

CHEAT-SHEET OF THE LACANIAN DISCOURSES

Allan Pero's essay, "The Chiasm of Revolution: Badiou, Lacan, and Lefèbvre" (<http://www.lacan.com/thesymptom/?p=365>) uses \neg to symbolize relationships of impossibility (ref. Aristotle's square of logical oppositions) and \lrcorner to symbolize relationships of impotence. These predication-like symbols are ideal for notating the space between the top and bottom lines of Lacan's classic *mathemes* for the four principal discourses; fruitfully, they suggest that, after the "primary" expression of the numerator and denominator, one on the left, another on the right, that there is a "left-right" chirality that, like the symmetry of handedness, bears a strong likeness but cannot be collapsed or further simplified. This is like the "twins rule" that establishes the transitive operation of boundaries (you can't be in two places at the same time, or if you are, there is a "detached virtuality" of the uncanny!). But, as Russell Grigg has pointed out, Lacan's logic is a bit fluffy. Instead of a constructionist position, where $\sim\sim P$ returns to P , Lacan is an advocate of the "not-all" (*pas tout*), a kind of $\sim\sim P$ returning to both $P/\sim P$, our $\emptyset/-\emptyset$ situation. The not all illuminates Pero's point about impossibility/impotence. The chirality of the discourses is that privation (the twins rule for example, $\sim\sim P=P$) gives way to the "not-all" position, i.e. that "in theory you can do something but you SHOULDN'T." And, we can *fantasize* about doing it; we can imagine transgression.

Furthermore, Grigg and Pero taken together point to the idea that privation and prohibition are reverse predicates of each other. When the Other contains the Agent, we have privation; when the TRUTH contains PRODUCTION, we have prohibition. But, more basically, the left and right take place containing and being contained, giving rise to conversions of impossibility to transgression. Actæon transgresses. Djana reverse predicates.

MASTER-SERVANT: there is no "universal" in the chain of symbolic networks/formations, but this lack is converted into $\$ \diamond a$, fantasy about the role of the S1.

HYSTERIC: there is no subjective access to mastery, but this lack is converted to a pleasure conceived within the Symbolic — any system that can be used to signify.

ANALYSIS: the subject does not have access to his/her own desire — it comes from the Other — but this lack is experienced in terms of the meaninglessness of dreams, the unconscious, sinthomes — i.e. there is no "explanation," S2, for all the S1 evidence. [THE BASIS OF THE MYSTERY STORY, WITH ITS MCGUFFIN]

UNIVERSITY: There is no way to symbolize the role of desire other than the command to Enjoy!, but this lack can be converted into a relationship of subjectivity to mastery.