Japanese language disintegrates into an unbounded void in which the fragmented speech-Subjects lose themselves forever. Saal [0] explains that on the basis of their postulated interpretations of Lacan’s views on the “primacy of the signified,” different commentators site Lacan either with, or against, Derrida. However, all would agree that Lacan and Derrida shared the general view that in practice, and particularly in “internal” subconscious processes, meaning-making does not come to rest in the simple and unambiguous evocation of a unique signified for each signifier. That is, Lacan was, after his own fashion, intimately acquainted with the Derridean concept of Différance. However, along with Lévi-Strauss, Lacan believed that meaning-making occurs in unconscious but ever-evolving associative chains and networks, thus giving priority to the signifier in Psycho-semiotics. This is in direct contrast to Derrida’s stated opinion. In Lacan’s view, it is therefore very difficult to “mean exactly what you say,” particularly in terms of “internal” communication, and the resulting immersion in an uncontrollable Symbolic sea of ever-shifting meanings is a defining feature of human life. Lacan stressed that we are all born into very many symbolic networks – cultural, economic, educational, familial, political, religious, and social – and that these begin to structure every aspect of life even before birth [50]. Leader gives the example of the Virgin Mary nursing her immaculate infant, and musing to herself – “I think I’ll call Him Jesus” [50].

6. Object-Big-A <> Object-little-a

After birth, the infant becomes increasingly aware of the limitations of its body in fulfilling its needs, and of the incompleteness of its nervous system; and of the disparity between its apparent visual image, and its perceived emotions; of the difference between its whole image, and its “fragmented” body. As a result of this contrast the infant at first feels a rivalry with the Self-image. However, in order to dissipate this rivalry it becomes increasingly captivated by the mirror-image Counterpart; and it is from the infant’s primary “Mistaken identification” with the specular “Imaginary register” that the Ego develops to rationalize its actions. This “alienation” or symbolic identification with an external image illustrates the importance of the visual field, and reflects a generalized developmental principle, since it enhances the organism’s repertoire of behavioural possibilities [52]. This is a sense-making process, which clarifies spatial relations; introduces Subjectivity; identifies internal Self in contrast to external Image; and defines “I” as separate from “You” [48]. The infant is no longer a fragmented bundle of libidinal needs, but now begins to Self-perceive a coherent “Ideal-Ego” which serves as an anticipatory covenant of wholeness whose function is to support the developing Ego [48]. Mirror-identification is, however two-edged: the infant Subject rejoices in its imagined mastery; and yet it also suffers as it notices its carer’s omnipotence as the Subject’s particular representative of the Symbolic Other [37]. This is the Object-Big-A, representative of all norms, language, relationships, structures, and the “Law,” which necessarily acknowledges the identification and which cannot be assimilated by identification [4]. Through the “Œdipus Complex,” this Law controls the Subject’s Desire. This cultural, Symbolic Object-Big-A represents radical alterity in contrast with the illusory alterity of the natural, Imaginary other, the Object-little-a. This Other is primarily the locus constitutive of speech; and secondarily a Subject when that locus is occupied by another person who personifies the Other for a second speaking Subject [53], [54]. Lacan’s work is constructed

around the concept of a “radically alien,” linguistic, “Symbolic Other” as “Object-Big-A” (French – “Autre”) and stressed the difference of this from the “Imaginary other” as “Object-little-a” (French – “autre”) which is to do with the utter impossibility of complete symbolization [5]. It is crucial that the therapist distinguish between Object-Big-A and Object-little-a in order to replace the former, and avoid replacing the latter, so therapy can proceed successfully [4], [5].

7. Imaginary Reflections

Language and speech are thus consciously controlled neither by the Subject nor by the Ego: they arise from the Other which is located in the Unconscious [4], [5]. Thus whilst the Symbolic has a linguistic facet, it does not constitute the whole of language, since the Symbolic is properly the Register of signifiers, which do not exist independently, but are rather predicated on a system of mutual differences based on the binary opposition of presence / absence [46], [55]. This very opposition means that the Symbolic is by its nature potentially incomplete, and lacking in some signifier(s). Lacan later came to identify “Mirror-structuring” as defining all of Subjective experience; in particular, it controls the fundamentally conflicting relationship between Subjects and their Body-images [4], [55]. The Imaginary register is formed by internalization of these coherent images – it reflects Peirce’s unmediated “icon” [56] and Saussure’s conceptual “signified” [57]. The Imaginary, as Register of signification and signifieds, thus has a linguistic facet, and as such it is structured by the Symbolic, the register of signifiers. The Symbolic determines Subjectivity; the Imaginary is an effect of the Symbolic [37]. The Imaginary is also the repository of “primitive Phantasies” made up of preverbal structures and conceptualizations in infants, perverts, and psychotics [4]. At the same time, the infant’s parents make magical symbolic associations between the Image, and themselves and others, through words and names. This

symbolic magic unconsciously defines the infant's developing identity "exoterically," through its manipulation of discrete images and their relations and combinations [50]. Moreover, self-identification through language naturally leads to Objectification of the Subject, thus dissolving the Subject – Object boundary (see, for example, "The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis" in [4], as elaborated in [5]). Lacan was thus careful to differentiate "Self = Me" (the "Subject of Being" which is located in the Imaginary register) from "Self = I" (the "Subject of Language" which operates in the Symbolic register) [58].

8. The Symbolic and The Real

The Unconscious meaning-maker partakes of the Symbolic register – all that cannot be symbolized resides in the Real register of experience. The Real is a totally "present," undifferentiated whole, since there is "no absence in the Real" [46]; which is "always in its place" [46], [59]. Lacan expressed this contrast by saying that the Symbolic "never ceases to be written" – and the Real "never ceases of not being written" [4]. The Symbolic defines and organizes the Subject through infinitely-recursive "Semiotic Web" of language [60] – it reflects Peirce's "symbol" [56] and Saussure's "signifier" [57]. The elusive Real, by contrast, is pre-eminently "pre-representable," "anti-linguistic," and "extra-Subjective" – it is the "impossible" traumatic sphere where words fail – and it disintegrates if one attempts to access it symbolically [48]. It reflects Peirce's "index" [56] and Saussure's "bar" [57]. Loos explains that the nature of the Real is "sticky" – but suggests that we can perhaps conceive of it as the seat of the Subject's internalized, unconscious transactions with the Imaginary and with the Symbolic [48]. The Real evokes extreme anxiety since it is an "essential non-Object" which cannot be mediated and which utterly silences words and breaks all categories [61]. It is linked with death, sexuality and unspeakable, highly polysemous [62] "Jouissance."

What can be understood of the Real at all is understood through mathematics; and the sexual aspect cannot be comprehended even in this way [63]. The words of the Symbolic “cut” across the inchoate and unnamed “things” in the “here and now” of the Real in signification, the “process of coming into being” [4], [5], [59]. Žižek, the “materialist theologian” [64], [65] explains that the Real arises from the “minimal difference,” between existence as described reductionistically, and as it is experienced by humans [64]. The Real is thus not perceptible as an “entity” but is rather only captured in a difference of viewpoints – the so-called “Parallax View” [64]. He differentiates between the absolutely unsymbolizable “Abject Real;” and the “Symbolic Real,” which is composed of empty or meaningless signifiers from which sense cannot be made. The Abject Real further differentiates into the terrifying “Real Real” as intimated in the horror genre; and the ineffable “Imaginary Real,” as intimated in glimpses of the sublime [66]. Language is thus involved in each of the Symbolic, the Imaginary, and the Real registers [55]. In the first case it provides the structure and the rules which enable all communication; in the second case it acts as the “Wall of Language” which necessarily distorts and inverts the “Discourse of the Other;” and in the third, it structures itself around the elusive “gap” of the utterly unsymbolizable [46]. Therapy seeks to use language in its Symbolic aspect to change to the client’s perceptions of the dependent Imaginary images, and thus change the client’s Subjective experiences [37]. Kittler presents a metaphor for the three Registers based on media typology, namely – “gramophone = Real” (the realm of undifferentiated, unedited, fragmented “primal sound”) – “film = Imaginary” (the realm of phantasmagorical flowing images) – “typewriter = Symbolic” (the realm of alienation and abstraction which requires constant sequential translation and decoding) [49].

9. Language's Edge

Furthermore, we should always bear in mind Lacan's insight that through symbolization, human personality is not restricted to the physical form, but rather permeates a subtle cultural matrix [50]. He goes on to comment on the "paradox of mensuration" or "perfidy of bifidy" which means that even when two spaces necessarily share a completely permeable boundary, the very imagined demarcation itself forces them to exert mutual influence [2]. In his treatment of the "Mirror Phase," Lacan was especially interested in the dialectical influence between the Imaginary inner space of the "I," and the physical space of the body. Parental influence during development "translates" the parents' words into unconscious symbolic neuroses, and moreover the "Mirror Phase" introduces a fundamental psychic alienation in its own right, since the Image is external to the infant, and alien to it. Moreover, entry to the world of semiosis causes the infant to identify with "Ideal" (that is external and "pre-programmed") symbols which, even as they ground it in the Symbolic register, and liberate it to some extent from the Imaginary, get laid down as the bedrock of its unconscious identity, and drive its future development. Thus the Lacanian Ego composed of Imaginary Images, is by definition "inauthentic," and constantly strives to paper over a frightening disjointedness at the core of one's being – it is said constantly to "falsify" – to keep up a façade of coherence and wholeness in the face of otherwise unbearable Lack [50], [54]. The Imaginary is thus a place of alienation and deception; of image and imagination; of illusion and narcissism [53]. Here the unwary fall prey to delusions of autonomy, duality, similarity, and synthesis. His conclusions led him to warn of the perils of psychic idolatry, with admonitions which might be paraphrased "be wary of the Image" [50]. Kress and van Leeuwen [67], and Schroeder [68], put forward the "gaze" as an asymmetric psychological power relationship between a spectator's (or observer's, or gazer's) indirect, initiatory, offering gaze, and the unaware subject's (or observed's, or object's, or gazer's) direct gaze, which is a demand to

be viewed. Lacan understands the importance of gaze in the “Mirror Phase” of development, in which he establishes a dialectic between Imaginary “Ideal Ego” (for example, successful businessperson) and Symbolic “Ego-Ideal” (for example, the domineering teacher) [69]. He uses these insights to reverse the postulated power-balance and instead assigns ownership of the gaze to the object [70]. Frye [71] in particular, contrasts the dominant position of the “arrogant gaze” of subjugation and stasis, which engenders resistance and strife, with the “loving gaze” of liberation and growth, which brings forth cooperation and harmony. Now, “madness” reveals the truth of the previously-mentioned Ego-falsity, since then the unreal Self-Other boundaries dissolve, leading to new and frightening states of awareness [50]. The Unconscious, in contrast, is composed of chains of discontinuous Symbolic elements. Lacan saw the aim of psychotherapy as formalizing the “unteachable” symptomatic interplay of the three Registers into the “teachable” form of the “matheme” [63], [69]. The ultimate goal is to enable clients to “identify” with their mathemes and thus partake freely of the Real [72]. The importance of the matheme develops from the “resolution” of an individual client’s symptoms in therapy, and ramifies through a therapist’s teaching, thus gaining more general clinical significance, and indeed, potentially leading to political impact. The modes of “mathemic” formalization as “knowledge-concentrates” are complex. They evolve from Symbolic arithmetical signifiers “on the edge of language,” which soon cease to signify; they move through Real “mathematizable” forms; and they end as topological objects which unite Real, Symbolic, and Imaginary.

10. Of Desire and Purification

Lacan came to believe that neuroses could be said to obey “psychic laws” and that their elements behaved like mathematical “groups” with associated “permutation rules” [50]. He developed a psychoanalytic approach which seeks to apply (re)(de)(con)structive symbolic

approaches to reveal and comprehend repressed unconscious chains of signification, and the relationships between them, and in so-doing, to purge the neurosis. Thus psychic maturation involves progression from alienation by the Imaginary, to self-actualization in the Symbolic, just as the infant must be weaned from the images it uses to command its mother's attention, and introduced to adult symbolization [50]. However the Other is never complete with signifiers – in fact, it is the “barred-Other” – there is always something missing [4], [73]. This is the “Object-little-a” – which is the Object of Lack for the infant Subject, who feels castrated on acknowledging its absence. Lacan proposed the “Phallus” as the Object promised to the infant for future use in the Symbolic, to make up for the Loss of the Images in the Imaginary. In terms of this progression, Lacan [4] was first at pains to distinguish impersonal and autonomous “language” (French – “langage”), which is an abstract, formal, difference-structure (although not a humanly-manipulable “superstructure” [4], [5]), and personal “speech” (French – “parole”), which is a concrete, informal, meaning-making and identity-forming act [50]. These differences are rooted in observations from anthropology, metaphysics, philosophy, and theology, as much as those from linguistics [5]. Whereas as a structure, language exists independent of anything else, speech requires, and sites, both a speaker as the Subject who expresses Desires, and a listener as the Other who recognizes those Desires. Speech is a “symbolic exchange” which acts to link those communicating [70] in a secret and magical covenant [4], [5]. Paradoxically, the Other, as the site of language-structure, is simultaneously external to speakers (in the form of the listener), and internal to speakers themselves as a language-users. The Subject is located in the Symbolic, but in general, the act of speech unleashes uncontrollable unconscious semiotic chains, thus allowing precedence to fall to Images from the Imaginary, produced by the Ego, which tend to block the recognition of the Subject's true Desires. In therapy, the client's presenting “I” is considered an essentially fragmented entity. It is constrained by language, and prevented

from expressing its true Desires, and thus unable even to know its own wants. In a carefully-controlled therapeutic dialogue, the therapist first acts as listener to the client's speech; the therapist then sends the message in inverted form back to the client, allowing the Subject to recognize, and name, its own Desires [70], [74]. However, this process of therapeutic signification is unusual in that it actively creates a novel, and previously unknown, "Desire-thing" in the world [61]. Nevertheless, this "Desire-thing" can never fully represent the truth of the client's Desire, and there is always a Desire-excess which inheres within the client [74]. Fink explains that the inter-relationship of Desire is represented by the diamond or lozenge matheme (" \diamond ") which is considered to unify the separate mathemes for alienation (" v "), separation (" \wedge "), greater than (" $>$ "), and less than (" $<$ "), and which thus symbolizes a convoluted "(d)e(n)velopment" or "(dis)(con)junction," [74]. Zupančič [75] employs the metaphor of (electrical) installation where psychological (re)(de)(con)struction aims to seek out and repair "short circuits" – which impair a (mind-)machine's proper functioning – and yet can also lead to novel effects, shocking, obfuscating, and possibly either deadly or life-resuscitating [76]. The most that can be said of successful therapy is that it leads to the "purification of Desire" which allows the client's "(playful) entry into the I" (French – "l'entrée en je(u)") [39]. Saal uses these ideas to suggest the mathemic relationship "Lacan \diamond Derrida" to indicate the nature of the "(im)possible (non)relationship" of "(disj)un(ct)ion" between their Names.

11. Loss / Lack / Desire

Lacan later changed his stance on the role the Symbolic, and of language, with its inherently impersonal structure, which he came to see as necessarily identity-blocking and alienating. In fact, the expression of Desire by speaking in language introduces a twofold Loss. The reason for this is that language employs words which are essential for representation, expression and

comprehension, and yet which have not been designed for the language-user, and thus destroy the Subject. Moreover, the very use of words to express the biological instinct of Need for an Object as a Demand, transforms that Need into Need for a different Object, namely the recognition of the Other [4], [5]. We could say that at the most basic level Demands for any apparent Object are in fact reducible to Demands for Love – and are thus at the same time unconditional and insatiable [50]. Even when the apparent appetitive Demand is satiated, the hidden Demand for Love is not satisfied, and the difference between these is left over as marginal, surplus Desire [4], [5]. In these terms, Desires are uncanny, absolutely conditional, symbolic processes, which unconsciously transform elements of the representational system, and are themselves produced by these distortions. Thus Desires by definition cannot be satisfied: in fact they actively seek to reproduce themselves as further Desire [77]. We could say that whereas Wishes are conscious, Desires are unconscious Wishes for which “Object = Lack” [50]. This Lack is represented by Object-little-a, not in the sense that Object-little-a is the “attractor” and end of the dialectal, socially-constructed Desire, but rather in the sense that it is the “Object-cause” of the Desire. In Freudian terms, the possibility of the Satisfaction of Desire is a delusion, rooted in the “theoretically necessary myth” of a non-existent “nostalgic first experience” of Satisfaction by means of which all further Desire is driven [0]. Lacan claims that Lack of Being metonymically drives the neurotic’s Desire [4], [5], [61]; however, in the slippery play of signification, Desires undergo constant metonymic re-Symbolization above the Phallic Bar, and can thus never “cross the Bar” and be fully symbolized, and totally satiated. In contrast, Lack of Having metonymically drives Demand [78]. Deleuze and Guattari, in contrast, claim that Desire acts productively in its own right, and does not require motivation by prior Lack [79], [80].

12. The Emergent Subject

Unified Desire of the Other (as opposed to unified, yet insatiable Desire for Love) is partially manifest in multiform Drives [46]. Culturally and symbolically determined Drives differ from instinctual and primal biological Needs since they do not have an “attractive” Object and they neither can, nor do, demand satisfaction; but rather they use *Jouissance* in order perpetually to circulate fractally about this Objective “center” [46], [69]. This fractal circulation allows the Subject to go beyond the restrictions of the “Pleasure Principle,” and it is controlled by three syntactic verbal functionalities or “voices” [69]. The autoerotic a-Subjective phase involves the active and reflexive functionalities (that is, “to feel” and “to feel oneself,” respectively). A new Subject arises in the erotic phase on completion of a Drive-circuit and involves the (middle) passive functionality (that is, “to (make oneself) be felt”) [81]. Pickstock reminds us here that in ancient Indo-European languages the middle verbal functionality expressed more than straightforward “reciprocity” or “reflexivity,” and that it was rather used to convey the “mediation of divine by human action” [82]. In terms of partial Drives, the Invocatory (“erogenous zone = ears” – “partial Object = voice”) and the Scopic (“eyes” – “gaze”) relate to Desire; and the Oral (“lips” – “breasts”) and the Anal (“anus” – “fæces”) relate to Demand. The only escape from this frustrated metonymic Desire-chain, is when a Desire-signifier “crosses the Bar” using metaphor and becomes a Desire-signified [4], [5]. The Subject then instantaneously emerges in the “gap” left above the Bar where the Desire-signifier once was. Lacan stresses the importance of metaphor for clients in replacing their frustrated metonymic Desire-circulation, thus allowing the emergence of Subjects who can say of their new Selves, in Freud’s terms “Wo Es war, soll Ich werden” (from Lecture XXXI of [83]), which Lacan interprets as “‘Where ‘It was,’ so ‘I am’ now” [74].

13. Signification Veiled

Lacan goes on to reinterpret Freud's "Œdipus Complex," as the "Paternal Metaphor" of the fundamental anti-incest Law [53], [84]. Here, when an infant enters the Symbolic, the metaphoric signification of "Name of the Father" or "Paternal Function" (as "primordial signifier") for "Desire of the Mother" (as "primordial signified") generates the necessary "Phallic Loss" [4], [5]. This Loss comes to be represented by the Phallic Object (depicted by a concealing veil), since Words belong to the Other; and thus the Symbolic register, site of the Other, contains a "Signifier of the Impossibility of Signification" [53]. This marks the paradoxical Loss of meaning and fundamental inadequacy of language in addressing the "Big Questions" of the type discussed in Kant's metaphysical "Critiques" and Wittgenstein's "Tractatus," for example [50]. However, the Loss mediated by the Name, and symbolized by the Phallic Object, brings with it necessary separation from the mother, full entry into the Symbolic, and development as an independently-symbolizing adult [85]. In this case, the Imaginary register (I), the Symbolic register (S), and the Real register (R), are topologically fully integrated in the so-called Borromean Knot of the RSI [45], [86], in the manner required for successful communication and meaning-making. The intersection of Real and Symbolic in the Knot is the place of "Sense" or meaning-making [87]. Object-little-a lies at the centre of the Knot as an amalgam of RSI bound by the Sinthome, in an "extimate" (or "externally intimate") relation to Sense, to phallic-Jouissance, and to supplementary-Jouissance [39]. We might summarize by saying that in crucial respects even our own mother tongue is first and always a foreign language to us [50]. Lacan discusses three positions for the Father, corresponding to each of the three Registers [4], [5], [55], [88]. The Symbolic Father represents and exercises the Paternal Function as a fundamental unity which enforces Law and controls Desire, as discussed above. The Imaginary Father is a constructed ideal or anti-ideal Phantasy father-*imago*. The Real Father arises from the use of language; he is the

person claimed to be the biological father, the one who is symbolic castrator. Lacan also distinguishes three kinds of Lack, again with reference to the three Registers [55]. The Object of the most important form of Lack, namely Symbolic Castration by the Agency of the Real Father, is the Imaginary Phallus; the Real Breast is the Object of Imaginary Frustration, whose Agent is the Symbolic Mother; and the Symbolic Phallus is the Object of Real Privation, under the Agency of the Imaginary Father.

14. The Real of Eden

In terms of the “secret and magical covenant” of language we note that in Genesis, God creates “ex nihilo” with the “symbolic invocation” of the Word; human communication creates a cognate “new order of being in the relations between men” [70]. Barth in his “neo-Orthodox” position [89], [90], [91], [92] is at pains to point out the qualitative difference between God and Humanity – that God is utterly transcendent and unknowable; that His separation from the world is absolute and that immanence is by definition impossible. He is wholly Other – outside, above, and beyond – space, time, possibility, conjecture, and conceptualization. He cannot be measured or compared in spatio-temporal media. God therefore cannot manifest or reveal Himself in any form in a corrupted and evil Creation. He inhabits the realm of the incomprehensible Real, since “finitum non capax infiniti” (Latin – “the finite has no capacity for the infinite”). Barth [92] makes these points particularly strongly to counter the modern trends to “scientize” God as an expression of exquisitely complex natural phenomena, or to “psychologize” God as an expression of subconscious libido. However, God went on to gift-curse Adam in Eden with “Voces Magicæ” – Magic Voices – when He created Humanity “in His {language-}image.” We see how this “Vis Verborum” – Verbal Force – necessarily causes a rupture of Human from Nature – of God from Satan – of Order from Chaos – of Image from Word – of Word from Thing – of Real

from Symbolic – of Being from Becoming – of Man from Woman – of Deity from Mankind – and of Name from Namer. This in turn pushes dreamy Eve to seek new Knowledge and hence precipitates the Fall from the enforced innocence of Being into the knowing experience of Becoming, as Humans are denied God-Father’s Name and become beguiled by their own Image. And so in recursive return from creation to annihilation we come to see that “GoD” = “God over Djinn” = “GoD” [93] is the eternally wakeful (un)dead sleeper who controls the players of the game of life, who move pieces in their petty daily pace, until all once more is revealed as dusty quintessence. This game gives rise to the Lacanian “G(raph) o(f) D(esire)” also [4], [5]. Here the “Signifying Chain” crosses the “Vector of Desire” this connects the Signifier of the Lack of signifiers, the Image of the Other, Otherness, Desire of the other, Drive (the Lack of signifiers related to Demand), the Signifier of the Impossible, Phantasy, the Signifier of the Lack of signifiers related to the other, signifiers of the Other, the Ego, and Identification with the Other. Morrison [94] feels that this event sees the inception of corruption in Human minds, imaginations, and propensities – the beginning of an “empty existence” which people desperately try and fill with any substitute for Edenic immersion in the “is,” a wounded life a bloody universe, at once harrowing and humanizing [95]. In Lacanian psychoanalytical terms, the price of God’s wrath can be read as involving the partial withdrawal of the “Name of the Father” and of the creative “fiat” from the human signifiers made “betselem ‘elohiym” [50]. This hereditary Lack of the God-signifier is manifest in the subsequent human “psychic sickness” of “Original Sin” – which leads Humanity on a constant, painful and winding “search for meaning” after its banishment from the creative power of the Name [50].

15. The Fall into Symbolization and the Prohibition on Images

Morrison [94] paraphrases Romans 5:12 – 14 by having God disown Humanity, and turn it over to Satan’s parenthood, so that humans thereafter wander the earth, homeless and orphaned, a “law unto themselves,” trying in vain through historical civilization to mend this Hellish psychic damage. Here we can borrow a metaphor from Kushner [95] to describe this Fall from Grace. He envisions Humanity as being created like some delicate flower, destined to bloom seldom but splendidly and decorously – totally immersed in the elegant, unsymbolizable current of existence, and unperturbed by time. But in the Fall, and expulsion from the Real register humans “get Fucked Over” by the introduction of “Viral Time” [95] – they are stripped of their endless “decades of majesty,” and doomed to death as footsoldiers in a finite world in which the Symbolic is constantly at war with the Imaginary. From this time, as Morrison observes, Humanity constantly runs the risk of staggering, baggage-laden yet purposelessly, along a dark, winding path, into an unknown future of needy, nonindividuated, and unbearable subsistence [96]. For even imagination has limits, and no amount of logically permuting mundane untruth can truly reveal extraordinary verity – for it is impossible to know anything unknown [95], and the attempt to do so is the birth of human Jouissance. This in turn drives the Desire to perfect the world as an Imaginary image, thus condemning humans to an eternally unsatiated existence – and moreover, a dangerous one, since “el sueño de la razón produce monstruos,” and unfettered Symbolic magic can bring forth warped imaginations into the world [97]. Thus, Humanity becomes increasingly entombed in the History it carries and germinates within itself [98], whilst at the same time being forlorn and lacking in Destiny [96].

16. Cast Out from the Real

In Lacanian terms, we have seen that when God withdrew His Name, He exiled Humanity from unsymbolizable immersion in the Edenic Real to grope for self-made meaning in the Symbolic register [50]. Thereafter, people have created Phantasy, rooted in binary distinctions, with which to try and bridge the Real – Symbolic gulf in their search for the meaning of the Other [50]. However, this semiotic search is, by definition, chaotic, alogical, and unending, and these features lead to an accumulation of Real Jouissance in the body. In successful psychic maturation, symbolic “Castration” allows “expulsion” of Jouissance, and the introduction of necessary Loss, in an evolution to psychic equilibrium. And if this equilibration does not occur, or if the process is improperly conducted, then the effects are felt as “unbearable suffering” [50]. Dunn reminds us that human beings always seek to transcend these limits, and to break down the fundamental Self / Other split, through art, magic, mysticism, and religion [99]. But, intrepid Lingwiz’ds must always “fall back” from pure, wordless experiences of the Real, into the Symbolic register, and yet they are transformed as a result of them, and must learn to deal more carefully with language thereafter. Thus Eco’s cancer-stricken Diotallevi believes he is dying because he has parodied true information and “sinned against the Word” [38]. Meanwhile, his companion Belbo, determined to write, not just to edit; to partake, not just to watch, “falls into the trap of belief” [100] and deceives himself into believing that he is a superhuman creator, and that by “Inventing, he had created the principle of reality” [38], [100]. This misguided self-belief leads him, too, to his doom.

17. The Genesis of Jouissance

As Pope realized [101], Humanity is left torn between the apparently contradictory calls of mind and body, either to Godhead, or to Bestiality [102]. And, Humankind’s constant fear is

that it does not find meaning in God once again, it will never do so, and all that is left is that it fall eternally into the “horrifying dark abyss” [50] of zero-signification, presided over by the viral *Serpens Rogator*. But, of course, this in fact Humankind’s blessing, and not its curse. This is why Kushner’s *American Angel* – the “Regina Vagina” – the “Released Female Essence Ascendant” – manifests to Prophet Prior as an “Utterly Fleshy” Book in her attempt to bring stasis to the world and end its slide into dissolution [95]. This stasis is expressed through “word and image blocks” which manipulate consciousness, and embalm us in conventionalized and paralyzing “double-bind” behaviour-patterns [103]. Limiting personal and cultural mythologies are seen metaphorically as broken fragments of ancient evil enchantments manifested by certain regressive and repressive (or “Angelic”) memetic elements of Vallee’s “Planetary Consciousness” [103]. We are thus transformed from instinctual “Eternal Orang-utans” immersed in the Real, into automated “Soft Machines,” groping around in the Symbolic, and prey to selfish memes. Dillon [104] sees this particularly in the “Tormented Hope” of the hypochondriac, whose insanely sensitive body-awareness is akin to immediate personal insight into the workings of the universal machinery [102]. Such patterns lead to stagnation of libido, and the accumulated psychic energy is sucked off to feed the “Angelic Unconscious” through an informational flow of pleasure-pain image-words [103]. This unnaturally repressed psychic *Jouissance*, however, cannot be kept at bay forever, in healthy Humans, and demands a painfully gratifying release. Here we recall again the fundamental tension between Fluxus and Stasis, which seeks to build architecture amidst anarchy, and which engenders fortitude in the face of anxiety [102]. We might conjecture that the search for gnosis through “special neuro-linguistic trance-inducing techniques” which allow the necessary (re)(de)(con)structive memetic mutilation, provides such a suitable unconscious mechanism [103], [105], [106]. However, he is unable to convey this in a directly comprehensible way, but can only provide suitable experiences, based on trust.

Leader [50] points out that this can be understood in Lacanian psychoanalytical terms, whereby knowledge proffered from “on high,” rather than self-learned, is seen as serving only to vitiate Desire and thus to hamper true psychic growth. Humankind must thus be prepared to venture forth into unforeseen territory in order to learn, and only then can it begin to make insightful choices about its own destiny. Humanity, with its paradoxical need to suffer in order to learn, is driven onwards by excessively high (or low) levels of Real Jouissance, felt consciously as “unbearable suffering,” but unconsciously, as “pleasurable satisfaction” [50].

18. The Birth of Human Phantasy

Now, despite the inherent linguistic difficulties in any attempted separation from signification, the Big Questions regarding identity still persist in the human psyche, and people strive to anchor their personalities around “Phantasy Objects” [50]. These Phantasy Objects (such as “look” or “voice”) [50] are all based on binary oppositions of presence / absence, partake of both Real and Symbolic registers, and map the path from the former to the latter as the individual struggles with the question “What do I mean for the Other?” However, the very act of attempting to answer this question, and of translating any unsymbolizable Real aspect of such a Phantasy Object into the Symbolic, introduces yet another inescapable Loss – one cannot see one’s own gaze; nor can one truly hear one’s own voice, for instance [50]. In the Imaginary register, the image of this Phantasy Object is the “Object-little-a” – it is the Other’s “lost Object” which depicts the “absence of Subject” with which the Subject nevertheless paradoxically constantly tries to self-identify, but always in vain [107]. It is in fact not really “other” to the Subject, but is rather a reflected projection of the Subject’s Ego. It represents the Subject’s actual, physical mirror-image, and the Counterpart or Semblance of other individuals who are perceived to share a visual similarity

with the Subject. When, in the “Discourse of the Master,” the inauthentic and inconsistent “Master signifier” strives to dominate all other signifiers, and solely to symbolize the Subject, the excess meaning which emerges as “surplus Jouissance” is Object-little-a [88], [108], [109]. This Object-little-a is the void of Lack at the center of the Symbolic which arises from the attempt at impossible abortive symbolization of the Real [46], [110], [111]. It has no “use value” but exists merely for its own sake; however, it subliminally stands guard at the threshold of the Real and the Symbolic, enabling signification by mutely asserting its limits. As a loss, a hole, a remnant, a secret, it is intriguing and enticing and thus drives a need to explain, to interpret, and to symbolize. In this way, it inserts itself into the gap between conscious and unconscious, and, like a fish in a trap, opens up the hole by closing it, thus allowing waves of unconscious pulsation to be felt in the conscious [46]. It is the Greek “ἄγαλμα” – a valuable “ornament” kept in a worthless box – or the divine “spark” entrapped in a moribund body [54], [112]. In particular, Rassias points out that it is an “image” (including spoken word, or inscription), created to honour a Deity, which, of course, transcends all human representation or praise [113]. Skriabine (in “Clinic and Topology: The Flaw in the Universe” in [45]) characterizes it also as “refuse” (French – “déchet”), an Imaginary “part-Object” [73] which comes to seem like a separable bodily appendage. He explains how it is that which the Subject appears to Lack, and in so-doing it creates the ruptured Symbolic Subject. It is also, in Phantasy, that which the Subject Desires to find in the apparent false “complenitude” of the actually “broken” Other which cannot apprehend its own fissure, in order to stitch up this Lack [114]. Thus Object-little-a provides logical consistency as the necessary complement to the logical inconsistency of Object-Big-A [114]. People thus become secret vessels of unconscious knowledge, which can only be revealed through dreams, parapraxes, and free-association – and the greater the linguistic alienation, the greater the knowledge revealed when “language speaks them” [50].

19. Jouissance: Nature and Nurture

If we now go on to define pleasurable “Plaisir” as arising from a decrease in stored psychic tension; then we can contrast this with painful “Jouissance” which arises from an increase in psychic tension [62]. Miller explains that Object-little-a is a “false Real” which is the only knowable, semantic, Phantasy manifestation of Jouissance [115]. According to Lacan the Pleasure Principle seeks to constrain access to “Plaisir;” since organisms are subject to a limited pleasure, and after this they suffer [39]. However living organisms are naturally spurred on by the Symbolic conceptions of Lack and Death [61]. These combine in the “Death Drive” which repetitively drives the organism to break this Lawful prohibition against attempted possession of the “Thing” [59], [61]: Žižek explains that this Drive arises from the “minimal difference” between existence as described reductionistically, and as it is experienced by humans, which is inhabited by the terrifying “Thing that thinks” [64]. This is the inexplicable “something” which cannot be captured even in the limit of (as yet unavailable) “complete” bio-psychological models of mind. In other words, the paradox of “consciousness” is that one can never know whether it is “true” consciousness or “false” consciousness. The result of this transgression is a painful overload of psychic energy, which is called “Jouissance” [39]. It arises from an excessively high or low level of stimulation, too great a stress for an organism to bear, perceived consciously as “unbearable suffering,” but unconsciously, as “pleasurable satisfaction” [50]. Other commentators imagine Jouissance as arising in the “gap” between foreplay and orgasm, that is, in terms of the sexual dialectic of “buildup and release” [62]. One is constantly driven to try and pre-empt the time, the quality, and the quantity of this accumulation and discharge, and this expectation itself forms part of the Jouissance. Even when release is achieved, and fails, as it must, to match the imagined scenario, the ever-tantalizing question still remains: does my disappointment arise from too much or too little tension; from releasing too soon, or not soon enough?

Jouissance remains as a “deadly, heterogeneous” presence of orgasmic sexual energy or libido pent up in the Real register of the human body, always beyond image and symbolization [50]. It has a temporal axis, as is at the same time sought and denied, and the Subject annihilates the Self in the instant of trying to consummate it [62]. Blocks to psychic development are also represented as Jouissance. Sexually, Jouissance is Phallic in nature and is not oriented toward the Other; however, there is also a supplementary-Jouissance, or feminine-Jouissance which does relate to the Other, although this is indescribable in language [6]. It is thus crucial to regulate Jouissance in order to maintain appropriate psychic and behavioural equilibrium; and this is done societally through culture and education. Desires, always unsatiated, are one way of controlling Jouissance [62]. Utilization of the language of the Symbolic register is a form of semiotic “Castration,” allowing “shifts” and “discharge” of Jouissance, and the introduction of Loss, in an evolution towards psychic equilibrium. Leader suggests that this is indicative of the fact that psychotherapy can only succeed by Symbolic means [50]. However, in his final work, Lacan [6] established a direct link with Derrida’s Différance by the introduction of the concept of the “Lalangue” of the unconscious, composed of what could perhaps be called a “Libidifier” – the “One” – a melding of libido and signifier – which is both connected with, and supplemental to, the Symbolic chain of semiosis [0], [50]. Lalangue is primal, chaotic, and alogical “babble” or “lallation” – it precedes, underlies, and supports formal “language” [6]. Lalangue thus represents the individual’s unique, innate, unspoken, non-communicative function of “knowing how to do” things, and it affects human meaning-making in a twofold fashion – through its influence both on Symbolic semiosis, and on Real Jouissance [6]. In conclusion, we see that the mathemic relation “Lacan \diamond Derrida” itself wonderfully exemplifies the operation of Derridean Différance, and also the similar but different operation of identity-construction through the agency of Lacanian Object-little-a.

20. The Paradoxical Logic of Sexuation

Lacan [6] (re)(ab)used ideas of mathematics and formal logic such as those introduced below in an (a)logical, psychological reinterpretation of Freud’s “Totem and Tabu” [116] by which means he produced his paradoxical “Sexuation Formulas” [5], [6], [117] which describe how the Subject “inhabits language,” namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_M^{(P)} : \quad \forall J_M^{(\lambda)} (\Phi[\Psi_M^{(\lambda)}] J_M^{(\lambda)}) \Leftarrow \hat{\sigma}_M &\Rightarrow \sigma_M^{(N)} : \exists J_P^{(\lambda)} (\overline{\Phi[\Psi_M^{(\lambda)}] J_P^{(\lambda)}}) \\ \sigma_F^{(I)} : \quad \exists J_F^{(\lambda)} (\overline{\Phi[\Psi_F^{(\lambda)}] J_F^{(\lambda)}}) \Leftarrow \hat{\sigma}_F &\Rightarrow \sigma_F^{(C)} : \forall J_S^{(\lambda)} (\Phi[\Psi_F^{(\lambda)}] J_S^{(\lambda)}) \end{aligned}$$

In this version of the Formulas the subscripts “M – F – P – S” refer to “male – female – paternal – supplementary” respectively. First, we must remember that Sexuation is directly related neither to biological sex, nor to acculturated gender, but rather to the nature of Jouissance built up and let go by an individual, and to the mechanisms of this accumulation and discharge [5]. In fact, whereas the term “sex” implies a reproductive interaction between differently-sexed individuals, and “gender” implies a socio-culturally-mediated interaction between different-gendered individuals, Sexuation, in contrast, implies the impossibility of meaningful relationship between differently-Sexuated individuals [118]. Klein goes so far as to say that in Sexuation, “the heteros is {sic} missing” [118]. Individuals of either sex or gender can function by the logics either of “male-Sexuation” (labelled “ $\hat{\sigma}_M$ ”) or of “female-Sexuation” (labelled “ $\hat{\sigma}_F$ ”), as these are defined next [62]. Indeed, the very choice of the labels “male” (for “the One”) and “female” (for “the Other”) is rather inexplicable, and Fink [5] wryly comments that the “female” side is so-labelled, simply because “many women seem to enjoy talking more than men do” [62]. We shall go on later to see that a mathematical formulation of Sexuation leads to descriptive labels “Conservative” (or “Frictionless”) and “Nonconservative” (or “Frictional”) for male-Sexuation and female-Sexuation, respectively. The Formulas are based on formal Aristotelian logic in which

propositions are members of one of four classes – the universal affirmative ($\sigma_M^{(P)}$); the universal negative ($\sigma_F^{(I)}$); the particular affirmative ($\sigma_M^{(N)}$); and the particular negative ($\sigma_F^{(C)}$) – although these, however, have novel interpretations in terms of the mathematics of Sexuation [119], [120]. Adapting Bryant’s discussion, we identify “ \forall ” as the “universal quantifier” (“for all”); “ \exists ” as the “existential quantifier” (“there exists”); “ Φ ” as the Phallic Function (“Castration or a limitation of Jouissance” acting on an Ego-energy tensor $\{\Psi_M^{(\lambda)}, \Psi_F^{(\lambda)}, \Psi_P^{(\lambda)}, \Psi_S^{(\lambda)}\}$) which signifies “Desire or Lack in the Other,” expressed in language (“ λ ”); and “ $\{J_M^{(\lambda)}, J_F^{(\lambda)}, J_P^{(\lambda)}, J_S^{(\lambda)}\}$ ” as male-Jouissance, female-Jouissance, paternal-Jouissance, and supplementary-Jouissance respectively [62]. We should note that in the standard formal logic used here for the Sexuation Formulas the symbols for the different types of Jouissance, namely “ $\{J_M^{(\lambda)}, J_F^{(\lambda)}, J_P^{(\lambda)}, J_S^{(\lambda)}\}$ ” are “dummy variables” which are “bound” to the quantifiers, rather than being “free variables” which can take any name-value [119], [120]. This justifies the use of four different symbols in each of four Sexuation sub-propositions; indeed the use of four different symbols acts to clarify substantially the mathematical arguments relating to Sexuation presented below. We also note the logically non-standard “quantifier- negation” shown in the notations “ $\bar{\exists}$ ” and “ $\bar{\forall}$ ”. Moreover, Lacan [6] points out that the Formulas are predicated on their application to infinite sets rather than to finite ones. The Formulas defined and derived in the mathematical discussion below thus involve quantities involving the process of integration over continuous variables, and quantities defined in terms of infinite sums. In the finite case, the logical implication sub-proposition pairs in the male-Sexuation Formula and in the female-Sexuation Formula could each be made separately to collapse identically to a single logical expression; one for male-Sexuation and the other for female-Sexuation. However, this collapse is not in principle possible in the infinite case [62].

21. Simply Insatiable Male-Sexuation

Bryant explains male-Sexuation as a Phantasy either that “utter-Jouissance” is attainable by action or possession; or, that some Other has access to this utter-Jouissance. In either case the male-Sexuated individual is doomed to daily dissatisfaction in his search [62]. He analyzes the male Formula into the two sub-propositions: “ $\sigma_M^{(P)}$: all male-Jouissance is Phallic” (which means that “Every single one of a male’s satisfactions may come up short” [5]); and “ $\sigma_M^{(N)}$: some male-Jouissance is not subject to Castration” [62]. The first is the “universal possible” (or “universal affirmative”) which is “contradictory” in that it “never ceases to write itself” [121], [122], [123]. The second is the Sinthome, the exceptional at-least-One (French – “au-moins-un”) the “necessary” (or “particular negative”) Lackless Real which “ex-sists” and which “does not cease to write itself” in order to define the “edge” of the “universal possible” [121], [122], [123]. This excluded male is the “Primal Father” whose Name induces phallic-Jouissance in all other men. However, in order for the Name of the Father to function totemically it cannot be an actual speaking Subject, or it would itself be subject to Castration, torn asunder in signification. If we take these two together we get for male-Sexuation that “if all males are subject to prohibition, then-by-Sexuation there is one male who is not subject to prohibition.” Exactly the same logic applies to anyone in a position of complete satisfaction: that is, to the omnipotent God; or to a phenomenally wealthy magnate; or to the magus in possession of Hegelian “absolute knowledge” [62], [124], [125], [126]. The very existence of such a Primal Father drives male-Sexuated individuals in their ever-unfulfillable Desire [62]. The interpretation of this is that since concrete phallic-Jouissance is mediated by the utterly abstract Symbolic, then it must always be experienced as Lack [62]. What-I-expect is not what-I-get, and there is always something to be Desired, and this feels like a fundamental Lack within the Self of the male-Sexuated Subject [62]. Whatever Jouissance that male-Sexuated individuals do possess “turns to shit” or fundamentally “fails to satisfy” – and thus

all their Phantasy plotting to gain utter Jouissance is doomed to self-destruct in order to avoid the inevitable disappointment of the endeavour [62]. Bryant exemplifies this with the film called “About Schmidt” where the central character, despite all his apparent Phallic gratifications, is still “profoundly dissatisfied with life” [62].

22. The Complex Ex-sistence of Female-Sexuation

On the other hand, female-Sexuation obeys an entirely different (and “far more difficult” [62]) logic, although again, it is related to the motivation of Drives in female-Sexuated Subjects. Bryant analyzes the female Formula into the two sub-propositions: “ $\sigma_F^{(I)}$: there exists no female-Jouissance that is not phallic-Jouissance” (which can be read as “all female-Jouissance that exists is phallic-Jouissance”); and “ $\sigma_F^{(C)}$: not all female-Jouissance is phallic-Jouissance” [62], [121], [122], [123]. This first sub-proposition corresponds to the “impossible” (or “universal negative”) which “does not cease to not write itself,” and means that since every existent thing must be articulable, speakable, symbolizable within the Phallic Law of Object-Big-A [5], then no Jouissance escapes the Castrating necessity of language [62]. The second sub-proposition corresponds to the “contingent” (or “particular negative”) which “ceases to not write itself.” If we take these two together we get for female-Sexuation that – “if there does not exist one female who is not subject to prohibition, then-by-Sexuation not all females are subject to prohibition” [50]. The paradox is that by the second sub-proposition we might still conceive of non-phallic-Jouissance or supplementary-Jouissance – but that this Jouissance does not “exist” (it “is” not) – rather it is said to “ex-sist,” and as such is “lawless” and “unspeakable” – it “re-sists” in the Real, and is thus causes Friction [5], [62]. Bryant cites the concepts of “love” or “the taste of tuna steak” as such “ex-sistences” which can only be “known” by experience, and which cannot be described adequately by language [62]. Thus female-Sexuated individuals experience supplementary-Jouissance through the

very Lack of the possibility of phallic-Jouissance. Lacan cites as examples of “mystical” experiences the “ec-stasies” of Christian Saints Teresa of Ávila and John of the Cross, which exceed all mundane descriptions and limitations [62]. We note here that such experiences are actually culture-universal, as for example, instanced by the many varieties of shamanic magic [127], [128]. However, Bryant also reminds us that supplementary-Jouissance is also inherent in more ordinary body-oriented biological processes such as menstruation or parturition [62]. Metaphysical philosophers such as Plotinus can be read also as struggling with descriptions of the finite and broken World of Castration, and its relationship with the infinite and whole World of the One [129], [130]. The experience of supplementary-Jouissance engendered by such contemplation is exceedingly hard to describe in language, and Plotinus can only say that the experience is like being “annihilated in the One” [62]. In any case, female-Sexuation does not partake of “universality” – there is no exception in terms of which a “female-Set” can be defined – there is no “female-essence” – and thus Lacan concludes that “*The ‘Female’ does not exist*” [6].

23. Sexuation and Desire

Lacan noted that in general therapeutic terms, both male-Sexuated and female-Sexuated clients exhibited a propensity to repeat the same mistakes, and he attributed this to their need to suffer in order to learn, driven on by the “unbearable pleasure” of Jouissance [50]. However, the difference between male-Sexuated and female-Sexuated individuals lies in their Objects of Desire and their relation to Jouissance [62]. Male Jouissance is denumerable, and male-Sexuation is defined by contradiction in terms of a countable infinity of entities; female Jouissance is non-denumerable, and female-Sexuation is defined by undecidability in terms of an uncountable infinity of entities [62]. Badiou respectively designates these Sexuation-functions as relating to “consistent multiplicities” (which possess a “construction rule”) and

inconsistent multiplicities (which do not possess a “construction rule”) [62]. If the defining equation is that “sexual Object = Phallus” (where the Phallic Object here signifies a generalized “power” function) then female-Sexuation is in operation; and if the equation is that “sexual Object = Fetish” then male-Sexuation is in operation [62]. Male-Sexuated individuals constantly “enumerate” Jouissance in a vain attempt to quantify it completely; female-Sexuated individuals are tantalized by totalized, enveloping Jouissance, which evades them even as they try to describe it [62]. It may well be that the only true difference between male Jouissance and female Jouissance may be expressed metaphorically as a difference in the enjoyment gained from the speech act – male-Sexuated speech is “goal-directed” and signification-driven; whereas female-Sexuated speech is “non-goal-directed” and satisfaction-driven, and “takes pleasure in the act of speaking itself” [62]. It is crucial to note that in terms of Sexuation, males and females occupy positions which are neither symmetric, nor complementary.

24. The Phallus: Having and Being

We must remember here that, as in Freud, the Phallus is a pure symbol of male generativity and as such cannot be “possessed” by any individual (in contrast with a physical penis), since possession of the Phallus equates with possession of God’s divine power [131]. However, as Butler points out, there is a natural, “binary and asymmetrical” gender-dichotomy between male and female bodies, symbolized by the presence or absence of the penis [132]. This gender-dichotomy is “naturalized” into an identification of penis and Phallus (that is, through the equation “Phallus = penis”), although there is no reason why, under different prevailing dichotomy-conditions, alternative “naturalizations” into identification of the Phallus with quite different symbols might occur [133]. This (gender-)dichotomy is moreover manifest in a (gender-)differentiation in the manifestation of Phallic Loss, rooted in the Sexuation-

dialectic of “Having / Being” within the realms of “Being / Becoming” respectively [4], [5]. This dialectic, based in the fundamental trauma of the impossibility of sexual rapport which punctures a “hole” in the Real register, is born in the Symbolic register; but as it progresses, it devolves into the Imaginary register [63], [134]. The originary pain is no longer that of Freudian Castration, but rather that of Lack, which is exceedingly well-represented by this non-existent yet still very much operational “Hole,” which causes symptoms such as the prosthetic emergence of gender-identification [118]. Males resign themselves to a promised, future Phallic “Having” (and consequently to access to potentially replete Symbolization) in the future, based on the necessity of present “not-Having.” The idealized male role involves total union with the Symbolic, and internalization of the signifier [50]. In contrast, females accept Phallic “not-Having” in the future (and consequently accept the idea of taking up the literal role of Symbol) as a necessary result of “Being” – and this means initially “being identified with” the “Maternal Phallus” [50]. The idealized female role is paradoxical in that it involves partial disjunction from the Symbolic, and a determined search for the Other [50]. Leader points here to Riviere’s [135] thesis that this difference is at the heart of the female’s desire to “masquerade” [50], and Saal [0] concurs that in Lacanian terms a woman exists in a condition of “pas-toute” (French – “not-All”). She is a representation of Différance, and like Truth, is by nature “struck through, erased, crossed out” [0]. In Michaux’s phrase, she is present “between center and absence” [136] – between knowledge and satisfaction (French – “savoir et jouissance” [72]) – she is not able to assume the Phallic Function, and yet she is not “non-Phallus” [2], [137]. However, in this “moving darkness” [136], the woman does uniquely participate (after a fashion) in the Phallic Function in the sense that her lover the “au-moins-un” (French “at-least-One”) gives it up on her behalf. The Phallus is thus both an Imaginary Lack-Object, and a Symbol of Desire [50]. Here we can mention that Gallop [138] and Grosz [139] interpret Lacan positively from a feminist stance. Irigaray [140] and Derrida

[141], however, find Lacan's analysis sexist and phallogocentric, and essentially propose a bivalent gender analysis based on the composite "HymenoPhallus."

25. Ego-Misrecognition and Subjective-Oblivion

Now, here we introduce Rabaté's [31] observation that Lacan's first English-language publication was "Some Reflections on the Ego" [142] in which he set forth the basis of his essentially "anti-Ego" psychology. Lacan linked his idea that language creates and maintains the Ego with Freud's association of the Ego with delusion, hallucination and "Subjective-oblivion" [31]. We can couple this with Nietzsche's teaching that in acculturated meaning-making, the function of arbitrarily-linguaged thought is to sublimate indescribable, exuberant, intensive libido into calculable, repressed, intentional symbols [143], [144]. Indeed arbitrary symbolization can never adequately express an individual's infinitely complex inner dynamics. However, in attempting to do just this, the fictive, homogeneous, unified Ego comes to dissimulate the true, multiple, heterogeneous Will. This leads to a build-up of psychic energy, and it is only through cathexes that the semblance of false inner unity is broken, and the libido is truly manifest. In fact for Lacan, therapeutic Ego-strengthening is self-defeating, as it also inevitably consolidates the neurosis it is trying to remove. However, even so, we can at least be sure that the Ego is not illusory but exists as an "inscribed" artefact of writing, binding, even in psychosis, the threads of Real, Symbolic, and Imaginary in a single psycho(a)logical Borromean Knot [86].

26. Aleolinguistics

Let us now go on to investigate the Psycho-chaotic Semiotics which underlies the Psycho(a)logical Autopoiesis of human thinking and personality. First, we recognize that language messages are ambiguous: they are part of a creative, changeable code [145]. This is

true both of the means of articulation, and the form of the content. So, following von Humboldt, language must be treated as an “organisches Ganzes” (German – “organic whole”) [146]. Secondly, language messages are self-referential, both in form and in content, and this leads to chaotic evolution in personal psychic individuation, [147]. This playful chaos is seen, for example, in the fact that the elements of psycho-linguistic tautologies arising in one particular context, at one stage of development, may well be extrapolated along different connotative chains as development progresses, resulting in quite different conceptual structures (and even contradictions), in the different contexts experienced at later developmental stages [148]. Changes in content relate functionally to, and are influenced by, changes in basic modes of expression and vice-versa [149], [150], [151], [152]. The field of “Aleolinguistics” aims to investigate and describe how changes in the conceptual model of the world, and changes in modes of expression, express mutual influence as an individual’s imposed and self-subcreated language grows chaotorganically [153], [154], [155] [156]. Here, the prefix “aleo–” is derived from the Latin verb “alēre,” which signifies continuous interactive growth, coupled with mutation, in a system; it seems to fit well a process of long-term psycho-linguistic maturation. There are also echoes of the Latin noun “āleæ” which means “dice” or “chance-games,” although we remember here that in the proper technical sense, “chaotic” events are not at all random, but rather are fully deterministic. Hence it is fundamentally necessary to “look beneath the appearance and distinguish the significant parts of the pattern, the true elements and framework” of language [157] in terms of its role in psychic development. Aleolinguistics provides a framework in which to investigate von Humboldt’s conjecture that “there can no more be a moment of true stasis in a language, than in the ceaseless effulgence of human thinking itself” [145].

27. Psychotherapeutic “Truths”

In this context Culbert points out that human faculties and experiences allow only limited perception of, knowledge about, and tolerance for, “reality,” and he claims that these limitations are sufficient to invalidate the very conceptualization of “absolute Truth” [158]. He maintains that there is not any “absolute Truth” to find or to give. This is echoed in Eliot’s opinion that Humanity is constantly under threat of being overwhelmed by the vast spatio-temporal *mélange* that is the “real” ([159], Number 1: “Burnt Norton”), perhaps mirroring a Lovecraft-Lacanian “Unaussprechlich Real” (German – “Unutterable Real) [160]. It is in this context that we site Heraclitus of Ephesus’ (who was called “Αἰνικτῆς” – “Riddler” in Book IX, chapter 1 of [161]; and “Σκοτεινός” – “Occultist,” by Cicero [162]) famous undecidable comment that “The truth loves to hide” [163], [164], [165] – where Truth (Greek – “ἀλήθεια”) itself is by definition that which is “not hidden” and “not forgotten” [166], [167]. Democritus expands on this and informs us that at its origin and end, “ἐν βυθῷ γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια” (Greek – “Truth lies in the Abyss”) and thus “ἔτεῃ δὲ οὐδὲν ἴδμεν” (“we know nothing”) [163]. The source and guardian of this Hidden Truth is the Unseen Ἄιδης, both father of the kingdom of the dead, wealthy in souls, and the realm of riches itself – and this is a twilight realm which heroic dreamers co-create, and where in Heidegger’s terms “making itself intelligible is suicide for philosophy” [168]. This is the world of Joyce’s “Wake” [169] – the slippery, hallucinatory territory patrolled by the “baku” (Japanese – “dream-eating tapir”) [170] where all boundaries are broken down, and all characters dream their lives. For Badiou, philosophy operates under the Truth-procedural “Conditions” or “Discourses” of Art, Love, Science, and Politics. He seeks in particular the “points of suture” between the Truths arising from these different discourses, whilst at the same time avoiding the philosophical “disaster” of assigning Truth externally to them. The unsymbolizable Lacanian Real circumscribes the possibility of Truth and can only be accessed retrospectively once Truths

have been discovered at the suture-points. It is the primacy of the Event which especially separates Badiou's work from that of Butler [171], Deleuze [172], Foucault [173], and Lacan [174]. In Badiou's Set-theoretical ontology the structure of Being is a "structural effect" or "situational operation" known as "Count-as-One" and this allows the conceptualization of all other multiplicities. Being (which is not itself an Event of Truth) is "ruptured" by the extra-ontological Event which is the means of the Subject's (re)connection with Truth. It is the foundation of all multiplicities in the Void-multiplicity that motivates the Event. This means that philosophical Truth is "singular" or "unconditioned" and cannot "fold" into already-existing categories, so that one must ask how to universalize Truth, and this is a fundamental question addressed by Badiou [175]. Moreover, the proper name "Being" does not name an element of any multiplicity, but rather "Being" names the Void-multiplicity. Thus there cannot be any "One" so that one can make the equation "Being \neq One" – neither can there be any Grand Theory representing Cosmos, God, or Nature, as expressed in the maxim "the One is not" – thus, contra Cantor, Badiou is an atheist. Since Being is anchored in the socio-historical situation of decentred multiplicities, this vitiates the possibility of any fully original action by the Subject. From a Derridean-Lacanian viewpoint, Saal [0] summarizes this genealogy of "Truth as unveiling" by comparing Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Derrida. Heidegger could be said to have discovered the limits of ontology through the analysis of Dasein [176], but also to have remained trapped within them. Nietzsche, in contrast, succeeded in escaping ontology by the parallel utilization of a pragmatic theory of Truth derived from an underlying pragmatic theory of Belief, and a correspondence theory of Truth based on an understanding of reality as a "forcefield," such that most "commonsense" Beliefs concerning existence are vitiated [143], [177]. Derrida would carefully query and tease apart the nature and means of interpretation of these "axiomatic presences" and "real Truths" in order both to gain knowledge, and to comprehend this knowledge wisely and without

prejudice. Cutrofello reads Freud and Lacan's meta-psychology as an "inverse Kantianism" (again with its inbuilt antinomies, ethics, ideals, and paralogisms), that reinterrogates the synthetic a-priori in terms of the previously foreclosed analytic a-posteriori [178], [179].

28. Symbolic Force

Bryant sees Lacan's achievement in enunciating the Sexuation Formulas as positing a linguistic-constructive Knowledge-system totally ruled by Symbolic Law, which is simultaneously "not-All" [62], [180]. Grigg believes that it therefore encompasses, for example, Badiou's ontology [181], [182] (whilst also defeating his criticisms of Lacan). In this ontology everything knowable is inscribed within the Symbolic Order and subject to the Phallic Function and to the Law of Castration; and yet this Order is not-All, since it can always be fractured and supplemented by a potentially non-mystical "aleatory" or chance Event [180], [183]. We see here that the importance of Lacan's knotty formulation of the Real, Imaginary, and Symbolic registers, bound together by functional representations of the Name of the Father [184], lies in its power to explain the distortions, deletions and generalizations that underpin delusions. It must be emphasized that these important structural implications rest not on the nature of the Name in its role as the static instantiation of a particular "nominalization" – but rather through its generalized, dynamic, symbolic "verb" power of naming as an act, or as is seen in the Biblical "Fabula Creationis," a command. When neurotically repressed, the Name's function breaks unconsciously through into the Symbolic in speech. But, in psychosis, an individual experiences an inassimilable signifier, which disrupts the Paternal Function, and "ruptures" the Symbolic register. The Name undergoes "Verwerfung" (German – "Foreclosure, Foreclusion") from the Symbolic [55]. It is utterly banished or rejected, as if it had never existed [69]. The Borromean Knot unties as the Symbolic and the Imaginary become disjoint, and reality unravels [85], and the Paternal

Function becomes manifest through the Real, in compensatory delusions, dreams or hallucinations.

29. On Psychosis and “Sinthomatologie”

However, in “successful psychosis” various Objects are “discovered” (or “Named”) to form a new unanalyzable topological Object. This is a fourth ring, or “Sinthome” [185] of pure Jouissance which re-un(it/ti)es the triadic rings of the three Registers – whether these be fragmented body-images in the Imaginary register (I); linguistic symbols in the Symbolic register (S); or exaggerated excitation-levels in the Real register (R) [45]. This is represented topologically by a re-formation of the Borromean Knot of the RSI [86]. By knotting the Real into the Sense already made by the intersection of Symbolic and Imaginary, the Sinthome moves beyond meaning [87]. It is crucial to note that the Sinthome is not Symbolized linguistically as a signifier, but rather that it is “Written,” or carved like an inscription within and upon the Subject [4], [5]. It is the Trace of the mechanisms by which the Unconscious controls the arrangement, flow and “enjoyment” of Jouissance [87]. It is thus does not demand interpretation by the Other, nor is it subject to therapeutic analysis. Successful therapy allows clients to “identify” with their Sinthomes. Lacan conjectured that one way in which such a complex might resist triggering psychotic affects, as is observed in some cases, is for the Sinthome to reify itself through the viral (re)(pro)duction of its own Name. Now here, Lacan agrees with Derrida that writing propagates the Sinthome by means of supplement and replacement in its artistic search for beauty; speech, on the other hand, discharges the Sinthome with its pragmatic expressions of equivocation and parapraxis [31]. So, in the former case, the Father’s “Original Sin” of Foreclosure causes a build-up of Jouissance, which is transmogrified into what Carrasco calls a “Sinthomatologie,” and as such can be “enjoyed,” and so overcome, in the Symbolic [186]. He suggests that Joyce

exemplified just such a “Sinthomatologie” [186] through his writing [31], [23], in which he uses “invented night-speak” [187] to “wage against language” in the Symbolic register [188]. By reun(it/ty)ing the Borromean Knot, Joyce’s supplementary writing becomes a form of topology which attempts to express that which escapes the Imaginary. In a world where Nietzsche claims that existence itself is justifiable only in æsthetic terms [143], [189], Marvin sees Joyce’s “Wake” [169] as a “transmodern” attempt to provide understanding of “ars gratia vitæ” – and thereby to fully (re)possess the Symbolic [190]. Moreover, Joyce’s unnatural version of Pound’s “Ego Scriptor” [191] cannot be located within the Imaginary, but rather forms an unstable meniscus on its surface. This means that fragmented body-Images, like tattered rags, are unable to clothe the Self. Similarly, the Unconscious, which can no longer be bound in the Real, breaks forth in physically-manifest metonymic symptoms – and eventually, “the psychotic drowns in the black waters of the Unconscious” [192]. Rabaté [31] further identifies the insidious semiotic-onomastic chain snaking from Lacan, who pronounces “je nomme” (French – “I name”) – to Jung (the homophonic “young man” – French, “jeune homme”) – who latterly was inimical with his former mentor Freud – whose German name is translation of the French “joie” (“joy”), and equivalent to the English name Joyce [53] – which is derived from “joyeux” (French – “joyful”) [193] – and who was disliked by Jung whom he “freudened” [169] with his enchanting tales using aberrant Modernist stylistics [194] – back to Lacan, who “re-Freuded psychoanalysis” [70], and reappropriated Joyce’s name in translating “Libido” as “Jouissance” [31]. Gilbert [195] has investigated and catalogued instantiations of the “subliminal tongue” of the “God-unconscious” which is given reign in psychotic dissociation. In “Finnegans Wake” [169], Rabaté [31] finds the Sinthome as a knot of Jouissance at the tipping-point between – “sens” / “non-sens” [196] – logic / alogic – meaning / unmeaning – spoken Desire (libidinal repression) / written Desire (excessive enjoyment) – neurosis / psychosis. For Joyce himself,

it was only his superabundance of skill, coupled with his lack of intellect, which stood as the “transparent leaf” between sanity and madness [197]. It is interesting here to note that Saal’s [0] concluding comparison of Lacan’s and Derrida’s views on the relation between “infinite semiosis” and “madness” closely echoes the lyrics of the “Rocky Horror Show” number “The Timewarp” [41]. Here “strange signals” representing the “call of the void” instigate the passage of the uninitiated into a hall of “infinitely-reflecting mirrors” – “another dimension” of “dreamy fantasy” – where one is “hit by blackness,” and undergoes a “mind flip,” so that “spaced out on sensation” one finds that “nothing seems the same” [41].

30. Dialectical Logistics

In terms of a Complexity Theory description of Psycho-chaotic Semiotics, we start from the aleostate form of the discrete logistic equation which relates the aleostate $\varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;n+1)}$ of the Ego-state energy at discrete timestep $(n + 1)$ to that at the previous timestep (n) , namely $\varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;n)}$, by means of changes mediated in language whose controlling effect is defined by the numerical value of the parameter λ

$$\varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;n+1)} = \lambda \left(1 - \varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;n)} \right) \varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;n)} .$$

The aleostates unite the Real, Symbolic, and Imaginary in the Borromean Knot founded in the postulated coherent but absolutely inaccessible Otherness of the Logos or initial “null aleostate,”

$$\Lambda\{s\} = \sum_{\alpha} \varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(0)}(i\{s[r]\}) ,$$

which subsumes the entire Unconscious, alinguistic, and essentially foreclosed history of an individual’s psycho-linguistic patterning [198]. In this depiction, the Imaginary is founded in the Symbolic, the Symbolic is grounded unfathomably in the Real, and the Real can only be dreamt of in terms of Imaginary images structured by Symbolic relationships. In the

Conservative case when the Real is “backeted” and does not disrupt the Imaginary-Symbolic linguistic coupling, one can notionally invert the Ego-state energy into its Imaginary and Symbolic components through the coupling functions $i_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;k)} = \varpi_i(s_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;k)})$ and $s_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;k)} = \varpi_s(\varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;k)})$ which are such that $\varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;k)} = \varpi_i(\varpi_s(\varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;k)}))$. In the absence of the Real, $\varpi_i^{-1}(\varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;k)}) = \varpi_s(\varepsilon_{\alpha}^{(\lambda;k)})$ and thus the Symbolic and the Imaginary are related by an “inverse twist.”

Once initiated, the process of subconscious, psycho-chaotic-semiotic evolution sees to enliven and multiply into a nexus of interdependent events, as the unknowable Real churns subliminally below the surface of Symbolic symbolization and Imaginary image-ination. At various crucial stages, or cusps, remarkable bifurcations in the psychic system are seen to occur, whereby divergent and often conflicting forms or “gnomes” arise and branch off [199]. These may die off, or they may go on to coexist in harmonious or conflicting juxtapositions, either of which may be helpful or deleterious in different circumstances [199]. These multiple psychic representational structures constantly (re)(inter)connect, forming a rhizomatic Gestalt workingsystem, the Ego-state eclectic, which is far more complex than the sum of its parts, and we then see the move towards integration and Ego-state individuation. The Ego-state eclectic may be thought of as being multiplex in a series of historically discernible time phases or aleostates and multiplex in all of its gnomes. The initial formative stages are glossolalial: that is, all the subconscious rhizomatic nexal, or deep-level interconnectivity develops quite naturally, without the necessity of the individual’s consciously interacting with the system (see Acts 2 [200]).

31. Psycho(a)logical Autopoiesis

Generally, in psycho-chaotic evolution meanings (re)(de)(con)structively blend and interweave between aleostates and gnomes revealing an underlying levelling process or “synapsis” (from Greek “σύναψις” – “conjunction”). Sometimes previously dormant modes are awakened to emerge again in a self-reordering process of “taxis” (Greek “τάξις” – “arrangement”). Yet again, surprisingly novel and inconsistent modes can be generated through “ekplesis” (Greek “ἐκπληξις” – “surprise”). Here once again we emphasize the tensions between cooperating and competing transformative processes which simultaneously “construct – destroy – restructure – reconstruct – deconstruct – redestroy – redeconstruct” in the neverending chaotic-semiotic dialectic of meaning-making. It is important that the psycho(a)logical Symbolic-Imaginary self-subcreational system is appropriately open to receive new semantic modes without unduly disturbing those already existing. Yet it must in some senses also be closed to modes thrown out during its development (and subsisting in the Real), which would otherwise thereafter be left as “blocks, fixations, blind spots and split-off aspects” that are disjointed from the Gestalt, as in neuroses and psychoses [201]. It is through this creative, chaotic “open closure” separating the Symbolic-Imaginary and the Real that internal inconsistencies are reconciled, their redundancies pruned, and saliencies retained, whilst the system still remains generative and does not become static. The relative degrees of openness or closedness give different degrees of “friction” in psycho-chaotic individuation. In order to describe these processes we define the Rhizomatic recoupling as a superposition of rupturings and reformings, each of which represents a different degree of severing and remaking of gnomonic connections [202].

General Ego-state coupling-tensors in aleostate k can be represented as

$$\mathcal{E}_{v\pi}^{(\lambda;k)}\left(\mathcal{E}_v^{(\lambda;k)}, \mathcal{E}_\pi^{(\lambda;k)}\right) = \mathcal{E}_{v\pi}^{(\lambda;k)}\left(i\{s[r]\}\right)$$

$$\varepsilon_{\nu\pi\rho}^{(\lambda;k)} \left(\varepsilon_{\nu}^{(\lambda;k)}, \varepsilon_{\pi}^{(\lambda;k)}, \varepsilon_{\rho}^{(\lambda;k)}, \varepsilon_{\nu\pi}^{(\lambda;k)}, \varepsilon_{\pi\rho}^{(\lambda;k)}, \varepsilon_{\nu\rho}^{(\lambda;k)} \right) = \varepsilon_{\nu\pi\rho}^{(\lambda;k)} \left(i\{s[r]\} \right)$$

for example, where the subscripts $\{\nu, \pi, \rho\}$ represent Rhizomatically-coupled gnomes. The extent of coupling is given in terms of functions of the Imaginary-Symbolic in the domain of the “i{s}” with potential disruptive incursions from the bracketed Real “[r]”. The Ego-tensor form of the discrete logistic equation, which relates the Ego-coupling tensor $\varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda;n+1)}$ at discrete timestep $(n+1)$ to that at the previous timestep (n) , namely $\varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda;n)}$, by means of changes mediated in language λ is given in terms of the “Transfer equation”:

$$\varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda;n+1)} \leftarrow \lambda \left(\delta_{\alpha\omega} - \varepsilon_{\alpha\omega}^{(\lambda;n)} \right) \varepsilon_{\gamma\alpha}^{(\lambda;n)},$$

where $\delta_{\alpha\omega}$ is the Kronecker delta, and where Einstein’s Summation Convention is implied by repeated tensor suffixes (here, α). Rearranging the previous equation, gives:

$$\varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda;n+1)} - \lambda \varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda;n)} \leftarrow -\lambda \varepsilon_{\gamma\alpha}^{(\lambda;n)} \varepsilon_{\alpha\omega}^{(\lambda;n)}.$$

Now, we introduce the discrete-state tensor-coupling-difference operator ∂_{λ} such that

$$\partial_{\lambda} \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda;n)} \right) \leftarrow \varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda;n+1)} - \lambda \varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda;n)},$$

and we drop the iteration labels (n) for convenience, allowing us to write:

$$\partial_{\lambda} \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda)} \right) = -\lambda \varepsilon_{\gamma\alpha}^{(\lambda)} \varepsilon_{\alpha\omega}^{(\lambda)}.$$

We now move to a “Density-functional” description of psychic energy transformation. First, we sum over all uncontracted tensor components present in the eclectic to give the superposition:

$$\sum_{\gamma\omega \neq \alpha} \partial_{\lambda} \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma\omega}^{(\lambda)} \right) \leftarrow -\lambda \sum_{\gamma\omega} \varepsilon_{\gamma\alpha}^{(\lambda)} \varepsilon_{\alpha\omega}^{(\lambda)}.$$

Then, taking the limit of potentially infinite Rhizomatic gnome-recoupling (represented by suffix η , where the number $[\eta]$ tends to infinity) we can write:

$$\lim_{[\eta] \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\gamma \dots \eta \dots \omega} \partial_{\lambda} \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} \right) \leftarrow -\lambda \lim_{[\eta] \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\gamma \dots \eta \dots \omega} \varepsilon_{\gamma \dots \alpha}^{(\lambda)} \varepsilon_{\alpha \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} .$$

To simplify notation, we define:

$$\hat{\partial}_{\lambda} \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} \right) = \sum_{\gamma \dots \eta \dots \omega} \partial_{\lambda} \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} \right) ,$$

$$\bar{\partial}_{\lambda} \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma \dots [\eta] \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} \right) = \lim_{[\eta] \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\partial}_{\lambda} \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} \right)$$

Let us now introduce the scaled Ego-energy-density arising from the multiplex of coupled gnomes labelled by tuples such as $\{ \gamma \dots \eta \dots \omega \}$,

$$\Psi^{(\lambda)} = \lambda \sum_{\gamma \dots \eta \dots \omega} \varepsilon_{\gamma \dots \alpha}^{(\lambda)} \varepsilon_{\alpha \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} = \sum_{\gamma \dots \eta \dots \omega} E_{\gamma \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} .$$

The Phallic Function (which expresses the way in which changes in the Ego-energy tensor are related to changes in the Imaginary-Symbolic as expressed in language λ) is given as the Imaginary functional fragmentation as projected through the Symbolic ($\hat{D}^{-1}[\vec{i}\{s\}]$) of the Infinitely-extended external-Borromean Projection of the Ego-energy-density:

$$\Phi^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \Phi^{(\lambda)}[\Psi^{(\lambda)}[i\{s[r]\}]] .$$

Infinite extension and Rhizomatic recoupling leads to a segregation of the Phallic Function into a fragmented Imaginary-Symbolic part (with fractional weight $0 \leq m \leq 1$), and a fused Imaginary-Symbolic-[Real] part, the “Knot Kernel” (with fractional weight $0 \leq n \leq 1$):

$$\Phi^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = m \Psi^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\}) \triangleright \hat{D}^{-1}[\vec{i}\{s\}] + n \bar{\Psi}^{(\lambda)}(\vec{i}\{s[r]\}) .$$

We now define a Gamepath as the course traced from startpoint $\Sigma(I, S, R)$ to endpoint $T(I', S', R')$ along the curve $\Gamma(\Sigma(i\{s[r]\}), T(i\{s[r]\}))$. The Jouissance is given in general by the line defragmentation along the direction of Id-reversal (“ $\hat{D}\vec{i}$ ”), namely:

$$J^{(\lambda)}[i\{s[r]\}] = \hat{D}[\vec{i}\{s\}] \triangleleft \Phi^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] ,$$

$$\left[J^{(\lambda)}[r] = \hat{D}[\vec{i}\{s\}] \triangleleft \Phi^{(\lambda)}[\dot{i}\{s[r]\}] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} .$$

A Lifepath is a Gamepath from startpoint at birth at point $A(I_A, S_A, R_A)$ to endpoint $\Omega(I_\Omega, S_\Omega, R_\Omega)$ along the curve $\Gamma(A(i\{s[r]\}), \Omega(i\{s[r]\}))$. Moreover, Lifepaths can be split into discrete n contiguous Gamepaths: $\Gamma(A, \Omega) = \Gamma_1(A, B) + \Gamma_2(B, C) + \dots + \Gamma_n(Z, \Omega)$.

32. Conservative Male-Sexuation

Generally, the Ego-energy-density is:

$$\Psi^{(\lambda)}(i\{s[r]\}) = \sum_{\gamma \dots \nu \dots \omega} E_{\gamma \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)}(i\{s[r]\}) .$$

If Rhizomatic recoupling projects all the Ego-energy into the Imaginary (i) – Symbolic (s) dimensions of the “ $i\{s\}$,” then the Gamepath $\Gamma(\Sigma, T)$ is described as “Conservative,” or “Frictionless.” Now, the first male-Sexuation subproposition is “ $\sigma_M^{(P)}$: all male-Jouissance is Phallic.” The Phallic Function (which expresses the Imaginary through the Symbolic in language λ) is given as a functional derivative, namely by the Imaginary fragmentation of the external-Borromean Projection of the Infinite extension of the Ego-energy-density as expressed through the Symbolic. In the Conservative case:

$$\Phi_C^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = (\Psi_C^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\}) + Y^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\})) \triangleright \hat{D}^{-1}[\vec{i}\{s\}] .$$

So the Conservative Jouissance reduces to

$$J_C^{(\lambda)} = - \left[\hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_C^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s\}] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} = \Psi_C^{(\lambda)}(\Sigma) - \Psi_C^{(\lambda)}(T) + Y^{(\lambda)}(T) - Y^{(\lambda)}(\Sigma) ,$$

where $Y^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\}) = \hat{D}[\dot{i}] \triangleleft \overline{\Psi}^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\})$. In other words, $J_C^{(\lambda)}(\Sigma, T)$ is Gamepath-independent, and the so-called “Circulation Integral” $J_C^{(\lambda)}(M, M)$ is exactly zero for any “simply-connected” (non-self-intersecting) closed path $\Gamma(M, M)$ connecting point M to itself.

We now have a mathematical description for male-Sexuation ($\hat{\sigma}_M$), under Conservative conditions:

$$\check{\partial}_\lambda \left(\varepsilon_{\varphi \dots [v] \dots \rho}^{(\lambda)} \right) - \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_M^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s\}] + Y^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\}) \leftarrow P^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\})$$

We arrive at the “Superego Name-hole” for a male-Sexuated individual, namely that:

$$\check{\partial}_\lambda \left(\varepsilon_{\varphi \dots [v] \dots \rho}^{(\lambda)} \right) - \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_M^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s\}] \leftarrow \Pi\{s\} \quad ,$$

Where $\Pi\{s\} = P^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\}) - Y^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\})$ is the purely Symbolic Foreclosed “Paternal Name” (from Greek – “Πατήρ”) which exists as a constant Lack or Hole in the Imaginary-Symbolic representations of the male-Sexuated individual. The male-Sexuated individual is “Εφορος” the plastic-artist [203] constantly at work manipulating the Symbolic “Phaneron” (Greek – “φανερών”) [204], [205].

It is mathematically possible, at least, that in the case of the Primal Father there is no Lack, so that $\Pi\{s\} = 0$, and we then recover the second male-Sexuation subproposition, “ $\sigma_M^{(N)}$: some male-Jouissance is not subject to Castration.” In the unique case that the Paternal Name is identically zero, then we arrive at the “Ego-sum Endgame” represented by the motto after John 14:31 that “The world might know” (Greek – “γνῶ ὁ κόσμος”) that “ego essendi incantator sum” (Latin – “I am a lingwiz’d of is”) which betokens operation in the static realm of Being (through with non-Having becomes Having) [204], [205]:

$$\check{\partial}_\lambda \left(\varepsilon_{\gamma \dots [v] \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} \right) \leftarrow \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_P^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s\}] \quad .$$

The Phaneron or psychescape is the mental symbol-space in which the constant self-(re)(dis)organization occurs, and it consists of the entire holistically-interacting ensemble of internal mental representations, constructed and experienced in any possible symbolic fashion [206], [207], [208], [209]. The Phaneron therefore includes all representations of “real” external phenomenal perceptions as well as all representations of “constructed” internal

constellations (such as emotions, imaginings, memories, or thoughts). In the broadest possible sense, then, the Phaneron is composed of “signs,” expressed in representational modalities called “signways,” represented by the aleostates and gnomes of the eclectic.

33. Nonconservative Female-Sexuation

The first female-Sexuation subproposition is “ $\sigma_F^{(I)}$: there exists no female-Jouissance that is not phallic-Jouissance,” and it is therefore still the case that the Phallic Function operates through Rhizomatic recoupling and Infinite extension:

$$\Psi_N^{(\lambda)}(i\{s[r]\}) = \sum_{\gamma \dots \eta \dots \omega} E_{\gamma \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)}(i\{s[r]\}) \quad ,$$

$$\Phi_N^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \Phi_N^{(\lambda)}[\Psi_N^{(\lambda)}(i\{s[r]\})] \quad .$$

Hence we obtain a Phallic Function with some unrepresentable component $1 \geq 1 - H \geq 0$ anchored in the unknowable Real:

$$\Phi_N^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = H \Psi_C^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\}) \triangleright \hat{D}^{-1}[\vec{i}\{s\}] + (1-H) \bar{\Psi}^{(\lambda)}(\vec{i}\{s[r]\}) \quad ,$$

such that the Non-conservative or Frictional Jouissance is

$$J_N^{(\lambda)} = \left[\hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_N^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} \quad .$$

We therefore find that:

$$J_N^{(\lambda)} = \left[-H \hat{D}[\Psi_C^{(\lambda)}(s)] \triangleleft 1 - (1-H) \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \bar{\Psi}^{(\lambda)}(\vec{i}\{s[r]\}) \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} \quad .$$

Hence the Jouissance $J_N^{(\lambda)}(\Gamma(\Sigma, T))$ is now path-dependent. The Circulation is then

$J_S^{(\lambda)}(\Gamma(M, M)) = \bar{\Pi}_{\Gamma(M, M)}[r]$ for any “simply-connected” closed path $\Gamma(M, M)$ connecting M to itself, where

$$\left[\bar{\Pi}[r] \right] = \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \bar{\Psi}^{(\lambda)}(\vec{i}\{s[r]\}) \Big|_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} \quad ,$$

giving rise to non-phallic-Jouissance or supplementary-Jouissance, thus satisfying the second

female-Sexuation subproposition, “ $\sigma_F^{(C)}$: not all female-Jouissance is phallic-Jouissance”.

We now have a mathematical description for female-Sexuation ($\hat{\sigma}_F$), under Nonconservative conditions. By simple rearrangement, we arrive immediately at the “(H)ero-ego Flux,” whose motto strives “to deliver” (Greek “ $\rho\upsilon\omega$ ”) us through the knowledge that “ero šamán faciendi ego” – “a shaman of becoming I’ll be,” betokening activity in the dynamic realm of Becoming (through which Being becomes non-Having), namely that

$$\left[\tilde{\partial}_\lambda H(\varepsilon_{\rho..[v]..o}^{(\lambda)}) - \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_F^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] \leftarrow (1-H)\bar{\Pi}[r] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma,T)} .$$

Now, the Gamepath-dependent flux-integral $\bar{\Pi}_{\Gamma(\Sigma,T)}[r]$ (named from Greek “Παράρτημα” – “Supplement”), measures the chaotic friction arising from Imaginary-Symbolic attempts to describe the indescribable Real. The supplementary-Jouissance is governed by the equations:

$$\left[\hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_{S(H)}^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] \leftarrow -S_{(H)}[r] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma,T)}$$

$$\Phi_{S(H)}^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \nabla_H \Phi_F^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \Phi_F^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] - H \Phi_M^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s\}]$$

$$S_{(H)}[r] = \Delta_H \bar{\Pi}[r] = (1-H)\bar{\Pi}[r] - H\Pi\{s\} .$$

Since the “fractional frictional weight (or “lightness of being”) or can take any value in $0 \leq H \leq 1$, we can see that there is no unique “zero” for supplementary-Jouissance, and thus “*The* ‘Female’ does not exist.” Moreover, “Other” (that is, “O(~~the~~)r”) explicitly projects out (through the inclusive-function “Or”) “*the One*” in the special case when $H = 1$.

We note here, in passing, that the Knot Kernel $\bar{\Psi}(i\{s[r]\})$ is formed of weighted contributions from the Symbolic Real $\bar{\Psi}_S(s[r])$ and the Abject Real $\bar{\Psi}_A(i\{r\})$, where the weights are $h_{sr} + h_{ar} = 1$:

$$\overline{\Psi}(i\{s[r]\}) = h_{sr} \overline{\Psi}_S(s[r]) + h_{ar} \overline{\Psi}_A(i\langle r \rangle),$$

and where the Abject Real further differentiates into the Imaginary Real $\overline{\Psi}_I(i\{r\})$ and the Real Real $\overline{\Psi}_R(r)$, with weights $h_{ir} + h_{rr} = 1$, and where the Register of the Abject Real differentiates as $i\langle r \rangle \rightarrow \{i\{r\}, r\}$, so that:

$$\overline{\Psi}_A(i\langle r \rangle) = h_{ir} \overline{\Psi}_I(i\{r\}) + h_{rr} \overline{\Psi}_R(r) .$$

Overall, we therefore have:

$$\overline{\Psi}(i\{s[r]\}) = h_{sr} \overline{\Psi}_S(s[r]) + h_{ar} [h_{ir} \overline{\Psi}_I(i\{r\}) + h_{rr} \overline{\Psi}_R(r)] .$$

In this conception we can see that the Symbolic Real is “parasitic” on the Abject Real, in the sense that, by simple rearrangement one can alternatively write (for instance – there are other equivalent forms):

$$\overline{\Psi}(i\{s[r]\}) = h_{sr} \tilde{\Psi}_S(s[r], i\langle r \rangle) + h_{ir} \overline{\Psi}_I(i\{r\}) + h_{rr} \overline{\Psi}_R(r) ,$$

$$\tilde{\Psi}_S(s[r], i\langle r \rangle) = h_{ir} \delta \overline{\Psi}_{RI}(i\langle r \rangle) - \delta \overline{\Psi}_{RS}(s\langle r \rangle) ,$$

$$\delta \overline{\Psi}_{RI}(i\langle r \rangle) = \overline{\Psi}_R(r) - \overline{\Psi}_I(i\{r\}) \qquad \delta \overline{\Psi}_{RS}(s\langle r \rangle) = \overline{\Psi}_R(r) - \overline{\Psi}_S(s[r]) .$$

34. Psychosis: An Attempt to Regain Paradise

In male-Psychosis, (that is, in Conservative-, or Imaginary-Symbolic-Psychosis) labelled by “V” for “Verwerfung”) individuals seek to “plug” the “Superego Name-hole” by the Unconscious Foreclosure of a Non-infinitely-extended proportion of Symbolic-Imaginary Ego-tensor-variation into the Real (leaving a restricted proportion in the Symbolic-Imaginary), with which they seek to balance the effect of the Paternal Name. The male-Psychotic individual tries to construct a Phallic Function which has some unrepresentable component anchored in the unknowable Real, at the expense of appropriate symbolization in the Symbolic-Imaginary:

$$\Phi_V^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \Phi_V^{(\lambda)}[\Psi_C^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\})]$$

$$\Phi_V^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = K \tilde{\Psi}_C^{(\lambda)}(i\{s\}) \triangleright \hat{D}^{-1}[\vec{i}\{s\}] + (1-K) \Theta^{(\lambda)}(\vec{i}\{s[r]\}) ,$$

such that the male-Psychotic Jouissance is

$$J_V^{(\lambda)} = \left[\hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_V^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} .$$

We therefore find that:

$$J_V^{(\lambda)} = \left[-K \hat{D}[\tilde{\Psi}_C^{(\lambda)}(s)] \triangleleft 1 - (1-K) \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Theta^{(\lambda)}(\vec{i}\{s[r]\}) \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} .$$

Now, in male-Psychosis, there is an attempt constantly to maintain the psychosis by instantaneously making the equality:

$$(1-K) \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Theta^{(\lambda)}(\vec{i}\{s[r]\}) = \Pi\{s\} .$$

The male-Psychotic is thus governed by the equations for “excess-Jouissance”, namely:

$$\left[\nabla_K \bar{\partial}_\lambda (\varepsilon_{\gamma\dots[v]\dots\omega}^{(\lambda)}) \leftarrow \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_E^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} ,$$

$$\nabla_K \bar{\partial}_\lambda (\varepsilon_{\gamma\dots[v]\dots\omega}^{(\lambda)}) = \check{\partial}_\lambda (\varepsilon_{\gamma\dots[v]\dots\omega}^{(\lambda)}) - K \hat{\partial}_\lambda (\varepsilon_{\gamma\dots\omega}^{(\lambda)}) ,$$

$$\Phi_E^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \nabla \Phi_V^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \Phi_V^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] - \Phi_M^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s\}] .$$

We might conjecture that Real-, Nonconservative-, or female-Psychosis is represented by the situation given above for female-Sexuation when $H=0$. This “unbearable lightness of being” occurs through the experience of “Unbearable Jouissance” (labelled by “U”), under which extraordinary conditions the Subject is totally immersed in the Real, and the Ego-energy-tensor does not enter the equations, namely:

$$\left[\hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_U^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] \leftarrow -\bar{\Pi}[r] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} .$$

Neurosis might be seen as a case of “psychotic cross-over” involving “chiasmatic-Jouissance,” through which an individual seeks to make the identification $X \Pi\{s\} = \bar{\Pi}[r]$, (with $0 \leq X \leq 1$), and is thus governed by the equations:

$$\left[X \check{\partial}_\lambda \left(\varepsilon_{\varphi \dots \nu \dots \rho}^{(\lambda)} \right) \leftarrow -\hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \nabla_X \Phi_U^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)} ,$$

$$\nabla_X \Phi_U^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \Phi_U^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] - X \Phi_M^{(\lambda)}[\vec{i}\{s\}] .$$

35. The Problematics of (Post-)Structuralist Analysis

Žižek [77] gives a detailed interpretation of Lacan’s (Post-)Structuralist approach to analysis. We do bear in mind here Parker’s admonition that Žižek’s writing can appear convoluted and opaque since his view on philosophy is that it should challenge and question, rather than attempt to provide answers [210]. Žižek himself, however, disavows what he diagnoses as the modern desire to find “grand explanations” [211]. He also derides the “ass-kissing” required to become an “American academic” and states that he would prefer to be a professional advertizing copywriter [47]. His view is that Lacan refuses to stand in the place of Object-Big-A and lay down the Law regarding therapy and mental health, but rather tries to bring us to our own position in acknowledging our Desire. This is based in Lacan’s motto that “Speech alone is the key” to successful psychotherapy [4], [5]. In Lacan’s “Early” period (roughly 1940s – 1960s, as set forth particularly in “The Field and Function of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis” in [4]), he supported the binary polarization between on the one hand, “inauthentic” objectifying Knowledge, which silences the Subject; and on the other, “authentic” Truth, which empowers and affects the Subject. With this interpretation, the goal of therapy is to move clients psychically from a deceitful “neurotic” position, where they “lie through truth” – to an intermediate, dissimulating “hysterical” position, where they “affirm through lies” – to arrive finally at a new “super-factual” Knowledge which expresses Truth in “Full speech” (French – “parole pleine”) [77]. Here Lacan draws on Heidegger’s contrasting “Rede” (German – “discourse” or, perhaps “literacy”) and “Gerede” (German – “chatter,” or maybe, “aphasia”) [176], in his own distinction between “Full speech” or “True speech,” and

“Empty speech” (French – “parole vide”) [4], [5]. Full speech identifies with its Object and unites Subject with Desire; Empty speech in contrast alienates Subject from Desire [4], [5], [70]. As stated above, Empty speech can itself bring forth Truth about Desire; and between Full speech and Empty speech is a continuum, although fundamentally, Desire can never be fully spoken – there is no such thing as “Truth, whole Truth, nothing but Truth” [4], [5], [212]. Psychotherapy strives to give voice to difficult (French – “pénible”) Full speech as fully as possible under the prevailing circumstances.

36. Mathemephilia

Now, in the milieu of modern civilization, the Logos of Science is “pure Drive” which operates in the Real register, and is satisfied merely by the accumulation and discharge of Jouissance engendered by the discovery of ethically-unfettered “acephalic” Knowledge. Scientific satisfaction is not goal-driven, it cannot partake of the Symbolic, and Žižek thinks that it is the “fundamental fascist fantasy” to attempt to circumscribe Science within the realm of Truth [77]. Heidegger (in “What Calls for Thinking?” in [213]) opined that “science does not think” – that it suspends the “commonsense ontology” of Truth – that it is blind to its own metaphysical foundations – that it is dumb on its own hermeneutical limitations – that it is invariant to culturally-determined symbolic transformations – and that all of these features are completely necessary to its function and discourse [214]. Lacan would claim in contrast, that “Science Knows,” and Žižek finds this conclusion liberating. Thus, from the 1960s onwards, Lacan’s conception of “Scientific analysis” shifted radically. He came to identify Drive as an “acephalic,” non-Subjective Knowledge (unrelated to, and “ontologically” preceding Truth, although this situation of course invalidates the very concept of “ontology”), the pursuit of, and acquisition of, which, leads to satisfaction. This splits the therapeutic process into an inter-Subjective dialogue comprising two distinct yet interlinked

phases – the Interpretative one, dealing with Desire, and then the Constructive one, dealing with the “quasi-mutually-exclusive” *Jouissance* [215], [216], [217]. The first phase involves the interpretation of symptoms (from, for example, unconscious formations) in order to discover the Truth of the client’s Desire as that whose utility [218] lies only in its own self-reproduction, and not in its satiation. Here, the client must “recognize” and Subjectivize the significations suggested by the therapist. The second phase is critical to the success of therapy, as discussed by Freud in “A Child is Being Beaten” [219], for example. In essence, it involves the (re)(de)(con)struction of the radically unconscious “Fundamental Phantasy” [220] in order to establish Knowledge about the client’s Drive as that whose utility lies in the regulation of Desire, and in the control of access to *Jouissance*. Here, clients must suspend their own symbolizing in order to accept the therapist’s uncanny, logical explanations regarding the “acephalic” Knowledge of the “thou-art-that” [77] originating in the Real, which can never be remembered. Moreover, acceptance of this non-Subjective Knowledge actually de-Subjectifies the client, in a process called “Subjective Desensitization” [221]. Žižek [77] goes on to ask how these therapeutic understandings regarding the “quasi-mutually-exclusive” Truth of Desire, and Knowledge of Drive, can ever be coupled to achieve satisfaction of Drive with the concomitant introduction of the minimum of *Jouissance* into the space of Desire. His answer is that the Object-little-a (which, although the Object-cause of Desire, is not itself the unattainable Object of Desire), provides the motivation and frame for the circulation of Desire. As Desire metonymically displaces itself from Phantasy Object to Phantasy Object, it is the Object-little-a which gives formal consistency to these transient manifestations, and as such should be mathematically like an “algebraic sign” [69]. Under such conditions, Miller discusses a situation where one can say Constructively of the Real – “ça jouit” (French – “it’s enjoying it”), rather than Interpretatively, “ça parle” (French – “it’s speaking”) [222].

37. Gödelic Undecidability

We conclude with Klein's analysis of how the theoretical material outlined above relates to the psychotherapeutic enterprise [118]. We first note that Lacan, in "Science and Truth" (section VII, chapter 33 of [4]) formalizes psychoanalysis as a minimum-arithmetic scientific System in which the Subject-of-science is the Subject of the Unconscious Other. Next, we acknowledge that a scientific System in itself cannot say Truth or Falsehood; only the speaking Subject can do this. Empirically, it is discerned that the Subject speaks a natural, informal language; the Subject is thus meaningfully determined by linguistic signifiers, and tends towards "psychologizing thought" which presupposes a "natural morality" that prohibits Drive. This is emphatically not the psychoanalytical Subject-of-science. The methods of Logical Empiricism provide a self-referential theoretical framework which both depends upon, and must guarantee the Truth of, observations, as expressed in artificial, formal languages. In trying to show the structure of the scientific System, Logical Empiricism seeks to Suture the Subject as Subject-of-science which must always say Truth. This System, based in mathematical logic, is therefore structured by Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems. By implication the incomplete, inconsistent barred-Other is necessarily Lacking, such that properties of the barred-Other cannot be proved with reference of the barred-Other itself. In the field of the barred-Other, all constructive or interpretive psychoanalytic statements regarding the now divided-Subject, intended to make it complete or to make it consistent, are hence neither Truth nor Falsehood, but rather are Undecidable. This divided-Subject must thus be founded on arithmetic as governed by Peano's Set-theoretical Axioms [223]. Now, according to one of these Axioms, "zero is a number" as far as Set Theory is concerned. This "assertion of Nothing" is the basis for a new, painful, foundational Lack in the now divided-Subject who is therefore itself inconsistent, incomplete, and Undecidable as to Truth or Falsehood; and who thus seeks wholeness in a consistent, complete, and

Decidable Other – which, we have seen, does not exist. The nature of psychoanalytic therapy is delineated in these terms in “On Freud’s ‘Trieb’ and the Psychoanalyst’s Desire” in section VII, chapter 32 of [4]. The divided-Subject is thus divided by the Phantasy between necessary, logical Truth, and contingent, alterable Knowledge. The structure of the Phantasy is that Drive divides the divided-Subject from Desire; and that the Truth of Desire is actually exactly the divided-Subject’s incompleteness, inconsistency, and Undecidability. The divided-Subject, unable to utter a conclusive “yes” or “no” thus oscillates between claims of true and false constructions or interpretations and cannot be Sutured by the formal languages of Logical Empiricism. Therapy must therefore proceed by a lengthy and non-Logically-Empirical process whereby accumulated Knowledge is reduced and rejected, leading eventually to the acknowledgement of the divided-Subject and of the incomplete and inconsistent Other. At the end of therapy, the Subject’s Drive is related to the therapist’s Desire to formalize a language, structured by Gödel’s Incompleteness Theorems, in which the Subject can say Truth. If therapy is successful, this process produces an appropriate Subject-of-science and culminates in this Subject’s realization of the Truth of Drive.

38. Achieving the Impossible?

Now, Lacan’s breakthrough was to see that to disavow the parasitic Symbolic [50] is an “attempt at the impossible” [224] and leads to our becoming trapped in a mirror-world of Imaginary depiction, where depth of interpretation is impossible, and only one, superficial, authoritarian viewpoint prevails. Here, dreams, hearsay, and memories merely multiply idealized images of standard shapes. All cognitive surplus [225] is overloaded by passive consumption, vitiating any possibility of human creativity and individuation. Bereft of any Real, unmediated, experiential context, meaning is cloaked in a miasma of undecidability, hovering between miracle and metaphor. And here, our Desirous Lacks, ever seeking

satisfaction in Imaginary objects, which they can never possess in a Reality beyond the Symbolic, consume us utterly, and we fade into a pseudo-existence of mere imagining. If, on the other hand, we accept the Symbolic, we must remember that poets such as Bely [226] put forth a different dilemma. This is that we then lack the meta-mythology to escape the constant chaotic cascade of symbolization, since symbolization and mythologizing are self-referential – and we can only hope to extricate ourselves through the direct apprehension of sound, and the accompanying silences which can also speak loudly. This is the goal of Analysis, although we must realize that we still arrive inexorably at a consideration of the logomyth of glossolalial sonogenesis – a never-ending tale which is alogical, enlightening, magical, poetic, and symbolic [227]. However, by internalizing and synthesizing the symbols which thus arise, a true Subject-I can emerge to escape from a world where the “I am” is determined by those Other than me [228] – in which “I am” is forcibly and falsely dichotomized into being both the silent Other and the vocal Other – and where the sacred colour is fixed immutably at an Orange hue, rather than being allowed to refract the whole spectrum of Divinely-named experience [229]. The Aleolinguistic equation for Analysis represents a carefully controlled admixture of the Real into the Symbolic-Imaginary. This allows the recovery of the “Lost” (that is, repressed) “anti-Master-Signifiers” using the “Therapon” (Greek – “θεράπων” or “skilled servant”) of Symbolic tools. We can thus, at least to some extent, Symbolically “Name” the Ego, and eliminate a proportion of its Imaginary deceptive power. The result is something of an “inversion” of supplementary-Jouissance into “adventitious-Jouissance” (indicated by the label “A”):

$$\left[\tilde{\partial}_\lambda (\varepsilon_{\theta \dots [\rho] \dots \pi} \{s[r]\}) - \hat{D}[\vec{i}] \triangleleft \Phi_{A(Q)}^{(\lambda)} [\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] \leftarrow A_{(Q)}[r] \right]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)}$$

$$\Phi_{A(Q)}^{(\lambda)} [\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \bar{\nabla}_Q \Phi_A^{(\lambda)} [\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] = \frac{1}{2} (\Phi_F^{(\lambda)} [\vec{i}\{s[r]\}] + Q \Phi_M^{(\lambda)} [\vec{i}\{s\}])$$

$$A_{(Q)}[r] = \bar{\Delta}_Q \bar{\Pi}[r] = \frac{1}{2} ((1-Q) \bar{\Pi}[r] + Q \Pi\{s\}) .$$

39. Analysis and Atheistic Spirituality

Now, we learn from Jung that a chaotic but recoverable Ego-extinction and descent into the dark, primordial abyss of the subconscious, is required for psychic healing and integration into true god-Selfs [230]. Modern Freemasonic symbolism [231] is rooted in the “Great Lights” of the “Square and Compasses” – ostensibly standing for honesty and control. However, the deeper reading of this is that the Square represents baseness, earth, female, receptivity, sensuality, vagina, kteis; the Compasses represent elevation, heavens, male, activity, spirituality, penis, phallus. Thus the combination of Compasses straddling Square in fact represents the resolution (but not the unobtainable “exact solution”) of the task of “Circling the Square” [232]. This is Lacan’s utterly horrific analytical moment at which a client grasps the paradox of the inadequacy of language [31], [185], as symbolized by the logically and visually impossible “circular square” [50]. Rather than pursuing an ultimately futile attempt to reconcile the two sets of opposing characteristics, their fundamental differences are acknowledged and celebrated, and these are instead synthesized through the symbolic “petit mort” of the “ἱερός γάμος” (Greek – “holy wedding”) [233]. This acts as an Apostelic “Oorsprong” (Dutch – “Origin”) [234] of a new “Organischesganzes” – an organic whole [235] – which provides a “natural philosophy” of “Atheïstische Spiritualiteit” (Dutch – “Atheistic Spirituality”) [236], [237], which transcends the initial difficulties, and is flexible enough to tackle all problems but in a fluid, iterative, and approximate way. Here we recall Derrida, who self-identified with Augustine of Hippo and yet who claimed that “I rightly pass for an atheist” whilst also stating “Maybe I’m not an atheist” [238], [239]. In seeking to divert Western philosophy’s futile search for the “transcendental signifier,” he instigated the never-satiated Deconstructive “religion (without religion),” which seeks through the shedding of Messianic “prayers and tears,” to create the “non-lieu” (French – “non-place”) which is not an “enclosure in nothingness” but rather a positive space for “openness to the Other” [240].

40. Self-Recreation as God-Images

We have seen above that Humanity's "likeness" to God guarantees that every human being possesses the existential possibility of being a proper earthly representative of God. The gap between the potentiality of this and its realization is described by Lewis as "Sehnsucht" (German – "inconsolable longing") for "we know not what" [241], [242], [243]. Despite being a universal and constantly present feeling, it is intensely personal, that "for which we are made," and yet it is inexpressible in language, and this "soul's secret signature" sits as a "yawning gulf" of non-communicability between individuals. As the "reminder of a memory" it suggests never-heard musical echoes, unsmelled scents, visions of never-visited lands, and promises of things not-even-unknown. The unrequited longing or "painful joy" engendered by these spectres is sweeter than their possible materialization in reality. We here make the link between Sehnsucht and Lacanian supplementary-Jouissance or non-phallic-Jouissance which does not "exist" but rather "ex-sists" [5], [62]. Such "ex-sistences" can only be "known" by experience, and are "lawless" and "unspeakable" since they cannot be described adequately by language [62]. They do not ex-sist "in" the experiences but can only be expressed "through" them [242], as seen in the mystical "ec-stasies" of Christian Saints Teresa of Ávila [244] and John of the Cross [245]. Saint Thérèse of Lisieux describes such intense feelings as "my heart's most secret and deepest longings" [246]. Clines [247] sums up by stating that in the Genesis narrative the whole of Humanity is created with the potential to express God's Image – and that this potentiality is perfected in the Incarnation narrative in which Humanity can become fully "Human-in-God" through the one true image of Christ. In Duncan's terms this reconciliation of Human and Divine natures heals "schizophrenic" or "psychically deluded" Humanity of the hurt induced by its "ultimate sin" in Eden, of trying on the promised mantle of "God-likeness" [94].

41. Semiotic Sorcery

Let us now associate the inscription of the mathemes of Lacan's "Desire-graph" with the semiotic sorcery of Circe, daughter of Hecate and of Helios, by which she binds Odysseus and his men in the form of swine. Virgil recounts this episode in "The Eclogues" through the mouths of his two shepherds who are trying to compete with Orpheus' enchanting skills – "First with these three triple threads in separate colours three / I bind you, then about this altar thrice I bear / Your puppet self; uneven numbers please the god / ... / Tie the three colours, Amaryllis, in three knots" ([248], Book VIII, lines 73 – 75). Lacan notes that Gide, in "Paludes," perpetuates the puerile joke of hyper-literally (mis)translating line 75, "numero Deus impare gaudet" as "le numéro deux se réjouit d'être impair" (French – "number two is happy being odd") [249]. Gide here claims that writing is always collaborative – and that the part played by the "God-Unconscious" is inversely proportional to the author's willed control. He immediately calls for the reader to (re)(de)(con)struct his work, seeking a "revelation of things from everywhere" – things that have ended up in his text without the author's knowledge [249]. For Lacan, this observation opens up many possibilities, as Rabaté explores [31]. So, let us make a count of one ... two ... three ... before we begin [86]. The first effect of this "impair" is that we start to conceive of even numbers as paired unities. This disrupts the primordial dichotomy of "parity" (from Latin "par, -is" – "equal") as the "archetypal" even number "two" (from which all other even numbers are derived by simple multiplication) is subverted to "oddness" – and moreover it "rejoices" in this! Lacan goes further and claims that "evenness" is only special in contrast to "oddness" – and that this is why "three" is the "magic number" which drives the formation of the polychromatic Borromean Knot [86], [250]. This knot is a "magical" type of "Brunnian link" formed from three non-geometrically-perfect or geometrically-distorted circles, and is such that if any one of its elements is removed the remaining pair becomes unlinked [251]. Lacan's "odd knot"

binds together the Real, the Symbolic and the Imaginary such as to signify loosely-written “hérésie” (from the French pronunciation of the letters “R – S – I”). In this sense it embraces and engulfs the “perverse paternal hole” of “God-Jouissance,” and “l’impair” (French – “the oddness”) offers the chance of joy and liberation [249]. This heretical Borromean Knot frees humanity by puncturing “Real-ity” and allowing the literary expression of the “Jouissance of the Other” in a constant genesis of new “circle-squaring” meanings. This is reminiscent of the Hermetic conception of Atum the One which contains all dualities but is not itself dual; and which is identical with the All-for-One Mind that cannot be circumscribed; which contains All without limit, even unto the entire Cosmos [252]. These understandings of Atum urge us on reverential meditation on the mysteries of life – a single wondrous Artwork by an un-Nameable Master-crafter – of whom Beckett’s Estragon asks “His name is Godot?” ([253], act 1). And despite the stupefying beauty of “Godot’s archaic perfection” this is nevertheless a work which Vladimir realizes can at any time instantaneously vaporize, leaving us alone, as we began, adrift in emptiness. So our only choice is to attempt artistic, anentropic “creatio ex nihilo” – a gravely comedic, hopefully hopeless, brightly shadowed, task – before our atomic ashes are cast adrift on the Cosmic tides once more.

42. Passion *avec* Altruism

Thus, we must come to realize that “il s’agit de défaire le bon nœud” (French – “it’s all about untying the good knot”) so that we discover our “bonheur” (French – “happiness”) [86]. In fact, for Lacan, the refuse of this discharge of Jouissance is the “Saint Homme” – the “Holy Man” who “makes litter of the Letter” [2], and who can truly say “Oui, le bonheur et la grâce m’accompagneront / Tous les jours de ma vie” (Psaumes 23:6 [254]) – “Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life” [200]. The reason for this is God-given – “Car la prophétie n’est jamais venue par la volonté de l’homme, mais de saints hommes de Dieu

ont parlé, étant poussés par l'Esprit Saint" (2 Pierre 1:21) [255] – “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” [256]. Now we recall from 1 John 4:16 that “Deus caritas est” [257] – “ὁ θεός ἀγάπη εἰμί” [258] – “God is love” [200]. Here the Latin “caritas” (and in this case, the Greek word “ἀγάπη” – “agapē”) is generally taken to mean specifically “altruistic loving kindness,” as discussed in [259], [260], [261]. God pours out this “love” which glorifies and reflects His nature, in order to perfect humanity. It is willed not affective, and can be self-sacrificing. This is the “love” through which comes Salvation in Christ, as John 3:16 states – “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son” [200]. The self-sacrifice reunites Word with Image opening the possibility of human access to the Real once again. This “perfect love,” according to 1 Corinthians 13, surpasses all the “tongues of men and of angels” – all “prophetic powers” – all “mysterious understanding” – the entire wealth of accumulated knowledge – and all magical and physical abilities [200]. Augustine differed from this somewhat, in reading “caritas” as a synthesis of object-driven, passionate “ἔρως” (“erōs”) and non-objectifying, affectionate “agapē” [262], although this view was strongly opposed by Nygren [263]. Williams supports the former view in holding that God bestows “agapē” on those who seek it through “erōs” [264]. This view is endorsed by Pope Benedict XVI who defines “caritas” as a dynamic balance of giving and receiving [265]. Process theologians hold that “agapē” creates value in an Object such that it can then be enjoyed by a Subject through the exercise of “erōs” [266]. In this sense we can understand the logician Whitehead’s claim that God seeks to value the World as the realization of all potentiality [267], and Heschel’s further claim that He “suffers” when a response is not forthcoming through Humanity [268]. In all these interpretations we see a mutuality of relationship “God \diamond Humanity” which reflects the reciprocity of the relationship “Human \diamond Human” [269].

43. Sign(if)ying – Imag(in)ing – S(ens)ing

Now, to paraphrase Grosseteste [270], the fleshy body might be characterized as suffering from imperfection in four respects, namely “passibilitas, obscuritas, tarditas, corporalitas” (Latin – “sensateness, obscurity, slowness, materiality”). In contrast, as Heavenly Bridegroom, Christ’s Spiritual Body is endowed with the corresponding perfections, namely: “impassibilitas, claritas, agilitas, subtilitas” (Latin – “impassibility, clarity, agility, subtlety”) [271]. Lacan extends this standard exegesis and claims, in fact, that the greatest virtue of the “Saint Homme” is that of “trashitas” [212], perhaps reading the maxim regarding God-love as “altruism is mutual,” which can be seen as offering a way out of the so-called “misery trap” of relationless existence [272]. This perverse grace allows the impervious Saint Homme constantly to appear as the Other which is the source of the always-unsatiated heterogeneous Desire in the Subject of the Unconscious [273]. This is also important in overcoming Brooker’s “shitasmia” [274], which is the vomit-inducing pastiche of fabricated friendliness defined and created by modern advertising. This cultural-emotional artefact simultaneously evokes feelings of anger, disgust, embarrassment, and vertigo. Along similar lines, Hart [275] finds throughout “Finnegans Wake” the presence of the mandala-like “quincunx” formed from a sphere-sectioned-circle which circumscribes a cross formed from two interlocking circles. Here again is the Borromean Knot [86], which Rabaté [31] identifies as representing the “Trinitarian Schema” of the entire “Wake” in which the Cosmos is identified with the everchanging “chaosmos of Alle” [169], where form and structure interpenetrate in Deleuze’s immanent “organless body” [79], [276]. Here the “continually more or less intermisunderstanding minds of the anticollaborators” must be always “abcdminded” (alphabet minded?) [169] of the mysterious “Wake-Letter” – communing with the Real through “curios of signs” in all modes of expression, be these gestures, postures, or symbols [190]. Marvin [190] goes further to suggest that Joyce here even reflects Einstein’s

contemporaneous and arcane delvings into the realms of paradoxical relativistic (un)reality. And yet Einstein, motivated by Plato's idea of changeless, ideal Forms that transcend all transient physical appearances, could not accept Bohr's quantum-chaotic interpretation of a fundamentally probabilistic and uncertain Cosmos [277], [278]. The staggering scientific breakthroughs in modern physics nevertheless leave human beings in a limitless yet nonsensical world, shot through with primal Fluxus, where we can but beg repeatedly of the Cosmos, "what do you mean?" [190]. In this sense, Joyce seems to be exhorting humanity to a synthetic psychological "coniunctio" through his work. He calls on his readers to dive into the primordial sea of signification, and to take up the challenge of this multifaceted reality in which every word opens up many worlds. It is revealing to note here that Lacan, in his attempt to surpass the tripartite schema of sign(if)ying – imag(in)ing – s(ens)ing, and to convey the unmediated Real – "to show rather than to say" ([279], proposition 4.1212) – is nevertheless forced to fall back on mathematical topology which itself is a form of Symbolic modelling. He is thus in the position of the Wittgensteinian viewers who know that here they see, and yet cannot see here their own eyes ([279], propositions 5.541 – 5.641). And this attempt at a knotty reconciliation of opposites might be the reason behind the Wake's "commodius vicus of recirculation" – the "riverrun, past Eve's and Adam's" ([169], first line) which in its ending snakes back on itself – "The keys to. Given! A way a lone a last a loved a long the" ([169], last line). And today, a long, lonely, loveless way away from Eden, we still try to turn back time, and to wrest back the scientific keys to Paradise, even constructing molecular Borromean Knots from DNA [280]. For, as Jesus himself says in Matthew 16 – "{19} I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" [200] – in a mystical reuniting of binding / releasing – heaven / earth. And, it is only when we have rediscovered the "allaphbed" of creation that we can truly exist in the present time-space

[190] and realize that it is thus that we can and should have “lived und laughed and loved end left” [169].

44. The Scapegoat-Magus

Now in these terms, even an unnamed redactor can truly indicate that the metaphysical lies that seek to proscribe comedy, to rupture knowledge from wisdom, and to deny plurality in unity, are the root of an ultimately fatal linguistic cancer [281]. We must atone for this with the execution of a properly designed extra-mural symbolic sacrifice which erases the cancer's internal signature [282]. In terms of the magical “psycho(a)logical” search for creative human growth Derrida noted that In Plato's work the “Phædrus” [283] the undecidable Greek word “φάρμακον” obeys an “aberrant logic” (or “(a)logic”) – meaning, simultaneously, “magic potion, cure, remedy, poison” [141]. Like the modern word “drug” the term “φάρμακον” is polarized, containing and recalling its own opposite and calling into question all dichotomies. And thus we come full circle to acknowledge the magical enchantment of language since, in fact, Socrates himself is slandered as “φαρμακεύς” (Greek – “magician, poisoner”) by his enemies, who accuse him of being a “Lingwiz'd of Is” – an “Essendi Incantator” – a “Techneglossist” – a “Hakīsaḥīr” – a “Šamán Faciendi” – of doing “magic with words” – before “curing” their own society by forcing him to drink his own “φάρμακον.” And this leads us to the final realization – not made explicit by Plato but lurking below the surface of all his “pharmaceutical” writing – and that is that writing is the necessary, undecidable “φαρμακός” or “scapegoat” of philosophy, a sorcerous evil which must be cast out from the interior in order to maintain its purity in order to prevent philosophy attacking itself from within, by “repeating without knowing” [284]. We return here to the Freudian “Antithetical Meaning of Primal Words” [116], [285] since the scapegoat is of course the necessarily dumb sacrificial creature allowed to escape only in order to fulfil its totemic function in carrying

away the sins of the people. Lacan links this “au-moins-un” (French – “at-least-one”) with Freud’s primordial, bestial Father, the source of *Jouissance*, from whom all self-respecting human clans descend [122], [123], [286]. Christ, in contrast, as the embodiment of “God’s Word,” made in “God’s Image,” is the scapegoat who is not allowed to escape, and who is crucified in order to atone for the Original Sin of the people, thus allowing them to transcend the constitutional human condition of signifier-Castration. Eco [287], the “Semiotic Sorcerer,” manipulates the Symbolic realm to describe the fate of the blind monk Jorge of Burgos [288]. He, having constructed an entire Imaginary world which of course he cannot see – guarded not by an “*īdolum*” (Latin – “idol”) but rather by an “*εἶδωλον*” (Greek – “image, form; apparition, ghost, spectre”) – in order to sustain his twisted mirror-philosophy – cannot stand the encroachment of the Real (in the form of Aristotle’s lost Second Book of Poetics, “*Περὶ ποιητικῆς*,” written about 335 BCE, which might serve as an ancient (re)(de)(con)structive virus that attacks theology and metaphysics) – and instead chooses to end everything in conflagration. The individual (analyst-therapist) sacrificed to the Word is thus both scapegoat and magician, who dies amidst destruction in the Real and in doing so frees others’ expression [289]. Girard identifies this violently tragic sacrifice as the prototypical generator of all myth in Barthes’ sense [290], [291].

45. The Synthesis of Methodology and Wisdom

Despite the revelations and resolutions arising from all these Structuralist delvings, Zerzan [33] nevertheless decries all such Projects (citing the work of Barthes, Foucault, Derrida, Lacan, and Lévi-Strauss) which he claims have abandoned the search for the “meaning of language” in their constant questioning of its functions and methods. However, I would assert that by theorizing new concepts, processes, relationships and structures, all of these Projects do succeed in extending the matrixial frontiers of language into plural, non-Objectifying

realms where femininity-Otherness and masculinity-Oneness are always already interrelated [292]. In Lacanian terms, the necessary “price” for this transformative therapeutic transaction is that individuals disconnect from the need for autoerotic relations with their own bodies, thus allowing them fully to partake of language’s paradoxical symbolic freedoms [50]. The analytical mathematical-symbolic-imaginary investigations of the “shapes and shadows” of the Borromean Knot allow us to open doorways to “new states” of Being and Becoming, and to explore safely an array of multiply-interlocking, unpredictable, and yet wondrous “hyper-realities” of psychic potentiality [280]. We realize that the reconnection of the Phallic Function along our Life-paths in our own “(private) languages” is able to account (either Frictionally or Frictionlessly) for the (possibly infinitely many) psycho-linguistically-motivated chaotic changes in our Ego-tensors. And so we are able to “embrace our Lacanian mathemes.” In this way analysis can hope to achieve some “integration” within each client – emotionally, environmentally, psychically, physiologically, and socially [235] – leading to a more complete and fully-individuated (even if this is in the end still multiple and fragmented) “I” which is creator of its own personal reality [205]. And thus we can escape from the animal realm of the One with its corporeal emptiness ending in oblivion – and enter the realm of Other, which is one of Desire, generativity and sexuality, encouraging in specific cases literal birth, and in general the figurative birth of possibility. We are once again back with Eve in Eden, she who obeys her instinctive drive to transcend abstract, mundane, manufactured, simulacral fantasy and rather immerses herself in concrete, instantaneous, unknown reality [230], regaining true sustainable life, and synthesizing methodology with wisdom [293].

Summary

In terms of the “secret and magical covenant” of language we note that in Genesis, God creates “ex nihilo” with the “symbolic invocation” of the Word; human communication creates a cognate “new order of being in the relations between men”. Here, God is the “au-moins-un” (French – “at-least-one”), Freud’s primordial, bestial Father, the source of Jouissance, from whom all self-respecting human clans descend. When God withdrew His Name, He exiled Humanity from un-Symbolizable immersion in the Edenic Real to grope for self-made meaning in the Symbolic register under the tyranny of the process of “reification” by which we make the equation “words = reality.” Moreover, since language messages are self-referential, both in form and in content, this leads to chaotic evolution in personal psychic individuation. For Lacan, Signifier and Signified are separated by an un-Signifiable “Bar” (the “Phallus”) over which the Signifier slides metonymically, fundamentally confounding Signification and confusing language and communication. Lacan saw how this continuous Möbius-topology leads to the collapse of binary oppositions such as – Inside / Outside – Love / Hate – Self / Other – Truth / Image – Master / Analyst. In the light of this, Lacan went on to replace Freud’s somewhat static triadic psychic subdivision into Id, Ego, and Superego with the more dynamic linguistic signifying processes of Imaginary, Symbolic, and Real, each of which defines a Register of experience, and whose interplay mediates and reflects the process of human individuation through language.

The Unconscious is composed of chains of discontinuous Symbolic elements and the Unconscious meaning-maker partakes of the “Symbolic register” – all that cannot be symbolized resides in the “Real register” of experience. Lacan expressed this contrast by saying that the Symbolic “never ceases to be written” – and the Real “never ceases of not

being written". The Symbolic defines and organizes the Subject through infinitely-recursive "Semiotic Web" of language – it reflects Peirce's "symbol" and Saussure's "signifier". Language is thus involved in each of the Symbolic, the Imaginary, and the Real registers. Lacan's work is constructed around the concept of a "radically alien," cultural-linguistic, "Symbolic Other" as "Object-Big-A" and stresses the difference of this from the natural, illusory "Imaginary other" as "Object-little-a" which is to do with the utter impossibility of complete symbolization. Language and speech are thus consciously controlled neither by the Subject nor by the Ego: they arise from the Other which is located in the Unconscious. Lacan later came to identify "Mirror-structuring" as defining all of Subjective experience; in particular, it controls the fundamentally conflicting relationship between Subjects and their Body-images. The Imaginary register is formed by internalization of these coherent images – it reflects Peirce's unmediated "icon" and Saussure's conceptual "signified." The Imaginary, as Register of signification and signifieds, thus has a linguistic facet, and as such it is structured by the Symbolic, the register of signifiers. The Symbolic determines Subjectivity; the Imaginary is an effect of the Symbolic. The Symbolic and the Imaginary Registers are mirror-related by asymmetric "projective twists." At the same time, the infant's parents make magical symbolic associations between the Image, and themselves and others, through words and names. This symbolic magic unconsciously defines the infant's developing identity "exoterically," through its manipulation of discrete images and their relations and combinations. Moreover, self-identification through language naturally leads to Objectification of the Subject, thus dissolving the Subject – Object boundary. Lacan was thus careful to differentiate "Self = Me" (the "Subject of Being" which is located in the Imaginary register) from "Self = I" (the "Subject of Language" which operates in the Symbolic register). Lacan understands the importance of gaze in the "Mirror Phase" of development which establishes a dialectic between Imaginary "Ideal-Ego" and Symbolic "Ego-Ideal." Lacan

proposed the “Phallus” as the Object promised to the infant for future use in the Symbolic, to make up for the Loss of the Images in the Imaginary. The Phallic Function (which expresses the Imaginary through the Symbolic by means of language) is given as a functional derivative, namely by the Imaginary fragmentation of the Ego-energy-density as projected into the Symbolic.

Whereas as a structure, language exists independent of anything else, speech requires, and sites, both a speaker as the Subject who expresses Desires, and a listener as the Other who recognizes those Desires. The Subject is located in the Symbolic, but in general, the act of speech unleashes uncontrollable unconscious semiotic chains, thus allowing precedence to fall to Images from the Imaginary, produced by the Ego, which tend to block the recognition of the Subject’s true Desires. Lacan later changed his stance on the role the Symbolic, and of language, with its inherently impersonal structure, which he came to see as necessarily identity-blocking and alienating. In fact, the expression of Desire by speaking in language introduces a twofold Loss. We could say that whereas Wishes are conscious, Desires are unconscious Wishes for which “Object = Lack.” This Lack is represented by Object-little-a, not in the sense that Object-little-a is the “attractor” and end of the dialectal, socially-constructed Desire, but rather in the sense that it is the “Object-cause” of the Desire. Lacan claims that Lack of Being metonymically drives the neurotic’s Desire; however, in the slippery play of signification, Desires undergo constant metonymic re-Symbolization above the Phallic Bar, and can thus never “cross the Bar” and be fully symbolized, and totally satiated. The only escape from this frustrated metonymic Desire-chain, is when a Desire-signifier “crosses the Bar” using metaphor and becomes a Desire-signified. Lacan discusses three positions for the Father, corresponding to each of the three Registers. The Symbolic Father represents and exercises the Paternal Function which enforces the Phallic Law and

which controls the Subject's Desire through the "Œdipus Complex."

In successful psychic maturation, symbolic "Castration" allows "expulsion" of Jouissance, and the introduction of necessary Loss, in an evolution to psychic equilibrium. In the Imaginary register, the image of this Phantasy Object is the "Object-little-a" – it is the Other's "lost Object" which depicts the "absence of Subject" with which the Subject nevertheless paradoxically constantly tries to self-identify, but always in vain. Blocks to psychic development are also represented as Jouissance. Desires, always unsatiated, are one way of controlling Jouissance. Utilization of the language of the Symbolic register is a form of semiotic "Castration," allowing "shifts" and "discharge" of Jouissance, and the introduction of Loss, in an evolution towards psychic equilibrium. Lacan linked his idea that language creates and maintains the Ego with Freud's association of the Ego with delusion, hallucination, "Ego-misrecognition," and "Subjective-oblivion." This single male excluded from the Phallic Law is the "Primal Father" whose Name induces "Phallic Jouissance" in all other men. The very existence of such a Primal Father drives male-Sexuated individuals in their ever-unfulfillable Desire. The interpretation of this is that since concrete Phallic Jouissance is mediated by the utterly abstract Symbolic, then it must always be experienced as Lack. Male-Jouissance is denumerable, and male-Sexuation is defined by contradiction in terms of a countable infinity of entities; in contrast female-Jouissance is non-denumerable, and female-Sexuation is defined by undecidability in terms of an uncountable infinity of entities. If the defining equation is that "sexual Object = Phallus" (where the Phallic Object here signifies a generalized "power" function) then female-Sexuation is in operation; and if the equation is that "sexual Object = Fetish" then male-Sexuation is in operation. Male-Sexuated individuals constantly "enumerate" Jouissance in a vain attempt to quantify it completely; female-Sexuated individuals are tantalized by totalized, enveloping Jouissance,

which evades them even as they try to describe it. It may well be that the only true difference between male Jouissance and female Jouissance is expressed as a difference in the enjoying gained from the speech act – male-Sexuated speech is “goal-directed” and signification-driven; whereas female-Sexuated speech is “non-goal-directed” and satisfaction-driven, and “takes pleasure in the act of speaking itself.” The idealized male role involves total union with the Symbolic, and internalization of the signifier. The Phallus is thus both an Imaginary Lack-Object, and a Symbol of Desire. The Sexuation Formulas posit a linguistic-constructive Knowledge-system totally ruled by Symbolic Law, which is simultaneously “not-All.” When neurotically repressed, the Name’s function breaks unconsciously through into the Symbolic in speech. But, in psychosis, an individual experiences an inassimilable signifier, which disrupts the Paternal Function, and “ruptures” the Symbolic register such that the Name undergoes “Foreclosure” from the Symbolic.

The Borromean “odd knot” binds together the Real, the Symbolic and the Imaginary such as to signify loosely-written “hérésie” which reveals a mutuality of relationship “Father \diamond Humanity” underpinning the reciprocity of the relationship “Human \diamond Human.” Lacan claims that “Science Knows,” and formalizes psychoanalysis as a minimum-arithmetic scientific System in which the Subject-of-science is the Subject of the Unconscious Other. Empirically, it is discerned that the Subject speaks a natural, informal language; the Subject is thus meaningfully determined by linguistic signifiers, and tends towards “psychologizing thought” which presupposes a “natural morality” that prohibits Drive. Therapy seeks to use language in its Symbolic aspect to change to the client’s perceptions of the dependent Imaginary images, and thus to change the client’s Subjective experiences. The necessary “price” for this transformative therapeutic transaction is that individuals disconnect from the need for autoerotic relations with their own bodies, thus allowing them fully to partake of language’s

paradoxical Symbolic freedoms. Full-speech identifies with its Object and unites Subject with Desire; Empty-speech in contrast alienates Subject from Desire. Empty-speech can itself bring forth Truth about Desire; and between Full speech and Empty speech is a continuum, although fundamentally, Desire can never be fully spoken – there is no such thing as “Truth, whole Truth, nothing but Truth.” In trying to show the structure of the scientific System, Logical Empiricism seeks to Suture the Subject as Subject-of-science which must always say Truth. The divided-Subject is thus divided by the Phantasy between necessary, logical Truth, and contingent, alterable Knowledge. The structure of the Phantasy is that Drive divides the divided-Subject from Desire; and that the Truth of Desire is actually exactly the divided-Subject’s incompleteness, inconsistency, and Undecidability. These insights allows us to create the therapeutic space required to cut through the Knot so as to “Traverse the Phantasy,” to accept Subjective responsibility, and to acquiesce in the innocence of the Other, the Object-Big-A in the Loss of the Imaginary Object of Desire, the Object-little-a. At the end of therapy, the Subject’s Drive is related to the therapist’s Desire to formalize a language, structured by Gödel’s Incompleteness Theorems, in which the Subject can say Truth. If therapy is successful, this process produces an appropriate Subject-of-science and culminates in this Subject’s realization of the Truth of Drive.

References

- [0] Saal, F (1997) Lacan <> Derrida. *Journal of European Psychoanalysis*. Number 3 / 4 (Spring 1996 / Winter 1997). URL: <http://www.psychomedia.it/jep/pages/number3-4.htm>.
- [1] Walker, M (1980) *Visionary Love: A Spirit Book of Gay Mythology*. San Francisco CA: Treeroots.
- [2] Lacan, J; Stone, J W (translator); Miller, J-A (editor) (1987) "Lituraterre". *Ornicar?* Number 41 (April / June 1987), pp 5 – 13; URL: <http://web.missouri.edu/~stonej/Lituraterre.pdf>.
- [3] Appignanesi, R, Garratt, C, Sardar, Z and Curry, P (2005) *Introducing Postmodernism*. London UK: Icon.
- [4] Lacan, J; Fink, B (editor, translator); Fink, H and Grigg, R (collaborators) (2006) "Écrits": *The First Complete Edition in English*. New York NY: Norton.
- [5] Fink, B (2004) *Lacan to the Letter: Reading "Écrits" Closely*. St Paul MN: University of Minnesota.
- [6] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor); Fink, B (translator) (1999): *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan (Book XX: "Encore" – On Feminine Sexuality, The Limits of Love and Knowledge 1972 – 1973)*. New York NY: Norton.
- [7] Johnston, A; Ayerza, J (editor) (1999) *Lacan's Purloined Linguistics: "Lalangue" and Languages in "Encore"*. *Lacanian Ink*. Number 14 (Spring 1999). URL: <http://www.lacan.com/frameXIV5.htm>.
- [8] Kristeva, J (1991) *Language: The Unknown: An Initiation into Linguistics*. New York NY: Columbia University.
- [9] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 1: The Magical Nature of Natural Language*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926013>.
- [10] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 2: Lingwizd'ry: The Craefy Science of*

- Language. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926020>.
- [11] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 3: Technoglossy and the Linguistic Labyrinth*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926037>.
- [12] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 4: Mathesis and the Metaphysical Maze*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926044>.
- [13] Jemmer, P W and Yoeli, J (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 5: Anti-philosophy as "Wiseloving"*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926051>.
- [14] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 6: Psycho-chaotic Semiotics and Psycho(a)logical Autopoiesis*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926068>.
- [15] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 7: Language: Lies, Laughter and Evolution*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926075>.
- [16] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 8: Linguistic Logomyths*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926082>.
- [17] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 9: Lingua Dei Nomina Creationis*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926099>.
- [18] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 10: Vis Voces Magicaeque Verborum*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926105>.
- [19] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 11: ReCreating OurSelves in Gods' Images*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926112>.
- [20] Jemmer, P W (2010) *Enchant Newcastle Part 12: A Shaman of Becoming I'll Be*. Newcastle UK: NewPhilSoc. URL: <http://tinyurl.com/isbn9781907926129>.
- [21] Dennett, D C (1991) *Consciousness Explained*. New York NY: Little Brown.
- [22] Fodor, J A (1975) *The Language of Thought*. New York NY: Crowell.
- [23] Joyce, J (1990) *Ulysses*. New York NY: Vintage.

- [24] Lacan, J; Aubert, J (editor) (1987) “Joyce avec Lacan”. Paris FRA: Navarin.
- [25] Calliou, S (Band, M) (1996) Shaking Rattles in All Directions: A Case Study / Story of a Female “Indian” Student Attending a EuroCanadian University (1991 –) Located on the Traditional Territory of the Musqueam. Faculty of Graduate Studies (Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction): Unpublished PhD Thesis. Vancouver CAN: University of British Columbia.
- [26] Sarma, J (2010) Art and Artificiality: The Re/De(con)struction of “Natural” Gender in 1990s Visual Culture. Department of Visual Arts: Unpublished MA Thesis (Art History). Ontario CAN: University of Western Ontario.
- [27] Stepancic, T; Klemperer, O (conductor) (2010) Den Haag All Stars Ensemble: First Performance / Presentation as Part of DHAS residence in Studio LOOS (2 December 2010): re/de/con/struction. URL: <http://denhaagallstars.tumblr.com/concerts>.
- [28] Emmett, R B (1996) Economic History Association: Henet: HES: Editorial (Original: 3 December 1996; Cache 17 January 2011): Whig H of E is Dead: Now What? URL: <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:nB9WcKB1A9QJ:eh.net/pipermail/hes/1996-November/004822.html+Whig+H+of+E+is+Dead&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=uk&source=www.google.co.uk>.
- [29] Phillips, J (2009) Course Web Page of John Phillips: Jacques Derrida: Derrida Pages: Articles 4: Introduction to Derrida: Derrida and Deconstruction (Parts 1 – 3). URL: <http://courses.nus.edu.sg/course/elljwp/derriduction.htm>.
- [30] Tishchenko, P D (cited); Maylenova F G (2011) Complex Human Studies and Virtualistics: Preface (Tishchenko, P D: Biotechnological (Re)-(de)-(con)-struction of Human Nature: The Case of Sexuality). URL: http://www.intelros.ru/pdf/Etik_misl/3/2.pdf.
- [31] Rabaté, J-M (2006) Aspace of Dumbillsilly: When Joyce Translates Lacan. Critical Quarterly. Volume 48, Issue 1, pp 26 – 42.

- [32] Wolf, M (2008) *Proust and the Squid: The Story and Science of the Reading Brain*. London UK: Icon.
- [33] Zerzan, J (2007) *Primitivism: The Pursuit of Ways of Life Running Counter to the Development of Technology, its Alienating Antecedents, and the Ensemble of Changes Wrought by Both: Writings Language: Origin and Meaning*. URL: <http://www.primitivism.com/language.htm>.
- [34] Dowd, T; David, D (editor) (2006) *A Critical Review of the Current Trends in Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology – Chapter 1: Cognitive Behaviour Therapy: Evidence and New Directions*. Hauppauge NY: Nova Science.
- [35] Freud, S; Strachey, J (translator) (1968) *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (Volume XXI: 1927 1931: The Future of an Illusion, Civilization and its Discontents, and Other Works)*. London UK: Hogarth.
- [36] Barr, S (1965) *Experiments in Topology*. London UK: John Murray.
- [37] Evans, D; Wilson, E O, Crews, F C, Gottschall, J and Wilson, D S (editors) (2005). *The Literary Animal: Evolution and the Nature of Narrative (Rethinking Theory) – From Lacan to Darwin*. Evanston IL: Northwestern University.
- [38] Eco, U; Weaver, W (translator) (1990) *Foucault's Pendulum*. London UK: Secker and Warburg.
- [39] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor); Porter, D (translator) (1992): *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan (Book VII: Ethics of Psychoanalysis 1959 – 1960)*. New York NY: Norton
- [40] Wagnière, G H (2007) *On Chirality and the Universal Asymmetry: Reflections on Image and Mirror Image*. Weinheim GER: Wiley VCH.
- [41] Author Unknown (2008) *Drew's Script-o-Rama: The Rocky Horror Picture Show: A Screenplay by Jim Sharman and Richard O'Brien (Adapted from "The Rocky Horror Show": A Musical with Book, Music and Lyrics by Richard O'Brian)*. URL:

<http://www.godamongdirectors.com/scripts/rhps.shtml>.

[42] Seckel, A (2006) *Optical Illusions: The Science of Visual Perception (Illusion Works)*. Tonawanda NY: Firefly.

[43] Scroggie, J (2008) *Tic-tac Teddy Bears and Teardrop Tattoos: The Secrets and Signs You Miss Everyday*. London UK: Hodder and Stoughton.

[44] Stevens, A (1990) *On Jung*. London UK: Routledge.

[45] Walters, J, Ragland-Sullivan, E, Ragland, E and Milovanovic, D (2004) *Lacan: Topologically Speaking*. New York NY: Other.

[46] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor); Sheridan, A (translator) (1998): *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan (Book XI: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis 1964)*. New York NY: Norton.

[47] Glenn, J (2003) *The Examined Life: Enjoy Your Chinos!* Boston Globe. 6 July 2003, p H2; URL: <http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/boston/access/355220551.html?FMT=ABS&date=Jul 6, 2003>.

[48] Mitchell, W J T, de Almeida, E and Reynolds, R; Loos, A (editor) (2004) *Chicago University: Humanities Division: Theories of Media: Keywords Glossary: Symbolic, Real, Imaginary*. URL: <http://humanities.uchicago.edu/faculty/mitchell/glossary/symbolicrealimaginary.htm>.

[49] Kittler, F (1999) *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter*. Palo Alto CA: Stanford University.

[50] Leader, D and Groves, J (2005) *Introducing Lacan*. London UK: Icon.

[51] Barthes, R; Howard, R (translator) (1983) *The Empire of Signs*. New York NY: Hill and Wang.

[52] Rabaté, J-M (2003) *The Cambridge Companion to Lacan*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University.

[53] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor); Grigg, R (translator) (1997) *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan (Book III: The Psychoses: 1955 – 1956)*. New York NY: Norton.

- [54] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor) (1991) “Le Séminaire (Livre VIII: Le Transfert dans Sa Disparité Subjective: 1960 – 1961)”. Paris FRA: Seuil.
- [55] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor) (1994) “Le Séminaire (Livre IV: La Relation d'Objet et les Structures Freudiennes: 1956 – 1957)”. Paris FRA: Seuil.
- [56] Peirce, C S; Buchler, J (editor) (1955) *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. New York NY: Dover.
- [57] de Saussure, F; Harris, R (translator) (1998) *Course in General Linguistics*. Chicago IL: Open Court.
- [58] Carson, T; Carson, T and Sumara, D (editors) (1997) *Action Research as a Living Practice – Reflection and its Resistances: Teacher Education as a Living Practice*. New York NY: Peter Lang.
- [59] Zizek, S; Wright, E and Wright, E (editors) (1999) *The Zizek Reader*. Oxford UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- [60] Dunn, P (2005) *Postmodern Magic: The Art of Magic in the Information Age*. St Paul MN: Llewellyn.
- [61] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor); Tomaselli, S (translator) (1988): *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan (Book II: The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis: 1954 – 1955)*. New York NY: Norton.
- [62] Bryant, L R (2006) WordPressCom: Sinthome: Larval Subjects: 1 August 2006: Lacan and Sexuation. URL: <http://larval-subjects.blogspot.com/2006/08/lacan-and-sexuation.html>.
- [63] Lacan, J (1973) “L'Étourdit”. *Scilicet*. Volume 4, pp 5 – 52.
- [64] Zizek, S (2009) *The Parallax View*. Cambridge MA: MIT.
- [65] Zizek, S (2001) *On Belief (Thinking in Action)* London UK: Routledge.
- [66] Zizek, S and Daly, G (2009) *LacanDotCom (Lacan Dot Com is Lacan in the US): Risking the Impossible*. URL: <http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm>.

- [67] Kress, G and van Leeuwen, T (2006) *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London UK: Routledge.
- [68] Schroeder, J E; Stern, B B (editor) (1998) *Consuming Representation: A Visual Approach to Consumer Research – Representing Consumers: Voices, Views, and Visions*. New York NY: Routledge.
- [69] Evans, D (2006) *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London UK: Routledge.
- [70] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor); Forrester, J (translator) (1997): *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan (Book I: Freud's Papers on Technique: 1953 – 1954)*. New York NY: Norton.
- [71] Frye, M (1983) *The Politics of Reality*. Freedom CA: Crossing.
- [72] Miller, J-A (1999) *Return from Grenada: Knowledge and Satisfaction*. *Psychoanalytical Notebooks of the London Circle*. Volume 2 (Spring 1999), pp 75 – 90.
- [73] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor) (1998) “*Le Séminaire (Livre V: Les Formations de l’Inconscient: 1957 – 1958.)*”. Paris FRA: Seuil.
- [74] Fink, B (1996) *The Lacanian Subject: Between Language and Jouissance*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University.
- [75] Zupancic, A (2008) *The Odd One In: On Comedy*. Cambridge MA: MIT.
- [76] Lippitt, J (2008) *Hegel and the Chicken Suit*. *Times Higher Education: Reviews*. 29 May 2008, p 48.
- [77] Zizek, S (1997) “*Desire : Drive = Truth : Knowledge*”. *Umbr(a)*. Number 1 (1997: “*On the Drive*”). URL: <http://www.lacan.com/zizek-desire.htm>.
- [78] Lacan, J, Mitchell, J (editor); Mitchell, R (translator) (1985) *Feminine Sexuality: Jacques Lacan and the Ecole Freudienne*. New York NY: Norton.
- [79] Deleuze, G and Guattari, F; Hurley, R (translator) (2009) *Anti-Oedipus (Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Volume 1)*. London UK: Penguin.

- [80] Buchanan, I (2008) Deleuze and Guattari's "Anti-Oedipus". London UK: Continuum.
- [81] Feldstein, R, Fink, B and Jaanus, M (1995) Reading Seminar XI: Lacan's "Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis" Including the First English Translation of "Position of the Unconscious" by Jacques Lacan. Albany NY: SUNY.
- [82] Pickstock, C (1998) Literature and Modernity. Telos. Volume 113, pp 19 – 40.
- [83] Freud, S; Strachey, J (translator) (1973) The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (Volume XXII: 1932 – 1936: New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis, and Other Works). London UK: Hogarth.
- [84] de Waelhens, A and ver Eecke, W (2001) Phenomenology and Lacan on Schizophrenia: After the Decade of the Brain (Figures of the Unconscious: Volume 2). Leuven BEL: Leuven University.
- [85] Fink, B (1999) A Clinical Introduction to Lacanian Psychoanalysis: Theory and Technique. Cambridge MA: Harvard University.
- [86] Lacan, J; Stone, J W (translator); Miller, J-A (editor) (1975 / 1976) The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: XXII: "RSI" (The Real, the Symbolic, and the Imaginary): 1974 – 1975. *Ornicar?* Number 2, pp 88 – 105; Number 3, pp 96 – 110; Number 4, pp 92 – 106; Number 5, pp 16 – 66.
- [87] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor) (2004) "Le Séminaire (Livre IX: L'Angoisse: 1962 – 1963)". Paris FRA: Seuil.
- [88] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor) (1991) "Le Séminaire (Livre XVII: L'Envers de la Psychanalyse: 1969 – 1970)". Paris FRA: Seuil.
- [89] Barth, K; Thomson, G T (translator) (1949) Dogmatics in Outline. New York NY: Philosophical Library.
- [90] Barth, K; Haire, J L M and Henderson, I (translators) (1939) The Knowledge of God and the Service of God According to the Teaching of the Reformation. New York NY: Charles

Scribner's Sons.

[91] Barth, K; Hoskyns, E C (translator) (1933) *The Epistle to the Romans*. London UK: Oxford University.

[92] Barth, K; Horton, D (translator) (1928) *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. Boston MA: Pilgrim.

[93] Hofstadter, D R (1999) *Godel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*. New York NY: Basic.

[94] Morrison, A (1999) *The Serpent and the Cross: Religious Corruption in an Evil Age*. Cleveland OH: K and M.

[95] Kushner, T (2007) *Angels in America (Parts One: Millennium Approaches; Part Two: Perestroika)*. London UK: Nick Hern.

[96] Morrison, R (2008) *England: A Nation with a History, but No Destiny*. *The Times: Times 2*: Richard Morrison. 22 October 2008, p 7.

[97] Author Unknown (2008) Cornell University: The Herbert F Johnson Museum of Art: A Handbook of the Collection: Francisco Jose de Goya y Lucientes (Spanish: 1746 – 1828) “El Sueño de la Razón Produce Monstruos”: Plate 43 of “Los Caprichos”, second edition, c 1803. URL: <http://www.museum.cornell.edu/hfj/handbook/hb128.html>.

[98] Baldwin, J (1955) *Notes of a Native Son: Many Thousands Gone*. Boston MA: Beacon.

[99] Dunn, P (2008) *Magic, Power, Language, Symbol: A Magician's Exploration of Linguistics*. Woodbury MN: Llewellyn.

[100] Hutcheon, L; Capozzi, R (editor) (1997) *Reading Eco: An Anthology – “Foucault's Pendulum”*: Irony-clad Eco. Bloomington IN: Indiana University.

[101] Pope, A (2004) *An Essay on Man in Four Epistles*. Whitefish MT: Kessinger.

[102] Bywater, M (2009) *Sick Jokes and Bad Signs: Reading a Human Condition: “Tormented Hope” by Brian Dillon*. *The Independent: Arts, Film, Music, Books, Television*.

25 September 2009, p 30.

[103] Author Unknown (2008) Gnostic Friends Network: Articles: Gnostic Shock: Fringe Science and the Gnostic Heresies: A Secret History (Article Series): 18 October 2008: The Eden Experiment: Aliens, Archons and the Associative Universe. URL: <http://www.enemies.com/gnostic-magazine-articles/eden-experiment-aliens-archons/>.

[104] Dillon, B (2009) Tormented Hope: Nine Hypochondriac Lives. Dublin IRE: Penguin.

[105] Jonas, H (1992) The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity. London UK: Taylor and Francis.

[106] Barnstone, W (editor) (2005) The Other Bible: For the First Time in One Volume: Ancient Scriptures: Gnostic Gospels, Dead Sea Scrolls, Visionary Wisdom Text, Christian Apocrypha, Jewish Pseudepigrapha, Kabbalah. San Francisco CA: Harper One.

[107] Borch-Jacobsen, M; Brick, D (translator) (1991) Lacan: The Absolute Master. Palo Alto CA: Stanford University.

[108] Schroeder, J L (2008) The Four Lacanian Discourses: Or Turning Law Inside Out. London UK: Birbeck.

[109] Samuels, R (1993) Between Philosophy and Psychoanalysis: Lacan's Reconstruction of Freud. London UK: Routledge.

[110] Zizek, S, Stephens, S and Butler, R (2006) Interrogating the Real. London UK: Continuum.

[111] Zizek, S (interviewed); Willke, C and Höcker, K (directors) (1997) Internet Archive: Community Video: Moving Images: "Liebe Dein Symptom wie Dich Selbst" ("Thou Shalt Love Thy Symptom as Thyself") (Film in German and English). URL: http://www.archive.org/details/Zizek-Liebe_Dein_Symptom.

[112] Plato; Gill, C (translator) (2003) The Symposium. London UK: Penguin.

[113] Rassias, V G; Madytinis, M and Madytinis, L (translators, adapters) (2009) Supreme

Council of “Ethnikoi Hellenes”: YSEE’s Standard Terminology for “Hellenismos”: The English Lexicon. URL: <http://www.ysee.gr/download/TELOSTFH.pdf>.

[114] Forrester, M A (2000) *Psychology of the Image*. London UK: Routledge.

[115] Miller, J-A; Casalprim, R, d’Angelo, L, Palomera, V and Salinas, J (contributors) (1998) *The Seminar of Barcelona: On “Die Wege der Symptombildung”*. Notebooks of the London Circle. Volume 1 (Fall 1998), pp 11 – 65; URL: http://www.londonsociety-nls.org.uk/JAM_barcelona.htm.

[116] Freud, S; Strachey, J (translator) (1955) *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (Volume XIII: 1913 – 1914: “Totem and Tabu” and Other Works)*. London UK: Hogarth.

[117] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (collaborator) (2007) “*Le Séminaire (Livre XVIII: D’Un Discours Qui Ne Serait Pas du Semblant: 1970 – 1971)*”. Paris FRA: Seuil.

[118] Klein, R; Ayerza, J (editor) (2001) *Gender and Sexuation*. Lacanian Ink. Number 18 (Spring 2001). URL: <http://www.lacan.com/frameXVIII3.htm>.

[119] Hodges, W (2001) *Logic*. London UK: Penguin.

[120] Guttenplan, S (1997) *The Languages of Logic: An Introduction to Formal Logic*. Oxford UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

[121] Lacan, J (1972) “*Le Séminaire (Livre XIX: Ou Pire: 1971 – 1972)*” (Unpublished Session 14 June 1972); URL: http://gaogoa.free.fr/Seminaires_HTML/19-OP/OP14061972.htm.

[122] Lacan, J (1972) “*Le Séminaire (Livre XIX-bis: Le Savoir du Psychanalyste: 1971 – 1972)*” (Unpublished Session 1 June 1972); URL: http://gaogoa.free.fr/Seminaires_HTML/19bis-SP/SP01061972.htm.

[123] Gilson, J-P (1999) “*La Topologie de Lacan: Une Articulation de la Cure Psychanalytique (L’Ecriture Indocile)*”. Montreal CAN: Editions Balzac.

[124] Inwood, M J (1992) *A Hegel Dictionary (Blackwell Philosopher Dictionaries: Volume*

1). Oxford UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

[125] Hegel, G W F; Miller, A V (translator) (1998) *Science of Logic*. Amherst NY: Prometheus.

[126] Carlson, D G (2007) *Commentary on Hegel's "Science of Logic"*. Basingstoke UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

[127] Fries, J (1992) *Visual Magick: A Manual of Freestyle Shamanism*. Oxford UK: Mandrake.

[128] Harner, M (2001) *The Way of the Shaman: The Definitive Handbook*. San Francisco CA: Harper.

[129] Plotinus; MacKenna, S (translator) (2005) *The "Enneads"*. London UK: Penguin.

[130] Gerson, L P (2008) *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University.

[131] Moore, H L (2007) *The Subject of Anthropology: Gender, Symbolism and Psychoanalysis*. Cambridge UK: Polity.

[132] Butler, J (2006) *Gender Trouble*. London UK: Routledge.

[133] Butler, J (1993) *Bodies that Matter*. London UK: Routledge.

[134] Lacan, J (1974) "Le Séminaire (Livre XXI: Les Non-dupes Errent: 1973 – 1974)" (Unpublished Session 21 May 1974); URL: http://gaogoa.free.fr/Seminaires_HTML/21-NDE/NDP21051974.htm.

[135] Riviere, J; Hughes, A (editor) (1991) *The Inner World and Joan Riviere: Collected Papers: 1920 – 1958*. London UK: Karnac.

[136] Michaux, H; Ball, D (translator) (1997) *Darkness Moves: An Henri Michaux Anthology (1927 – 1984)*. Berkeley CA: University of California.

[137] Campbell, K (2004) *Jacques Lacan and Feminist Epistemology*. London UK: Routledge.

- [138] Gallop, J (1987) Reading Lacan. Ithaca NY: Cornell University.
- [139] Grosz, E A (1999) Jacques Lacan: A Feminist Introduction. London UK: Pan.
- [140] Irigaray, L; Porter, B (editor); Porter, C and Burke, C (translators) (1985) The Sex Which is Not One. Ithaca NY: Cornell University.
- [141] Derrida, J; Johnson, B (translator) (1981) "Dissemination". Chicago IL: Chicago University.
- [142] Lacan, J (2007) Some Reflections on the Ego. Journal of Lacanian Studies. Volume 2, Number 2, pp 306 – 317.
- [143] Solomon, R C and Higgins, K M (editors) (1988) Reading Nietzsche. New York NY: Oxford University USA.
- [144] Nietzsche, F W; Kaufmann, W and Hollingdale, R J (translators); Kaufmann, W (editor) (1968) The Will to Power. New York NY: Vintage.
- [145] Eco, U (1979) The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts. Bloomington IN: Indiana University.
- [146] von Humboldt W; Heath, P (translator) (1988) On Language. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University.
- [147] Eco, U; Robey, D (introduction); Cancogni, A (translator) (1989) The Open Work. Cambridge MA: Harvard University.
- [148] Caesar, M (1999) Umberto Eco: Philosophy, Semiotics and the Work of Fiction. Cambridge UK: Polity.
- [149] Eco, U (1978) A Theory of Semiotics. Bloomington IN: Indiana University.
- [150] Eco, U (1984) Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language. Bloomington IN: Indiana University.
- [151] Capozzi, R (editor) Reading Eco: An Anthology. Bloomington IN: Indiana University.
- [152] Eco, U; McEwan, A (translator) (2000) Kant and the Platypus: Essays on Language and

Cognition. New York NY: Mariner.

[153] Jemmer, P (1988) Linguistic Subcreation: A Developmental Approach (D H I Powell Memorial Scholarship). Swansea UK: University of Wales.

[154] Jemmer, P (1989) Schema Aleolinguistica (Projects Fund Scholarship). Cambridge UK: Trinity College.

[155] Jemmer, P (1990) Ars Aleolinguistica (First Yeomanship). Cambridge UK: Trinity College.

[156] Jemmer, P (2005) Aleolinguistics: A Salient Cuisine for Sub-Creative Cartography? The Hypnotherapy Journal. Issue 3, Volume 5 (Winter 2005), pp 7 – 13.

[157] Burrow, T (1973) The Sanskrit Language. London UK: Faber.

[158] Culbert, S A (2008) Beyond Bullsh*t: Straight-Talk at Work. London UK: Kogan Page.

[159] Eliot, T S (2001) Four Quartets. London UK: Faber and Faber.

[160] Harms, D (1998) The Encyclopedia Cthulhiana. Oakland CA: Chaosium.

[161] Laertius, D; C. D. Yonge, C D (translator) (2007) The Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers. Whitefish MT: Kessinger.

[162] Cicero, M T; Reynolds, L D (editor) (1998) “M Tullii Ciceronis: De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum: Libri Quinque” (Oxford Classical Texts). Oxford UK: Clarendon.

[163] Reale, G; Catan, J R (editor, translator) (1987) A History of Ancient Philosophy: From the Origins to Socrates. Albany NY: SUNY.

[164] Heraclitus; Kahn, C H (editor) (2008) The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: A New Arrangement and Translation of the Fragments with Literary and Philosophical Commentary. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University.

[165] Geldard, R (2000) Remembering Heraclitus. Great Barrington MA: Lindisfarne.

[166] Horwich, P (1998) Truth. Oxford UK: Clarendon.

- [167] Barr, J (2004) *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Eugene OR: Wipf and Stock.
- [168] Heidegger, M; Emad, P and Maly, K (translators) (2000) *Contributions to Philosophy: From Enowning*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University.
- [169] Joyce, J; Deane, S (introduction) (2000) *Finnegans Wake*. London UK: Penguin;
- Thomas, S (editor) (2006) *The University of Adelaide: Library: eBooks: Alphabetical List of Authors: James Joyce (1882 – 1941): Finnegans Wake (1939): URL: <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/j/joyce/james/j8f/>*.
- [170] Rumiko, T (1995) *The Return of Lum: Urusei Yatsura (Volume 8: Ran Attacks) – Waking to a Nightmare*. San Francisco CA: Viz.
- [171] Salih, S (2002) *Judith Butler*. London UK: Routledge.
- [172] Lambert, G (2002) *The Non-philosophy of Gilles Deleuze*. New York NY: Continuum.
- [173] Tepper, R (2010) *Michel Foucault: Toward a Philosophy and Politics of the Event: Continuity in Discontinuity*. Saarbrücken GER: Lambert.
- [174] Silverman, H J (editor) (1998) *Cultural Semiosis: Tracing the Signifier (Continental Philosophy: Volume VI)*. London UK: Routledge.
- [175] Badiou, A; Clemens, J and Feltham, O (editors) (2005) *Infinite Thought: Truth and the Return of Philosophy*. New York NY: Continuum.
- [176] Heidegger, M; Stambaugh, J (translator) (1996) *Being and Time: A Translation of “Sein und Zeit”*. Albany NY: SUNY.
- [177] Nola, R (1987) *Nietzsche's Theory of Truth and Belief*. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. Volume 47, Number 4 (June 1987), pp 525 – 562.
- [178] Cutrofello, A (1997) *Imagining Otherwise: Metapsychology and the Analytic A Posteriori*. Evanston IL: Northwestern University.
- [179] Holiday, A (1985) *Wittgenstein's Silence: Philosophy, Ritual and the Limits of Language*. *Language and Communication*. Volume 3, Number 2, pp 133 – 142.

- [180] Grigg, R (2008) *Lacan, Language, and Philosophy*. Albany NY: SUNY.
- [181] Badiou, A; Feltham, O (translator) (2007) *Being and Event*. New York NY: Continuum.
- [182] Badiou, A; Toscano, A (translator) (2009) *Being and Event II: The Logic of Worlds*. New York NY: Continuum.
- [183] Lecercle, J-J (1999) *Radical Philosophy* 98 (January / February 1999): Articles: Cantor, Lacan, Mao, Becket, Meme Combat: The Philosophy of Alain Badiou. URL: http://www.radicalphilosophy.com/default.asp?channel_id=2188&editorial_id=10208.
- [184] Thurston, L (2002) *Re-inventing the Symptom: Essays on the Final Lacan*. New York NY: Other.
- [185] Lacan, J; Miller, J-A (editor) (2005) "Le Séminaire (Livre XXIII: Le Sinthome: 1975 – 1976)". Paris FRA: Seuil.
- [186] Carrasco, M B (2005) "Sinthomatologie: Une Psychothérapie des Psychoses (À Partir du Concept de Sinthome chez Lacan)" (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Paris FRA: Université Paris 7 Denis Diderot: UFR Sciences Humaines Cliniques: Ecole Doctorale: Recherches en Psychanalyse.
- [187] Parrinder, P (1984) *James Joyce*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University.
- [188] Milesi, L (2003) *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University.
- [189] Nietzsche, F W; Whiteside, S (2003) *The Birth of Tragedy: Out of the Spirit of Music*. London UK: Penguin.
- [190] Marvin, J (2005) "Finnegans Wake" III.3 and the Third Millennium: The Ghost of Modernisms yet to Come. *Hypermedia Joyce Studies (Electronic Journal of Joycean Scholarship)*. Volume 6, Issue 1 (July 2005); URL: <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v3/marvin.html>.
- [191] Pound, E (2003) *The Cantos*. London UK: Faber and Faber.

- [192] Ellmann, R (1984) James Joyce. New York NY: Oxford University USA.
- [193] Gorman, H S (2007) James Joyce: His First Forty Years. Whitefish MT: Kessinger.
- [194] Pierce, D (2007) Reading Joyce. Harlow UK: Longman.
- [195] Gilbert, S (1937) The Subliminal Tongue. “transition”. Volume 26 (February 1937), pp 141 – 153.
- [196] Merleau-Ponty, M; Dreyfuss, P A (translator) (1992) Sense and Nonsense. Evanston IL: Northwestern University.
- [197] Mercanton, J (2002) “Ecrits sur James Joyce”. Vevey SWI: L’Aire Bleue.
- [198] Delaney, S R (2010) Babel-17. London UK: Gollancz.
- [199] Heinlein, R A (2007) Stranger in a Strange Land. London UK: Hodder.
- [200] Garcia II, S (editor) (2008) The Churches of Christ: Internet Ministries: Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible (Reproduced by Permission of Oxford University Text Archive: Oxford University Computing Service: Oxford UK). URL: <http://church-of-christ.org/bible/rsv/>.
- [201] Amendt-Lyon, N and Lobb, M S (2010) European Association for Gestalt Therapy: Description of Gestalt Psychotherapy. URL: http://www.eagt.org/description_of_GT.htm.
- [202] Pratelli, M (2007) Università degli Studi di Padova: Dipartimento di Matematica Pura e Applicata: Stochastic Processes: Theory and Applications: A Conference in Honor of the 65th Birthday of Wolfgang J Runggaldier: From “Stochastic Calculus of Variations on Wiener Space” to “Stochastic Calculus of Variations on Poisson Space”. Bressanone-Brixen (BZ) Italy: 16 July 2007. URL: <http://www.math.unipd.it/~brixen07/slides/pratelli.pdf>.
- [203] Corsten, T, Osborne, M J, Catling, R W V, Ricci, M, Fraser, P M and Matthews, E (2010) A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (Volume 5: Coastal Asia Minor: Pontos to Ionia). Oxford UK: Oxford University.
- [204] Rosensohn, W L (1974) The Phenomenology of Charles S Peirce: From the Doctrine of

Categories to Phaneroscopy (Philosophical Currents: Volume 10). Amsterdam NED: Benjamins.

[205] Jemmer, P (2009) Enchanting the Self through Creative Psycho(a)logical Change (Part 3 of a Series of 5). *European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis*. Volume 9, Issue 1, pp 59 – 66.

[206] Jemmer, P (2011) Psycho-chaotic Semiorcery and Neuro-linguistic Pragmatic Part 1: Chaotics. *European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis* (submitted February 2011).

[207] Jemmer, P (2011) Psycho-chaotic Semiorcery and Neuro-linguistic Pragmatic Part 2: Rhizomatics. *European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis* (submitted February 2011).

[208] Jemmer, P (2011) Psycho-chaotic Semiorcery and Neuro-linguistic Pragmatic Part 3: Autopoiesis. *European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis* (submitted February 2011).

[209] Jemmer, P (2011) Psycho-chaotic Semiorcery and Neuro-linguistic Pragmatic Part 4: Psych(a)ology. *European Journal of Clinical Hypnosis* (submitted February 2011).

[210] Parker, I (2004) Slavoj Zizek: A Critical Introduction (Modern European Thinkers) London UK: Pluto.

[211] Zizek, S (2008) *In Defense of Lost Causes*. London UK: Verso.

[212] Lacan, J; Hollier, D, Krauss, R and Michelson, A (translators) (1990) *Television: A Challenge to the Psychoanalytic Establishment*. New York NY: Norton.

[213] Heidegger, M; Krell, D F (editor) (2008) *Basic Writings from “Being and Time” (1927) to “The Task of Thinking” (1964) (Revised and Expanded Edition: Ten Key Essays, plus the Introduction to “Being and Time”)*. New York NY: Harper Perennial.

[214] Glazebrook, T (2000) *Heidegger's Philosophy of Science*. Bronx NY: Fordham University.

[215] Brown, L J and Miller, M (2002) The Triadic Intersubjective Matrix in Supervision: The Use of Disclosure to Work Through Painful Affects. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. Volume 83, Number 4 (August 2002), pp 811 – 823.

- [216] Maroda, K (1999) Creating an Intersubjective Context for Self-disclosure. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*. Volume 69, Number 2, pp 475 – 489.
- [217] Dorpat, T L and Miller, M L (1992) *Clinical Interaction and the Analysis of Meaning: A New Psychoanalytic Theory*. London UK: Routledge.
- [218] Dawkins, R (1990) *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford UK: Oxford University.
- [219] Freud, S; Strachey, J (translator) (1964) *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (Volume XVII: 1917 – 1919: An Infantile Neurosis and Other Works)*. London UK: Hogarth.
- [220] Sharpe, M; Fieser, J and Dowden, B (editors) (2009) *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Jacques Lacan*. URL: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/lacweb/>.
- [221] Lacan, J; Grigg, R (translator) (1995) Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School. *Analysis*. Number 6, pp 1 – 13.
- [222] Miller, J-A (1996) “Le Monologue de l’Appard”. *Revue de la Cause Freudienne*. Number 34, pp 8 – 18.
- [223] Miller, J-A; Bracher, M, Alcorn Jr, M W, Corthell, R J, Massardier-Kenney, F (editors) (1997) *Lacanian Theory of Discourse: Subject, Structure and Society – “Extimité”*. New York NY: New York University.
- [224] Lubbock, T (2008) Attempt at the Impossible (1928) René Magritte: Private Collection Brussels. *The Independent: Visual Arts: Great Works*. 5 September 2008, p 30.
- [225] Whitwell, T (2008) This Week: Cognitive Surplus. *The Times Magazine: Wisdom: Microtrends*. 20 September 2008, p 12.
- [226] Bely, A (1922) “Glossolalija: Poema o Zvuke”. Berlin GER: Hermann and Co; Bely, A; Beyer Jr, T R (translator) (2001) *Glossolalia: A Poem about Sound*. URL: <http://community.middlebury.edu/~beyer/gl/intro.html>.
- [227] Beyer Jr, T (1995) Andrej Bely’s “Glossolalija”: A Berlin Glossolalia. *Europa*

Orientalis. Volume XIV, Number 2, pp 7 – 25.

[228] Author Unknown (2008) Orange Telecommunications Advertisement. Metro. 7 July 2008, pp 15 – 16.

[229] Herbert, F (2007) Dune – Appendix II (The Religion of Dune); Terminology of the Imperium (Orange Catholic Bible). London UK: Gollancz.

[230] Herzel, S and Moore, P (1978) Man, Woman, and Priesthood. London UK: SPCK.

[231] Mackey, A G (1994) Lexicon of Freemasonry: Containing a Definition of All Its Communicable Terms, Notices of Its History, Traditions, and Antiquities, and an Account of All the Rites and Mysteries of the Ancient World. Whitefish MT: Kessinger.

[232] Hobson, E W (2007) Squaring the Circle: A History of the Problem. Slough UK: Merchant.

[233] Budin, S L (2008) The Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University.

[234] Apostel, L (2000) “Oorsprong. Inleiding Tot de Metafysica van het Ontstaan van Mens, Leven en Heelal”. Brussels BEL: VUB.

[235] Chun, S W and Zhuo, L (2008) “Mit TCM Gesünder Leben: Zufriedenheit und Lebensqualität für den Alltag (Gebundene Ausgabe)”. Berlin GER: Springer.

[236] Apostel, L (1985) Freemasonry, a Philosophical Essay. Brussels BEL: VUB.

[237] Apostel, L (1998) “Atheïstische Spiritualiteit”. Brussels BEL: VUB.

[238] Derrida, J (quoted); Pyle, F (quoted); McLemee, S (2004) Jacques Derrida, Thinker Who Influenced and Infuriated a Range of Humanistic Fields, Dies at 74. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 11 October 2004.

[239] Silverman, H J and Staats, H (editors) (2004) Stonybrook University: Department of Philosophy: CLT 601 (Deconstruction and Criticism): Seminar (11 October 2004). URL: http://www.stonybrook.edu/rtpl/HJS_COURSES/04F_601_DECONSTRUCTION_AND_CRITICIS

- [240] Kearney, R; Ricoeur, P (photographer) (1985) Dialogues with Contemporary Continental Thinkers: The Phenomenological Heritage: Paul Ricoeur, Emmanuel Levinas, Herbert Marcuse, Stanislas Breton, Jacques Derrida. Manchester UK: Manchester University.
- [241] Lewis, C S (2002) The Problem of Pain. San Francisco CA: Harper Collins.
- [242] Lewis, C S (2001) “The Weight of Glory” and Other Addresses (Collected Letters of C S Lewis) – The Weight of Glory. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan.
- [243] Lewis, C S (1998) Surprised by Joy. San Francisco CA: Harper Collins.
- [244] Sánchez de Cepeda y Ahumada, T (Saint Teresa of Ávila); Cohen, J (2004) The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila by Herself. London UK: Penguin.
- [245] de Yepes Alvarez, J (Saint John of the Cross); Peers, E A (editor, translator) (2003) Dark Night of the Soul. New York NY: Dover.
- [246] Martin, T (Saint Theresa of Lisieux); Jesus, A (editor) Story of a Soul. Charlotte NC: Tan.
- [247] Clines, D J A (1998) On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays: 1967 – 1998. London UK: Continuum.
- [248] Maronis, P V (Virgil); Lee, G (translator) (1984) The “Eclogues”. London UK: Penguin.
- [249] Gide, A (1973) “Paludes”. Paris FRA: Flammarion.
- [250] Cromwell, P E, Beltrami, E and Rampichini, M (1998) The Borromean Rings. Mathematical Intelligencer. Volume 20, Number 1, pp 53 – 62.
- [251] Rolfsen, D (2004) Knots and Links. Boston MA: American Mathematical Society.
- [252] Freke, T and Gandy, P (2008) The Hermetica: The Lost Wisdom of the Pharaohs. New York NY: Tarcher.
- [253] Beckett, S (2006) Waiting for Godot. London UK: Faber and Faber.

- [254] Author Unknown (2009) CampusLive: Lausanne (Campus pour Christ: Mouvement d'Étudiants): Resources: La Bible: "Bible (Version Louis Segond: 1910)". URL: <http://www.campuslive.ch/lausanne/Bible/Chapters/index.html>.
- [255] Darby, J N (translator) (1986) "La Sainte Bible: Qui Comprend l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament" (Broché). Valence FRA: Bibles et Publications Chrétiennes.
- [256] Prickett, S and Carroll, R P (editors) (2008) The Bible: Authorized King James Version. Oxford UK: Oxford University.
- [257] Gryson, R, Fischer, B, Frede, H I, Sparks, H F D and Thiele, W (editors) (2006) "Biblia Sacra Vulgata": Holy Bible (Vulgate) in Latin. Peabody MA: Hendrickson.
- [258] Sandborg-Petersen, U (editor) (2008) Tischendorf's 8th Edition Greek New Testament with Morphological Tags: Version 1.5 courtesy MorphGNTOrg: Based on G C Yale's Tischendorf Text and on M A Robinson's Public Domain Westcott-Hort Text. URL: <http://t8s.biblos.com/>.
- [259] Lewis, C S (2002) The Four Loves. London UK: Fount.
- [260] Keating, J F (2007) The "Agape" and the "Eucharist" in the Early Church: Studies in the History of the Christian Love-Feasts. Whitefish MT: Kessinger.
- [261] Soble, A (1999) "Eros", "Agape" and "Philia": Readings in the Philosophy of Love. St Paul MN: Paragon.
- [262] Arendt, H; Scott, J V and Stark, J C (editors) (1998) Love and Saint Augustine. Chicago IL: University of Chicago.
- [263] Nygren, A; Watson, P (translator) (1983) "Agape" and "Eros". London UK: SPCK.
- [264] Williams, D D (1965) Grace and Man's Hope: An Interpretation of the Christian Life in History. New York NY: Harper and Row.
- [265] Ratzinger, J (Pope Benedict XVI) (2006) God Is Love: "Deus Caritas Est". Fort Collins CO: Ignatius.

- [266] Cobb, J B and Griffin, D R (1976) *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition*. Philadelphia PA: Westminster John Knox.
- [267] Whitehead, A N (1967) *Adventures of Ideas*. New York NY: Macmillan.
- [268] Heschel, A J (2009) *God in Search of Man: A Philosophy of Judaism*. London UK: Souvenir.
- [269] Outka, G; Quinn, P L and Taliaferro, C (editors) (1999) *A Companion to Philosophy of Religion – Chapter 61: Agapeistic Ethics*. Oxford UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- [270] McEvoy, J (2000) *Robert Grosseteste (Great Medieval Thinkers)*. New York NY: Oxford University USA.
- [271] Biernoff, S (2002) *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages*. Basingstoke UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [272] Bramoullé, Y (2005) Université Laval Québec Canada: Faculté des Sciences Sociales: Département d'Economique: Mutual Altruism and Misery Traps (December 2005). URL: http://www.ecn.ulaval.ca/fileadmin/documents/Professeurs/Yann_Bramoull_/MutualAltruismDec2005.pdf.
- [273] Uebel, M; Classen, A (editor) (2002) *Meeting the Foreign in the Middle Ages – The Foreigner Within: The Subject of Abjection in “Sir Gowther”*. London UK: Routledge.
- [274] Brooker, C (2009) *In the Red Corner: Microsoft’s Grinning Robots*. The Guardian: Charlie Brooker. 28 September 2009, p 5.
- [275] Hart, C (1962) *Structure and Motif in “Finnegans Wake”*. London UK: Faber and Faber.
- [276] Deleuze, G and Guattari, F; Tomlinson, J A, Tomlinson, H and Burchell, G (translators) (1996) *What is Philosophy?* New York NY: Columbia University.
- [277] Kumar, M (2008) *Quantum: Einstein, Bohr and the Great Debate about the Nature of Reality*. London UK: Icon.

[278] Lindley, D (2008) *Uncertainty: Einstein, Heisenberg, Bohr, and the Struggle for the Soul of Science*. New York NY: Anchor.

[279] Wittgenstein, L (1922); Ogden, C K (translator) (1999) *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. London UK: Dover.

[280] Mao, C, Sun, W and Seeman, N C (1997) Assembly of Borromean Rings from DNA. *Nature*. Volume 386, Number 6621, pp 137 – 138; Author Unknown (2011) Editorial: Real Adventures in Numberland. *New Scientist*. 8 January 2011, p 5; Brooks, M (2011) This Week: Quirky New Matter via Mathematics. *New Scientist*. 8 January 2011, p 10.

[281] Groddeck, G (1977) *The Meaning of Illness*. London UK: Hogarth.

[282] Gamaroff, R (1997) Can the Tour (Surprisingly) Translate Us Anywhere? *Journal of Literary Studies*. Volume 13, Number 3 / 4, pp 397 – 415.

[283] Plato; Rowe, C (translator) (2005) “Phædrus”. London UK: Penguin.

[284] Collins, J and Mayblin, B (2000) *Introducing Derrida*. London UK: Icon.

[285] Author Unknown (2008) Grabloid: Language Scraps: A Blog Inspired and Started by an Unforgettable Class (UVSC/UVU: A Caldiero and S Abbott: Fall 2007: Language: Most Dangerous of Possessions): Saturday 1 March 2008: The Antithetical Meaning of Primal Words. URL: <http://languagescraps.blogspot.com/2008/03/antithetical-meaning-of-primal-words.html>.

[286] Stone, J W (2006) University of Missouri: Jack W Stone's Joyce / Lacan / SintHome Page: Lacan Links: Annotated Tabulation of Lacan's Sexuation Formulas (in Progress). URL: <http://web.missouri.edu/~stonej/formulas7.html>.

[287] Eco, U; Weaver, W (translator) (1994) “The Name of the Rose,” Including the Author's Postscript. Fort Washington PA: Harvest.

[288] Haft, A J, White, J G and White, R J (1999) *The Key to “The Name of the Rose,” Including Translations of All Non-English Passages*. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan;

Aristotle; Janko, R (translator) (1987) "Poetics" with "Tractatus Coislinianus", Reconstruction of "Poetics II" and the Fragments of the "On Poets". Indianapolis IN: Hackett.

[289] Girard, R; Bann, S and Metteer, M (translators) (1987) Things Hidden since the Foundation of the World. Palo Alto CA: Stanford University.

[290] Barthes, R; Lavers, A (translator) (1972) Mythologies. New York NY: Hill and Wang.

[291] Nutting, S S (1992) "La Representation de l'Indien dans le Theatre Quebecois du XXe Siècle": Unpublished PhD Thesis (French Text): Kingston CAN: Queen's University at Kingston; English Abstract Quoted in: Ojibwe Bibliography: Part 5 Number 2397: 19 January 2004. URL: <http://www.maquah.net/dissertation/bibliography/OjibweBibliography-part05.html>.

[292] Pollock, G (2004) Thinking the Feminine: Aesthetic Practice as Introduction to Bracha Ettinger and the Concepts of Matrix and Metamorphosis. Theory, Culture, Society. Volume 21, Number 1, pp 5 – 65.

[293] Fielder, C and King, C (2004) Sexual Paradox Complementarity, Reproductive Conflict, and Human Emergence: A God Whose Name is "Jealous". URL: <http://www.dhushara.com/paradoxhtm/>; paraphrased in: Genesis of Eden Diversity Encyclopedia: Consummation (Part 2): The Eden of Genesis. URL: <http://www.dhushara.com/book/consum/consum1.htm>.

All URLs were checked and found to be current as of 2000 on 18 April 2011.

About the Author

I'm currently Senior Lecturer in Mathematics in the School of Computing, Engineering and Information Sciences at Northumbria University. Prior to this I studied for a BA (Hons) / MA and a Certificate of Postgraduate Study in Natural Sciences from Cambridge University, followed by a PhD (Mathematical Chemistry) from Birmingham University. I've been a postdoc in the Universities of Exeter, Oxford, and Sussex. I now teach principally in areas like chaos theory and complexity, and computational mathematics, as well as doing lots of basic "service" work with engineers and building services engineers. I have also always had a strong interest in languages and linguistics, as well as in philosophy, mythology, and creativity. The conjunction (or collision, or conflict?) of the mathematical, linguistic and philosophical enthusiasms has developed into my undergoing professional training as a psychotherapist. I am trying to use this as a vehicle to help in exploring and developing "creativity" in myself and others, for use in personal and academic self-development, as well as in teaching and mentoring. As well as my earlier work and publication in physical science, I am now actively pursuing and writing about the "creativity" ideas and publishing them in "professional media" for psychotherapy as well as "peer-reviewed" scientific journals. Currently, I am at the stage of unifying some of my previous mathematical understanding with my more recent forays into creative thinking. I have, for example, just finished work on a mathematical "dynamical systems" model for psycho-semiosis, which has led to a "chaos theory" codification for various Lacanian mathemes. I've also recently edited a volume on "The Other" for Newcastle Philosophy Society, to which I contributed a "mathemagical" paper on "The O(the)r (O)the(r)." I am editor of "*Bifrons Creativity*" (the online journal for creativity: www.Bifrons.org.uk), and have to date published a series of twelve monographs in the "*Enchant Newcastle*" series through *NewPhilSoc* Publishing.

About Newcastle Philosophy Society

Newcastle Philosophy Society (NPS) is a Registered Charity (registration number 1106082) whose mission is to support the advancement of philosophy in all its aspects, through the organization and promotion of learning, discussion and research into all things philosophical. We are not by any means a group of “professional” philosophers, though. Rather, we comprise a network of people who share a strong common commitment to the idea that philosophical principles and methods, are, and should be, completely integrated into a rounded life-experience. NPS is not anchored to any particular philosophical school, method, or ideology, and we encourage and welcome all comers and all points of view. We aim to provide real opportunities for promoting the understanding of both historical and contemporary philosophers and philosophies, of all shapes and sizes. We also strive to create chances to help nurture and encourage the up-and-coming philosophers of the future.

We see philosophy as contributing to all ways of thinking about the world. We believe that philosophical inquiry does not have to be bound by a clearly defined set of rules, but rather that it represents overall a dynamic, exploratory, experiential, experimental, tentative, complementary, incorporative, quizzical, accepting, and fun outlook on life. For us, “philosophy” is at heart the “wise loving” which overcomes the mere study of impersonal data, facts, and information as “means to an end,” becoming an “end” in its own right. We feel that philosophy’s true goal should include the shared and caring acknowledgement and exploration of the emotion, irrationality, and alogicality at the core of human existence.

Our “mission” (which mirrors that of the UK-wide Royal Institute of Philosophy to which we are affiliated) is to demonstrate the relevance of philosophy to everyday life, and to forge a direct link between contemporary philosophy and the widest possible participating audience.

To this end, our activities focus on fundamental questions about philosophical issues of topical importance, but we aim to do this in accessible, straightforward, engaging, and entertaining ways. This audience is certainly not restricted to an academic élite, although we do have very active, self-directed “study groups” composed mostly of interested “non-experts” who get together to read and discuss, for example: What is Philosophy? – Continental Philosophy – Philosophy of Mind – *anti*-Philosophy – Exploring Psychiatry – Political Philosophy – and Why Work? We hold special “Ideal” sessions for college and sixth form students as well as: Philosophy in Pubs – Philosophy in Film – Philosophy in Literature – and Philosophy of Consciousness. We support education and research through our journal “*Engage Newcastle*,” and are seeking sponsorship to help us to support philosophical investigations and research projects.

Much of the material in this volume has been produced after intensive, extended, stimulating, and sometimes heated) discussions with the membership of NPS (and members of the public) in the fora described above, as well as the fortnightly “*Salon*” discussion groups, the monthly “*Café Philosophique*” sessions, and the occasional “*Café Newcastle*” lecture series. Work in progress is currently being introduced by the author at the public Swansea “*Philosophy Café*” sessions which have been running since December 2010 at Swansea University and Swansea Metropolitan University.

About “*Enflame Newcastle*”

“*Enflame Newcastle*” is published under the imprint “*NewPhilSoc Publishing*” by kind permission of the Board of Trustees of Newcastle Philosophy Society (2011 – 2012): Mr Richard Benjamin, Ms Laura Bowie, Ms Janet Darbyshire, Dr Roy Sturgess (Chair), Dr Sue Lord, Mr Leigh Rooney, Miss Jenny Thomas, Ms Lucille Valentine, and Dr Joel Yoeli. Where appropriate, Editorial guidance has been sought and gratefully received from the Trustees: notwithstanding this, the views contained herein are the author’s own and do not necessarily represent those of Newcastle Philosophy Society, nor of the Trustees.

“*Enflame Newcastle*” is a collaboration with “*Bifrons Creativity*” the online journal for all aspects of creativity, and further support and advice has also been readily available from the *Bifrons* Editorial Team: Dr Paul Attinello of ICMuS in the School of Arts and Cultures at Newcastle University (cultural studies, humanities, music, performance, philosophy), Dr Fin McMorran of the Institute for Design, Culture and the Arts at Teesside University (art, communication, media), Dr Ali Pickard who is Head of Quality and Student Experience in the School of CEIS at Northumbria University (information science, language, literature, media), Mr Joe McAnelly (Advantage GB Limited: humanities, psychology, psychotherapy), Ms Anna Round (formerly of Northumbria University Student Services and currently at the UK Ministry of Justice: communication, linguistics, literature, media, philosophy, sociology), and Mr David Sockett (independent therapist: art, communication, literature, sociology, therapy).

Enflame Newcastle Number 1

“(H)ero-ego Fluxes”

၂၁၂၇ ၁
 ၉၉၂၀၉၂၉၉၂၀၉၉၂
 R၉ ၂၀၂၉၁

Nonconservative Sexuation

O (THE) R	$\hat{\sigma}_F$	I{S[R]}
-----------	------------------	---------

“I deliver” Being [Becoming] non-Having

$$[\tilde{\partial}_\lambda (H) \varepsilon_{\rho \dots [v] \dots \omega}^{(\lambda)} - \hat{D}[i] \triangleleft \Phi_F^{(\lambda)} [i \{s[r]\}] \leftarrow (1-H) \bar{\Pi}[r]]_{\Gamma(\Sigma, T)}$$

“ero šamán faciendi ego”

web:	http://www.newphilsoc.org.uk/ http://www.bifrons.org.uk	ISBN 978-1-907926-13-6  9 781907 926136 >
e-mail (General):	philoSecretary@gmail.com	
e-mail (Enflame):	philoEditor@gmail.com bifronsCreativity@gmail.com	
e-mail (Sales):	philoSales@gmail.com	