THE BASIC CRISS-CROSS

How come four types of discourse? Why the four 'elements' of discourse (S1, S2 …)? Why the four 'sites' (agent, Other, production, truth)? Why the rotation of elements across the 'field' of sites? Why the relationship to fantasy and fantasy's varied strategy of relating to the Real? This short review considers the existence of an 'ultimate Real', i.e. life→death, which, when viewed in terms of the polarities of the Jentschian uncanny, produce the necessary and sufficient conditions of discourse. This connects the primary and ethnological forms of the uncanny, including seasonal and magical systems, with the primary clinical conditions, including the psychoses, beginning with paranoia and extending to hysteria and compulsion (death drive as a model for all drives).

That the fundamental core of human consciousness — generated by and destined to return to the Real is established from a number of critical perspectives, including Vico's apocryphal story of the the first humans' perception of the thunder as a 'primary word' of the sky, characterized as Zeus — is a broadly held view. Other trauma theories include the Judeo-Christian tradition, major mythic accounts (destruction of a primal monster, etc.), and trans-mutations of trauma into their semantic consequence, such as St. John's 'In the beginning there was the Word, and the Word was God'.

1. REAL: where death $\neq$ ~~life~~

2. FANTASY: separation $\leftrightharpoons$ anxiety

3. ~~LIFE~~ DEATH $\leftrightharpoons$ ~~DEATH~~ LIFE

   $D_A \leftrightharpoons A_D$

4. $D \parallel A \leftrightharpoons A \parallel D$

5. cf. $\parallel \rightarrow a \; [\parallel \approx <>]$

6. $\leftrightharpoons \rightarrow \$$

7. $D \parallel A$ AND/OR $A \parallel D = S2$

   (i.e. S2 has 'two modes')

8. S2's two modes = S1

10. $S2_a$ — 'anxiety'; metaphor; tuchē
   (master, hysteria);
   sympathy, semblance (?),
   A_D.

   $S2_b$ — 'separation'; metonymy;
   automaton (analysis,
   university); contagion,
   contiguity (?), D_A.

Because the Real resists symbolization, fantasy is required to materialize the encounters with the (traumatic) Real (step 1, on the left). Fantasy is bi-modal, i.e. it can be realized through two strategies, each of which implicates the existence and necessity of the other: (1) separation, in which the subject fantasizes about his/her absence from the Other; and (2) anxiety, where the subject's fantasies insulate or mask the trauma of the Real (2).

Where the 'ultimate' Real can be considered as death, the results of fantasy can be written in the form of the Jentschian uncanny, namely, A_D/D_A, the inscription of death within life (fate, drive, compulsion, etc.) and the inscription of iife within death (between the two deaths, the partial object, extimacy, etc.). This inscription is symmetrical, i.e. A_D requires and implies D_A, reflected in the co-dependency of anxiety and separation.

This distinction s also necessarily mirrored in a reverse condition itself is a permanent, resistant, and radical 'remainder', a void that cannot be filled just as the Real cannot be symbolized. This is Lacan's *object petit a*, the embodiment of the quality of all partial objects, i.e. that they resist all translation (5).

While $\parallel$ equals a, the partiality of the partial object, the relationships that $\parallel$ affords constitute the basis for two modes of relations among signifiers, S2. These two modes are brought into direct (traumatic) contact through the radical, permanently 'empty' master signifier, S1 (8).

Implications.The creation of 'two kinds of knowledge' is consistent with the divided path of fantasy, and its commitments to identity/authenticity (Freud's 'identity') and semblance (Freud's 'optics'). Metonymy's use of affordance, adjacency, etc. is the poetic method of parataxis and the general 'narrative' structure of the humanities. Metaphor's creation of picture-like representations relies on a screen model, a semblance/disguise mode. Motifs and paradigms may be withdrawn at this level to recombine at the level of popular culture, the arts, literature, etc., following the relationships determined by metonymy and metaphor or, respectively, artifact and representation.