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Abstract

This thesis is an analysis of colour as an event with painting and its subject form. It addresses three questions.

The first two are: can colour be an event in painting as colour and does its subject form encompass its viewers?

The analysis begins with a historical summary of how colour in painting, often aligned with woman and the feminine, has been disparaged and marginalized in Western art. Plato’s theory is examined because he is blamed for the marginalisation of the image and colour, and Lacan’s discourse theory is used to analyse colour’s disparagement and explore how Plato’s philosophy correlates with Lacan’s master and university discourses.

The thesis then explores Badiou’s theory on the event and Lacan’s on suppléance to demonstrate how colour becomes an artistic event with a painting and how a viewer becomes a part of the artistic subject form. I argue both pigmented colour and a viewer embody the artistic subject because a truth of the being of colour, in a new relational tie between them, is universalized with others. In different words, the viewer doesn’t just participate in the idea of the being of colour and thus remain caught in the prevailing discourse: she is the localizing point because of a specificity which tempers the singularity of her sight. ¹

Theories of Badiou and Lacan are employed to justify these assertions and to address a third question: what kind of philosophy prohibits compossibility with Lacan? ² I argue Badiou’s philosophy isn’t compossible with Lacan because unlike Lacan’s theory Badiou’s is emancipatory and indifferent to an individual’s symptom. My argument

¹ I use the pronoun “she” throughout this project to counter the usual predominance of the masculine pronoun “he.”
² Badiou states “philosophy is possible today, only if it is compossible with Lacan.” (Badiou 1992 p. 83-4)
requires I present an application of Lacanian discourse theory and theory on
nominations and suppletions to critique of Badiou’s philosophy. I specifically refute
Badiou’s claims that there is no subject in Lacan’s theories and that the artistic subject
is only with the art work.
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Introduction

My research explores an artistic event with painting as colour and its artistic subject. There is currently little or no theoretical analysis available about the following areas: colour in painting (apart from colour theory), an artistic event which produces a truth about the being of colour; and a viewer’s integrality with the artistic subject form. Thus this thesis presents new theory in these areas.

My first two questions involve colour as an event and its viewers as its subject form. I argue colour as an event emerges from its site, a trompe l’oeil, which envelopes both pigmented colour in painting and a viewer. In other words, the emergence is with a viewer’s sighted efficacious act in a relation with the colour and moreover, the emergence is specifically nominated beyond the mere recognition of verisimilitude. The event erupts locally with the act and materialises with a transcendental operation in sighted synthesis. A viewer is symptomatically specific to the site and although there is a lack of conscious intention with the act, she is part of subjectivization and the subject-body both because she is in a relation with the colour and is the being-there point in the relation. Furthermore, her status as a being-there site means she designates for a collectivized concept because she is integral to other viewers and thus the universal exposition of the localised relation.

I use a combination of both Badiou’s and Lacan’s theories to justify these assertions, which in turn requires that I address a third question: what kind of philosophy prohibits compossibility with Lacan’s theories? I argue philosophy usually completes the master’s discourse and that it isn’t compossible if it is emancipatory and/or indifferent to the singular symptom. I also analyse whether Badiou’s theory about an artistic subject furthers the master’s discourse. I detail and refute his criticisms of Lacan. In addition, my research widens the parameters of both their theories. For example, in Badiou’s I explore the effects of worldly objectivation for a viewer and her inclusion with the artistic subject. With Lacan, whilst maintaining a place for the psychoanalytic setting, I explore the theoretical (and to some degree the clinical) implications of psychoanalysis as artifice, that is, along with other forms of artistic semblance, its localized thought is with its artifice and a globally typical element, a singular
protagonist.

The chapters are presented in three parts. Part A deals with necessary background material about philosophy and psychoanalysis, Part B with Badiou’s criticisms of Lacan, and Part C with the artistic event and its subject.

Chapter One, *Colour and Collective Knowledge*, begins with a discussion about how colour has been marginalised and defined as secondary, and avoids codification and destabilises social orders. I begin to analyse how colour can change an individual which augments a change to entrenched collective attitudes. The chapter also assesses the extent of the historical and cultural marginalisation of colour in painting. It details colour’s status in comparison to line (drawing) and tone (light and dark) in painting and examines colour’s alignment with the feminine. I discuss how Lichtenstein blames Plato for colour’s marginalisation and reduction to secondaryness.

Chapter Two, *Colour and Discourse*, follows on from my discussion about Lichtenstein’s and Callen’s analysis of why colour is disparaged. I place this disparagement with Lacan’s discourse theory and examine why colour is a threat to a prevailing discourse. The disparagement, which serves to maintain and further a fantasy embedded in discourse, is based upon an Imaginary illusion of supposed equivalence. I begin analysis of the discursive site for evental change and how the fantasy takes on its new function and specific meaning within the site.

Chapter Three, *Philosophy and Human Sentience*, initially continues the discussion about Lichtenstein’s research on colour. I analyse Plato’s ultimate knowledge and sensory knowledge and how his disparagement of the latter influenced philosophical thought and was detrimental for colour and painting for thousands of years. I show being in-itself is not only part of existent colour in the sensorium but is also with colour in the human sentient tie. I explain this not only makes the viewer integral to the form and idea of colour but also to painting as colour. I show that Plato alludes to how

---

3 This chapter and the following two chapters are implicitly an assessment of her criticisms about Plato.
existent colour has being in-itself in the sentient tie with a viewer and that he presents a localisation process between existent colour and a viewer.

Chapter Four, *Colour and a Philosopher*, continues to explore Plato’s localisation process. The process is within a sentient tie between a pure multiple in a particular object, colour in the landscape (colour with light), and in a viewer (a concept of the sense of sight). Plato refers to such a multiple in the viewer as a capacity for knowledge innate in each individual’s mind. However, he misses how painting relates to the two realms of being. The chapter explores how all things in physical worlds exist independently from sensory knowledge but knowledge of such existence is dependent on human sentience. In fact, there is an existential interdependence between humans and such existent objects; a viewer cannot know of the existence of visible objects unless the objects are sensed in the tie. I explore how colour can emerge as an event from a site in the tie between colour and the viewer. The chapter also examines how a viewer can be a philosopher in that Plato states everyone can become a philosopher.

Chapter Five, *Philosophy: a Matter of Discourse*, examines how Plato’s dialogues relate to the site of the artistic event and specifically to the site in the artifice of the Lacanian clinic. I proceed to define philosophy and its act. I introduce Badiou’s theories for a basic overview on the site as a condition for philosophy and its act. I also introduce his theory of the subject and how it relates to the act and the forcing of a veracity of knowledge. I refer to Lacan’s statement, Plato straddles two discourses, and analyse how philosophy can complete a master’s discourse. This entails an examination of ontology with its guarantee of being in the forcing of veracity, for example, it may think the subject in the forcing because of its guarantee of being-there, but it is not the subject. The chapter concludes with an analysis of how philosophy can avoid the master’s discourse and a brief discussion on nomination.

Chapter Six, *The Singular in the Collective*, continues the analysis of discourse from Chapter Two and the previous chapter. It commences with how philosophy connects to Lacan’s university discourse which elucidates the “norm” of the master’s discourse. Lacan shows how the singular true doxa of an individual can subvert the master’s discourse. I examine how Lacan’s theory shows Plato and philosophy that proclaims
protestation only reveals a limit to the general doxa with the master’s discourse. Such philosophy doesn’t subvert old signified truths. Knowledge drawn from the jouissance of an individual, independent from others in a collective, is how the individual accedes to the Symbolic in the site. The chapter also analyses how a true doxa relates to distortion or a visible hole in a viewer’s sight. It occurs with the gaze which commences when a human enters the second count. I explore how Lacan’s theory of the gaze and sight within sensory synthesis differs from Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology. The gaze related to the drive implicates the specificity of the true doxa and specificity for a potential event. I place the specificity with a first instance of the sign connected to colour with the gaze and then the extra signifier theorised in Lacan’s later work with the second instance connected to the singular symptom of the viewer.

Chapter Seven, *Badiou, Lacan and the Subject*, begins the four chapters of Part B. It introduces Badiou’s criticism of Lacan in relation to the event and the artistic subject. It draws on an article of Bruno Bosteels and his criticisms of Lacan. Basically both Badiou and Bosteels declare there is no subject in Lacan’s theory and his theory is stuck with “structural lack as cause,” that is, with the divided subject. I begin briefly with theoretical differences between Lacan’s suppléance and Badiou’s event and examine the criticisms. I show that there is a subject in Lacan’s theories, and cite examples from decades of his work in which he theorized the event and its subject. I also discuss his theory of the site and nomination. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion about the compossibility of psychoanalysis with philosophy.

In Chapter Nine, *Lacan’s Subject-Body*, I analyze how Lacan’s Real gains consistency with a post evental subjective process. I present his theory for a new discourse of the subject-body. The chapter further analyses his theories of the event and investigates his theory on the subtractive Not All strategy and the symptom with the site. As a lead into Part C, the chapter explores how his Not All theory with psychoanalytic artifice juxtaposes with artistic artifice. I argue the viewer is integral to the site and examine how this relates to Badiou’s theory.

Chapter Ten, *Badiou’s Artistic Subject*, begins Part C which returns to a focus on art. In this chapter I analyse some of Badiou’s theories on his artistic subject. I refer to his articles *Dance as a Metaphor for Thought*, and *Art and Philosophy*, and analyse ephemeral art and his theory about a fulgurant gaze with a spectator of dance. The chapter also contains a general analysis of his theory on art, chiefly referring to his *Fifteen Theses on Contemporary Art* and *The Subject of Art*. I analyse why I disagree with his definition of the artistic subject and present a new theory for the artistic subject-body which is constructed from Lacan’s theory. The analysis is a foundation for the next chapter where I explore subtractive strategies with painting as colour.

Chapter Eleven, *Subtraction and Colour’s Materiality*, examines painting as colour and how subtractive strategies use colour’s inherent properties. The strategies point a viewer toward the site, which contains a locus for pigmented colour’s negated pure multiple of being. I refer to some aspects of Western art history and cite various artists, theorists and art historians as well as Badiou and Lacan. I initially explore colour’s materiality and separation from light then analyse colour’s invisible as well as visible materiality, and how a deeper analysis of negation with colour’s materiality connects with subtractive strategies in painting. I continue to discuss, in this chapter and the next, the viewer’s ensnared engagement with these strategies and the cut to her Imaginary transference. I also examine the logic of the non-sequitur (a form of the excluded middle) with pigmented colour in artifice. I analyse how painting supplies a site for colour as an event and how the event achieves a new truth about colour.

Chapter Twelve, *Site Specific*, continues the analysis of subtractive strategies and viewer engagement. It links back to Chapters Six and Seven and details areas where a
viewer plays a role with the event and truth. Its primary focus is upon how the viewer’s symptom has specificity with the site. The chapter also presents Lacan’s theory on how the site’s specificity relates to the political event and its subject. I begin with an analysis of the Imaginary and the Real and the repressed negated absence with universality as semblance, and examine how a viewer identifies with this error in the count. I link this to my earlier discussion on the non-sequitur and also errancy and the error with the site’s specificity. I also analyse the shift with the trompe l’oeil, the viewer’s envelope-value, and I begin to assess both Lacan’s and Badiou’s theory of localization.

Chapter Thirteen, *Localization: a Viewer and Colour*, follows a line of argument from Chapter Twelve, that an artistic event requires a viewer who has specificity with its site. It begins with an analysis of how an individual represents a collective of viewers. She is evaluated as a sub-object with a transcendental degree and is situated in the envelope of a world of a painting. I argue as a typical member of the group and integral to localization she undoes the Real synthesis in the envelope and thus alters the whole appearing of the world and semblance per se. I place her nil value relation with pigmented colour and analyse how the artistic event with an exposed relation requires a viewer identify colour which realises its own referential field. A new logic occurs or a maximal true consequence in a relation with a concept of sight. I examine how colour within artifice relates to the artifice of the sensorium. A consequence of the new logic realises a new signifier (literality with pigmented colour), which, whilst specific to painting, nevertheless ruptures the trompe l’oeil of sensorial semblance per se. The chapter concludes with an analysis of Badiou’s theory of the event with art and politics, and places the unconscious as the being-there site.
Part A

A Foundational Background

Although Part A deals with colour generally and colour in painting, it is predominately an elucidation of relevant theoretical material related to philosophy and psychoanalysis from Plato to the twentieth century.

The six chapters in Part A present background material for Parts B and C. Chapter One is about colour’s secondariness and marginalization. This is information required for an analysis of a relation of nil value with a viewer, which I discuss in Part C and particularly in Chapter Thirteen with theory about localization. Chapter Two indexes negated absence, which I discuss in detail in later chapters. The extra signifier arises from this absence in the site. Chapter Two with Six lays crucial ground work for later analysis on the symptom for the site and the symbol for the signifier of the event. Chapters Three, Four and Five address Plato and philosophical issues which are pertinent to Badiou’s criticisms of Lacan in Part B and my critique of Badiou’s theory of art and evental nomination in Part C.
Chapter One

Colour and Collective Knowledge

1.1 Displacement, Marginalisation

Colour evades codification. A reason given for this is its meanings and effects allude to myriads of contexts such as illumination, size, shape, identification of a coloured object, surroundings, cultural significance and individual experience. (Riley 2013 p. 5) (Brusatin 1991 p. 12) (Hardin 2013 p. 9) Take for example Wittgenstein’s Remarks on Colour.

Imagine a tribe of colour-blind people. … They would not have the same colour concepts as we do. For even assuming they speak English and have all the English colour words, they would still use them differently than we do and would learn their use differently. … Or if they have a foreign language, it would be difficult for us to translate their colour words into ours. (Wittgenstein 1977 p. 4e)

Cultural differences have to be considered because many societies interprete colour differently. (Gage 1993 p. 9) There are also the differences between how individuals and collectives codify colour. Eco explores how language connects social relations within a collective comprehension of colour. He quotes Línksz.

In colour as in kinship ... the terms stand in meaningful relations with other terms, and it is by the relations between terms ... the character of objective reference is sedimented. ... The concrete attributes ... function also as signifiers. ... It is not even necessary those who participate in [a] given natural order have the same substantive experience of the object, so long as they are capable of making [a] sensory distinction ... semiotically. (Línksz 1952 Vol. 2) (Eco 1985 p. 159)

Colour distinctions are sensory assumptions about physical phenomena. If one connects
sensation with sighted knowledge one is bound culturally to constitute a term for the colour and to form a semiotic relationship between the term and its correlated meaning. However, although attempts to codify colour may seem to restrict it, nevertheless, it breaks free.

Colour can seem bottomlessly resistant, attaching itself to its own specificity and the surfaces on which it has or finds its own visibility, even as it also appears subject to endless alteration arising through its juxtaposition with other colours. (Melville 1996 pp. 27, 52) 

Brusatin explores colour’s endless displacement within Goethe’s colour classifications. Firstly Goethe grouped *physiological colours* as casual, imaginary, fantastic, accidental, apparent, fleeting and spectral. Secondly he grouped *physical colours* as apparent, fleeting, false, variable, specious, emphatic and fantastic. Thirdly he grouped *chemical colours* as material, corporeal, fixed, permanent, substantial and true.

Precisely because of the attempts to distinguish between objectivity and subjectivity in judging the first two categories, the denominations seem to overlap and the nomenclature seems confused. … Is the perception of colour one of pure sensation and vibration, where cause prevails over effect, as in Newton’s theory, or rather, is it the result of sensibility and intellectual action through retinal perception of intensity, extension, and quality, as Schopenhauer suggested? Thus, one swings on a polarity around which theorists improvised a spectrum as well as all the similarities and differences of the various disciplines. (Brusatin 1991 p. 19)

Colour’s endless displacement has meant analysis of colour in painting or colour generally has been less than satisfactory. “Colour is almost everybody’s business but it has rarely been treated in a unified way.” (Gage 1993 p. 7) This has led to absurdities in

---

4 Melville points to Kristeva’s famous *Giotto's Joy* where she delights in an all-pervasive particular blue. (Kristeva 1980 pp. 210-36) I discuss Kristeva’s theory in Chapter Five.
Although, there are a number of academic areas in which colour is an important topic of investigation and debate ... it is not a subject that has hitherto played much part in the study of Western cultures as a whole – not least perhaps because it has not lent itself easily to academic treatment. (Gage 1993 p. 7)

Art history hasn’t known how to accommodate colour. In fact, it has marginalised and defined colour as secondary.

The problem with the infinite displacement of colour is not just that there are too many colours for language to convey or even as Eco states: “We must, then understand how verbal language makes the non-verbal experience recognizable, speakable and effable.” (Eco 1985 p. 159) No amount of trying to understand verbal language can convey the non verbal experience of colour or its meaning and effects, or halt its endless displacement. Melville discusses how this displacement fits with Derrida’s theory and how colour’s refusal to conform to verbal communication makes colour a generator.

Insofar as we recognize color as an object-in-deconstruction, we recognize its discipline … The point is general: that by grace of which a discipline can imagine itself to be closed upon its object is, prior to that imagination, an openness ‘in’ itself, a slippage, a parergonal unity in which rift and frame, differing, coincide. (Melville 1996 p. 142-3)

Although barely mentioning colour in Truth in Painting Derrida is occupied with the paragon, which is neither inside nor outside; colour “does not stop disturbing the internal order of discourse on painting, its works, its commerce, its evaluation, its surplus-values, its speculation, its law, and its hierarchies.” (Derrida 1987 p. 9) Therefore, to explore what authorises painting is perchance to find what is ‘beside,’ ‘in addition,’ and a supplement. Melville aligns colour with the paragon.

[It] does not fall to one side; it touches and cooperates within the operation, from a certain outside. Like an accessory, that one is obliged
to welcome on the border. ... that which borders, that which encloses, that which limits, that which is in extremity. … The limit between inside and outside, must, somewhere in the margins, be constituted. (Derrida 1987 p. 54-5)

Thus colour disturbs and de-stabilises ruling prominence. I argue in later chapters, that supplementation with such destabalisation can change a collective knowledge of colour. In fact, the only thing that can displace ruling prominence and infinite displacement is such a supplement. I argue this involves localization with an individual viewer of colour in painting. Hence the relation between the collective and the individual is of major concern because it is this localization which conveys change to a collective comprehension of colour. In other words, such change with an individual about colour per se and colour in painting extends beyond existing knowledge entrenched in centuries of Western societies and art history.

As well as localization with an individual viewer another two areas of relevance for such a change is colour’s marginalisation and secondariness. Although there is scant research available, an interesting fact emerges. Colour has been subjected to the same collective prejudice as other areas within Western societies which have been marginalised and made secondary.

Colour has been the object of extreme prejudice in Western culture. For the most part, this prejudice has remained unchecked and passed unnoticed. And yet it is prejudice that is so all embracing and generalised that, at one time or another, it has enrolled just about every other prejudice in its service. … In the West, since Antiquity, colour has been systematically marginalised, reviled, diminished and degraded. (Batchelor 2000 p. 22)

An example of this enrolment of other prejudices is colour’s alignment with the ‘feminine.’ Batchelor associates the denigration of colour with the other.

[The] purging of colour is usually accomplished in one of two ways. In the first colour is made out to be the property of some ‘foreign’ body –
usually the feminine, the oriental, the primitive, the infantile, the vulgar, the queer or the pathological. In the second, colour is relegated to the realm of the superficial, the supplementary, the inessential or the cosmetic. In one, colour is regarded as alien and therefore dangerous, or it is trivial, or it is both. (Batchelor 2000 p. 23)

Although colour is often rarefied and adored, it is also negativized and disparaged because it threatens to subvert accepted knowledge about the visual and displace ruling prominence.

1.2 Colour in Painting and the Social Order

The Feminine and Colour in Painting

Callen’s research is about entrenched collective knowledge based upon the marginalisation and secondariness of colour in centuries of art history. She proposes that colour in painting has been belittled along with women. She cites Blanc, who negativizes both colour and the feminine, and asserts that draftsmanship and drawing are superior to colour.

Drawing is the masculine sex; colour in it is the feminine sex. … One becomes a draftsman and one is born a colourist: nothing is more false than these proverbs; not only because colour, ... can be taught like music; but it is easier to learn than drawing, whose absolute principles cannot be taught at all. (Blanc 1867 pp. 22, 595)

Blanc has placed what he called the masculine in art over the feminine. His prejudice supported art which embodied notions of superior and inferior apparent in the bourgeois codes of sexual difference. Blanc’s influential writings were published in the nineteenth century when there were major changes in art training and an increase of women in the male public sphere. Callen suggests Blanc’s book was published to rebut any lack of restriction with art and liberal attitudes toward women: “The historical development of [a] polarisation of line and colour, mind and body, parallels the emergence of modern ideas of the two sexes as not merely distinct, but incommensurate.” (Callen 1995 p. 112-3) Blanc reinforced prejudice and heightened the fear of unrestrained colour, which
was actually seen as a signal of moral decline, degeneration, decadence and deceit. (Hardin 2013 p. 2)

The fear of young artists’ heads being turned – their powers of intellectual invention being undermined – by colour, was but one of many gender specific metaphors engraved in the artistic consciousness of the period. (Callen 1995 p. 113)

Hardin describes Blanc’s theory as a “testament to the emotional power of colour as well as anxieties about how that power is to be controlled.” (Hardin 2013 p. 8) Prejudices within Blanc’s society had to be vigilant.

One thing that becomes clear from Blanc’s thesis is that colour is both secondary and dangerous; in fact it is dangerous because it is secondary. … The minor is always the undoing of the major. (Batchelor 2000 p. 31)

Callen’s research shows this fear can be traced back to the Renaissance, the Poussinistes and the Rubenists. It was about the primacy of line (drawing) or colour. (Callen 1995 p. 113) Riley also describes a battle in painting between line and colour. (Riley 2013 p. 2) In addition, the debate encompassed body and mind, feminine and masculine. The body was aligned with woman and colour, and the idealisation of both was related to beauty. It was suggested the young artist avoid the feminine powers of seduction and sublimate his sexual appetite for the greater cultural benefit. “Both directly and indirectly, the feminine was ascribed the power to render the painter impotent.” (Callen 1995 p. 113-4) In the nineteenth century, this threat was minimised because colour was kept secondary to drawing and woman was marginalised.

Production of the work of art not only entailed conception, but also ‘gestation’ and ‘giving birth’ in order to empower male creativity; simultaneously it encoded woman’s creativity as re-productive, biological, and thereby excluded woman from cultural production. (Callen 1995 p. 114)

Blanc praised architectural and sculptural drawings as the highest form of drawing
because colour was ‘alien’ to those mediums. In the case of painting, where colour is integral, colour was seen as inferior to drawing. Blanc even pointed to a sexual analogy.

The union of drawing and colour is necessary, just as the union of man and women to engender humanity; but drawing must preserve its preponderance over colour. If it is otherwise, painting will run to ruin; it will be lost through colour as humanity was lost through Eve. (Blanc 1867 p. 22-3)

He saw colour as formless and therefore incoherent. Drawing however, associated with the masculine, carried meaning because it was legible and conveyed individuality.

Colour … had to be colonised, mastered by the authority of line; only the draftsman-cartographer could impose order and ‘draw’ meaning from this shifting, deceptive landscape. Like colour, woman was a desert waiting to be mapped by the male text. (Callen 1995 p. 114)

Science in the nineteenth century defined woman as lacking a defined character, having a suggestible mind, fickle emotions and inconsequential. The same characteristics were ascribed to colour. (Callen 1995 p. 125) Bracquemond described colour as unreliable and fickle as well as subordinate to light.

Where does this impotence of colour to express anything by itself come from? It results from its appearance being so unstable and always dependent upon the light which affects [it] and the milieu in which [it is] imperfectly glimpsed. (Brancquemond 1885 p. 46-7)

He also defined colour as feminine because it is insecure, precarious, and changeable. He stated colour is ‘only relative’ to light and is enslaved to a thousand variations which light imposes on it. (Brancquemond 1885 pp. 37, 47)

Blanc’s writing incontrovertibly belittled colour and colour’s affiliation with woman. He aligned women and colour with the “primitive” and articulated a nationalist discourse which idealized French male superiority. His theory served a collective
knowledge which rationalised exploitation and colonisation. He feared great French art would decay and disappear. (Blanc 1867 p. 610) He thought colourists were in search of gaudy accessories for hollow, descriptive paintings and that colourists exaggerated the material world, costume and “inert substances.” Colour was aligned with an individual’s life whereas drawing related to intellectual communication. (Blanc 1867 p. 594) Callen describes his fears as symptomatic of contemporary concerns about gratification of desires. “Art is materialised and infallibly declines [and] is vanquished by the sensation which colours.” (Blanc 1867 p. 610)

Few contemporary theorists have written about colour’s marginalisation. Landesman and Hyman refer to the lack of art historical or philosophical references to colour’s marginalisation and secondariness and how colour has been trivialized and treated as mere decoration. (Hyman 2006 p. 2) (Landesman 1989 p. 7) Brusatin asserts the predominance of form over colour remains an uncontroverted position which still persists today in Western art history. (Brusatin 2006 p. 62) (Riley 2013 p. 2) Hyman examines this predominance and declares art history often followed prejudiced thought in philosophy, for example, many art historians knew of Ruskin’s theory, which followed Locke’s theory of colour. Ruskin set out to show colour is secondary to form. Hyman cites Ruskin.

“The artist who sacrifices or forgets a truth of form in the pursuit of a truth of colour,” [Ruskin] concludes, “sacrifices what is definite to what is uncertain, and what is essential to what is accidental.” (Hyman 2006 p. 45)

Also another contemporary writer, Michael Taussig, in his critique of the denigration of colour refers to colour’s secondariness. He states colour has a “combustible mix of attraction and repulsion.” He aligns colour to the exotic and centuries of fantasies. (Taussig 2006 p. 32) Colour is called “an unmanageable thing,” something formless that needs to be controlled, “or else granted .. second class citizenship to form, … because it is a luxury, an excess, a filler, a decoration” and a deception. (Taussig 2006 p. 42)
**Colour, Drawing and Light**

The predominance of tone (light and dark) and line (drawing) over colour in painting is a consequence of the pronouncement of colour’s secondariness. Light dominates colour if tone enhances form, and drawing elevates form by giving primacy to line and shape. In the nineteenth century, Bracquemond, although he was committed to the primacy of drawing, placed a new emphasis on colour relative to light. “Without light there is no colour.” (Callen 1995 p. 116) (Brancquemond 1885 p. 64) Callen describes the collective view of the day.

Through the proliferation of new scientific theories, … colour, while still remaining subordinate to drawing – had become a subsidiary property of light; colour was simply a complement, of great interest only in so far as it was regulated by light. (Callen 1995 p. 116)

Light controlled, ordered and stabilised colour. Bracquemond saw the distribution of light with form as fundamental to art. Blanc however, considered light conveyed moral meaning. Light was first and foremost a “component of clair-obscur,” which not only gave relief to forms but conformity to the conventions of moral beauty. (Blanc 1867 p. 582) *Clair-obscur* promoted tonalist painting because of its dependence on light and dark. *Clair-obscuresque* harmony, Callen tells us, is one quarter light, one quarter dark and half mid tones.

The light-fall constituted the work’s meaning both literally and metaphorically; it literally sign-posted the progress of the narrative, while at the same time identifying the painting as meaningful; by these means, the pictorial light signalled the spectator’s movement towards ‘enlightenment.’ (Callen 1995 p. 116)

Callen describes studios prepared for exact arrangements of light to promote “art in which noble human sentiment could be read at a glance, through a fall of light and shade which emphasized anatomical form and the figure’s expression and gestures.” Tone was used to display form in relief as well as depth of space. (Callen 1995 pp. 117, 118) However, by the mid 1880s Bracquemond considered *clair-obscur* mere
sentimental abstraction. In step with changed scientific attitudes of the times, light was given a more authoritative role. He saw shadow as passive, imposed upon by light, and light of course was active.

Light was now the dominant active force. Light actively produced the two passive elements, colour and shadow. Indeed, Bracquemond was cautious in his use of the term “shadow,” seeing it not as an absence of light but rather as the presence of reflected light. (Callen 1995 p. 122)

He didn’t see clair-obscur as giving relief to form but “modelling” it, a term he referred to as a principle component of drawing. Drawing produced the contour of form and as a component of light it modelled the volume of form. Thus light made form visible and light and form together were responsible for colour. “Drawing realised colour.” (Callen 1995 p. 122) Callen cites Bracquemond.

Colours themselves could “not contribute to the value of a work if they are not ordered by [light and shade]”. … Just as the feminine was culturally marginalized in order to contain its sensuality and disorder, so too colour in painting: “In order to master this fugitive element, so singular in its inconstancy, art isolates colour.” (Callen 1995 p. 122) (Brancquemond 1885 p. 46-7)

Colour had to remain encoded as the ‘passive’ spectacle.

Lichtenstein’s research on colour goes back to Plato. She blames him for how painting had been banned from the realm of metaphysics. She explains the “confrontation between discourse and image … took place on the territory of language [and the] battle was internal to philosophical discourse.” (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 2) The image, itself, ended up reduced “to a simulacrum on the walls of a cavern, a mere shadow.” The image was effectively marginalised and reduced to secondariness.

Philosophy, .. could tolerate this image that was but a shadow of itself, the image of an image. As the shadow moved even further from reality, the image became metaphor and spent itself in figures of speech.
Destined to be heard rather than seen, poetic and rhetorical figures pose no threat to the primacy of language. (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 1)

The visible expanded into the “evocative power of the verb” thus philosophy sidestepped the domain of the image and effaced the visible. She accuses Platonic metaphysics of bringing about an otherness with the marginalisation of the image. Painting was “rejected by a paternity that could not recognise images without subjecting them to its authority.” Although Lichtenstein writes about the marginalisation of painting, she also discusses how drawing and light marginalised colour. An anti-Platonic revolt occurred in both theory and practice because of painting’s marginalisation. It occurred at the end of the fifteenth century in Italy and in the second half of the seventeenth century in France. Colorists who threatened the mastery of discourse and drawing led the revolt against the partisans of drawing. Lichtenstein historically traces and describes the role colour played in the conflict.

Color has always displayed a tension that runs through all theories of representation. For color is the material in, or rather of painting … that escapes the hegemony of language … The impotence of words to explain colour … baffles the usual procedures of language. (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 3-4)

Philosophy was fascinated by painting but disarrayed by colour. It “favoured drawing” and barely allowed for colour. Lichtenstein explained “the insurrection started with painting but it occurred because colour placed the insurrection within painting.” Western art history, bound to a discourse on form, has always relegated colour to the background. The debates provoked by color are necessarily double, both aesthetic and philosophical. (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 5-6) ‘Reason’ marginalised the visible and of course colour because, although constricted, the visible and colour threatened discourse. Despite its favouring of form and drawing in painting, the imposition of theoretical reason effectively marginalised ‘corporeality’ per se. Lichtenstein describes a corporeal eloquence and a similarity between colour, offering itself silently to the eyes of viewers, and rhetoric, which embodies the voice and the gesture. Both have mute eloquence: colour as silence in visibility, and rhetoric as silence with visible gesture. (Lichtenstein
1993 p. 6) Lichtenstein declares oppositions with binaries are set up by the logos so it can turn “its opponents against one another to increase its control over them.”

In painting, color had the same relation to drawing that the body had to discourse in rhetoric: the same uncomfortable place the Platonic metaphysics assigned to the visible and its images. (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 6)

Throughout history, Lichtenstein argues painting and rhetoric moved back and forth between the logos constructions; sometimes they were more autonomous, and sometimes more legitimate. When they gained more legitimacy, rhetoric tried to limit the importance of the specifically visible dimension of painting, its colours and materials, by favouring the more abstract qualities of its conception and drawing. (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 6) It was different when they gained more autonomy. Lichtenstein documents historical moments when colourists sought and gained autonomy, such as conferences where lectures were given in favour of colour in painting. There was even a presentation of a manifesto for a new colorist offensive. (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 146-7) She writes about France in the seventeenth century.

To attack the privileged position of drawing meant to attack the Academy. It questioned not only the theoretical principle but also the institutional base of painting’s general dignity. Only thus can we understand the bitterness of a debate whose vehemence outclassed the earlier experience of the Italians. (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 148)

The French singled out drawing as an expression of the idea or manifestation of form. The origin of drawing was defined as residing “solely in thought, the mark of an intellectual activity that proves to those who condemn painting, that the latter always follows a ‘design’ or project.” If someone were to question the authority and dominance of drawing one was “attacking the intellectual conditions that underlie the intelligibility of pictorial representation and thus break any possible link between painting and the universe of discourse.” (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 149) The dominance of line with drawing literally served the greater glory of the monarchy because it represented the king in
paintings. “Historical painting asserts the primacy of drawing in painting. … Drawing has since Aristotle been the favoured means for giving narrative form to representation, [to] recount history.” (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 149-150) Drawing implied painting was mute without drawing and its dependence on drawing gave it access to language. This argument restated a split between reason and the tangible realm.” (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 152)

The debates raged over the centuries. Lichtenstein cites Roger de Piles of 1677. “The rules of sculpture are obviously those of drawing [and] drawing is nothing other than the grammar of painting whose true practice begins only with the art of coloris.” (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 160) Lomazzo before him argued drawing in sculpture merely makes visible the contours of form. Roger de Piles also had sculpture in mind when he dissociated drawing from sight and associated it with touch. Drawing is more about matter and the hand rather than the eye. A blind man traces a contour and draws form but he couldn’t paint the form because he doesn’t know about light or colour. Although Roger de Piles stated the painter must know how to draw, he argued for the superiority of colour and painting over drawing and sculpture. (Piles 1677 p. 102-3)

To all those who blame coloris for its materiality and treat it as the ever cursed part of representation, Roger de Piles responds by defining drawing as the blind part of painting. Yet within painting drawing represents the order of discourse. And has not discourse always felt threatened by the dazzling figure of the visible, as if it feared being blinded? (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 159)

By 1885 Bracquemond linked drawing to light. As I mentioned, he referred to ‘modelling’ as a principle component of drawing. Drawing produces contour and as an aspect of light, which makes form visible, it modelled the volume of form. Furthermore, form with drawing was considered to be responsible for colour. Colour was impotent to express anything by itself. Brancquemond states this is because it is so unstable and always dependent upon the light. (Brancquemond 1885 p. 46-7)

In the following chapter I analyse why colour and woman are denigrated. This entails
an analysis of how the denigration is embedded in discursive structure.
Chapter Two

Colour and Discourse

2.1 Colour and Fantasy

As Callen, Batchelor, Lichtenstein and others have shown, colour is dangerous. (Batchelor 2000 p. 71) Writing in the late twentieth century, Batchelor describes colour as threatening even though it is excluded and disparaged. He defined white light as a tyrant. He analysed whiteness and was careful not to see colour as the opposite of white. He describes how a white gallery makes him only briefly think about whiteness. It excludes colour such that he thinks more about colour and less about whiteness. (Batchelor 2000 p. 21)

[Whiteness] began to speak more and more about what it excluded than what it contained. What did this great white hollow [gallery] make me think about? Not for long its whiteness. Rather its colour. (Batchelor 2000 p. 21)

He asks why is colour so vehemently excluded from society and art institutions. Something about colour must matter. Basically it matters because it gets in the way: “And it still matters because it still does.” (Batchelor 2000 pp.11-3, 21) As I have shown, colour threatens to escape from its position of exclusion. One way it threatens this is colour is endlessly displaceable, that is, it is peripatetic. The predominance of tone and line was an attempt to curb this threatening peripatetic errancy. The point here is that colour is dangerous and vehemently excluded because it’s a threat to existing knowledge related to prevailing discourse. In fact, we can only understand the vehemence of the colorist debate in the seventeenth century and the extent of its threat if we analyse how it is, along with woman, placed in discursive sentience. In this

5 “Colour is a lapse into decadence and a recovery of innocence, a false addition to a surface and a truth beneath that surface. Colour is disorder and liberty … Colour is all these things and more besides, but very rarely is colour just neutral.” (Batchelor 2000 p. 71)
chapter I use Lacan’s discourse theory to analyses why colour is disparaged and a threat.

What has become obvious in logic, mathematics and Lacan’s discourse theory is that disparagement serves to maintain and further a fantasy embedded in the collective social bonds of discourse. Lacan shows this specific fantasy only remains in collective knowledge because of a lack of a substitutive option. The fantasy in a nutshell is that equivalence or equality is a possibility. However, equivalence or equality is a representable possibility only if something is excluded. One can see this fantasy and the exclusion in the research of Lichtenstein and Callen. Although they have researched the disparagement of colour and its marginalisation and secondariness, they do not analyse the undermining fantasy in social bonds, that equality is possible. As I have shown, Lichtenstein’s definition of discourse is aligned with drawing and she describes the muteness of colour as marginalised by such discourse. Callen and others also consider woman, along with colour, as marginalised within the social order. However, Lichtenstein’s definition of discourse and Callen’s understanding of the social order are one and the same. Neither explores theoretically why exclusion and disparagement concurs with prevailing social bonds or how the equivalence between tone, line and colour or equality between a man and a woman is part of the aforementioned fantasy.

Lichtenstein’s conception of discourse with drawing displays a commonly understood definition of discourse, that discourse is just words and speech. But it is more than that. It is organised speech connected to the social bonds in collective relations. She presumes, as does the social order, there is a harmony of meaning between words and relations. However, collective relations depend upon agreed meanings which are constructed on abovementioned fantasy. Fink describes the fantasy as “an unquestioning approach to language and the categories and relations it provides.” Lichtenstein’s alignment of drawing with discourse lacks this deeper analysis about collectively supposed knowledge. The collective fantasy is built into discourse because discourse is based upon a fundamental error. “All knowledge .. participate[s] .. ‘in the fantasy of an inscription of the sexual link.’ .. The relation between knowledge and the world [is] consubstantial with a fantasy of copulation.” (Fink 2002 p. 148-9) What Fink is defining refers to Lacan’s famous statement ‘There is no sexual relation.’ (Lacan
It is the fantasy of copulation involved with the inscription of a sexual link. The fantasy is behind Lichtenstein’s definition of discourse and her conclusion that Plato’s reason with discourse has marginalised colour and the visual. The fantasy is also built into the feminist overtones with Callen and others who align colour with woman. Their research shows that the marginalisation of colour and woman has occurred over centuries because of Western prejudices. The fantasy also connects with Callen’s implied call for woman and colour to take up the offensive against a ruling prominence. Behind Callen’s ‘call to arms’ is an implied understanding that woman, colour and the visual have the power of the disadvantaged and that they should mobilize and use this power to demand recompense. Such is the threat of that which is excluded or marginalized. As I cited above, Batchelor points out colour is dangerous. It threatens to escape from exclusion. “The minor is always the undoing of the major.” (Batchelor 2000 p. 31) Such mobilization may seemingly procure recompense and achieve equivalence however, despite obtaining some modification, the achieved ‘equivalence’ will nevertheless fail to truly change collective prejudices. As Lichtenstein understands the logos constructs such oppositions between binaries to maintain control. The reason mobilization or protestation fails is equivalence (or equality) only continues to materialise as the ruling universal, that is, it is possible only at the expense of what is excluded. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 57) In other words, the collective fantasy is based upon the existence of the two sexes or equivalence between binaries, which is an Imaginary illusion, and the failure of protestation relates to the fact that the minimum, or that which is excluded, is exactly what is required for disjunction. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 61)

This minimality indexes an absence, which, for example, with the visible and colour, is within the bond between colour and a viewer. It is the lack of inscription with the supposed but disjunctive relation of equivalence. The relation requires a negated third term. When there is only two in the relation it cannot “hold together for even an instant.” Lacan explains that topology in mathematics is tied to signifying relations. In other words, inscription or signification requires the presence of a third term before a relation is established between two others. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 53-4) ⁶ These initial

⁶ This is what Lacan’s Borromean knot means.
fundamental topological relations are not measured in numbers but the defining functions of mathematics, which conceptualise inscriptions or significations. Moreover, language is modelled on these topological relations because language pertains to physical reality, which is only approachable by means of mathematical functionalisation related to any predicated argument. The four fundamental propositions or operational relations are negation, conjunction, disjunction and implication. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 60) Thus the feminist overtones implied in Callen’s ‘call to arms’ or to a relation of equivalence is caught in the disjunction between the two sexes, which only leads to reform with minor modifications. Lacan explains something happened to sexual copulation with the human animal: “from the moment language comes into play there is no second sex.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 54-5) The reference is to Simone de Beauvoir and ipso facto Callen’s call for woman and colour to take up the offensive. The other in the relation of two is the so called second sex, second as in secondary. It is where woman empties herself qua being for the signifying relation. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 55) Likewise it is where colour offers its being to be emptied for representation in a signifying relation with a viewer. It offers the negated absence, in its relation to the minimum, the emptied as being, to the effects of the inscription in human sentience. And where this third term of the relation inexists becomes the locus of the place where it is inscribed such that it transmits knowledge. In other words, the transmission occurs because “one of the terms of the relation must be emptied out in order to allow this relation to be written down.” (Lacan 2002k. VI, 3) However, when the term in the site writes this inscription it changes its function and the relation can no longer be a relation except by being written precisely at the site of this term. This site, Lacan theorises, is what I later define with Badiouian terminology as an evental site. It is where an extra significer or significifier of the event substitutes for the absence. It comes into existence and is transmitted as a new knowledge. The emptied out being in relation to what Lacan calls the Necessary is where new knowledge can be written. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 97) (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 3) The event emerges from the locus of the third term, where the inscription takes on its new function, within a specific discursive site. I propose in Lacanian psychoanalytic artifice the discourse of the site is what Lacan designates as the analyst’s discourse. I discuss this further in Chapter Nine. The site is a discourse that has specific meaning in the locus of the third term which has been created from previous shifts with Lacan’s other three discourses. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 4)
The prevailing discourse, which concurs with the marginalization Lichtenstein and Callen discuss, is the discourse Lacan defines as the master’s discourse. It is ascribed to the Symbolic unconscious, the father and masculine libido, and it presents the social bonds of old collective knowledge or a collective fantasy. It has two designations which relate to why colour and women are marginalised and secondary. One is where they are idealised, and the other where they are symptomatic. Lacan uses a mathème to define the designations of the discourse in four positions.

\[
S_1 \quad S_2
\]
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The S1 or master signifier is in the top left, the place for the masculine (in relation to woman), father and the Symbolic unconscious, and there is movement from S1 to S2. (Nomine 2007a p. 2) (Dravers 2002 p. 148) 7 The following details included with the master’s discourse show how its designations relate to when colour is a threat and disparaged in the sentient tie.

7 Lacan changed the contexts in the four places over time. The top signifiers designate ‘desire’ and ‘the Other,’ then he changed them to ‘agent’ and ‘work,’ then ‘semblance’ and ‘phallic jouissance.’ (Nomine 2007a p. 10) ‘Semblance’ and ‘jouissance’ are above the bar and truth and surplus jouissance beneath it.
Idealised woman and colour is with S2, which is in the top right, the place for the Other, work and phallic jouissance. Colour in this place is negated absence or the fundamental error in a relation with surplus jouissance under the bar. Woman and colour, aligned with the Other, are idealized in the fantasy. I place the inscription of the error with a sighted concept of colour in painting in the bottom left with S. It relates to the sentient bond between S1 and S2 but is barred by the master signifier, S1. Light as source (lux) is with S1 because light dominates a concept of sight as man dominates woman. Colour exists as partially hidden with lux and semblance. In this discourse S1 represents what is beneath it. (Nomine 2007b p. 9) Colour, in the position of the lower left, as barred

---

8 The collective of viewers knows, since Newton, how colour is hidden as a spectrum in light. We know, in comparison to say the Gothic epoch, that Newton demonstrated “the unity of light, the light of God, is nothing else than the multiplicity of colours. It is nothing but a unity that can be decomposed.” (Laurent 2008 p. 7)
from the visible by old knowledge, is thus represented as part of light in visible existence emptied ‘for’ the signifying relation with a viewer. It is where the three registers (Real, Imaginary and Symbolic) are tied in symptomatic form with colour’s non-existence.

Colour with human sentience is built upon a fundamental error because it is inscribed within a viewer’s old concept of sight. The Imaginary with S2, the symbol, provides equivalence between binary verbs which materialise as a mirage about equivalence in the collective fantasy. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 57) The mirage only materialises the universal and idealises woman and colour, for example, colour is idealised and desired when it is considered to be beautiful. The movement between S1 and S2 involves an existent symbol of colour as semblance and the S2 mirage represents it as the symptom beneath it. Such concealment covers that which inexists, the absent third term of the relation of two in equivalence. However, the symptom in this disjunctive relation cannot be mastered. It breaks free or the supposedly seemless mirage fails and symptom repeats. As I said above, colour and its endless peripatetic displacement is unconstrained. What is repeating with the master discourse is the symptom. It is in disarray because of the operational relation of disjunction. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 5) However, the site resides with a symptom until an event occurs. When the master’s discourse is subverted the symptom or the site, with the negated absence in the inscription, is moved into the dominant semblant position of the discourse of the site and what is produced is a potential supplementation for what has been the emptied as being. This potentiality is specific to the site with the viewer. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 5) The supplement (an extra signifier) ruptures a viewer’s old sighted knowledge about colour. If this doesn’t occur the fantasy of idealization proliferates. What we idealise we think exists. The universal will not recognise an association between an inexistent element of visible colour and a singular viewer in a sentient signifying relation.

Nomine states that the masculine libido in the master’s discourse is made of two currents with the neurotic. Firstly, the tender current between S1 and S2 is formed in early childhood. It is where colour in painting connects in a viewer’s preconception
with an idealised fantasy in the Imaginary and the gaze. Under the bar is the sensual current, which was repressed during childhood and confined in autoerotic satisfaction.  
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Thus colour is idealised above the bar and belittled and disparaged because of what it is beneath it.  

This theory is based on the oedipal myth, which is the fantasy with the S1 and S2 formed in early childhood.  

Above the bar colour and woman are loved and desired, idolised and a feast for the eyes. Below the bar they are denigrated and disparaged, negativized and disregarded as secondary. The idealization exists at the expense of that which it suppresses. Hence, the marginalisation and secondariness of colour in painting is the symptom of a fantasy just as woman is a fantasy for man. Masculine libido in the master’s discourse is revealed as a universal tendency toward debasement.  

A radical shift from desire and idealisation is required. If the shift is

---

9 As I discuss in Chapter Six, colour can be placed with the autoerotic. (Kristeva 1980 p. 220)  
10 “The ego [above the bar] does not want to know those two currents can converge on only one object. The forbidden of incest implies that man does not know he loved his mother, father, brother, or sister in a sensuous way. This is why man splits into two the object of his libido. He keeps intact the link of tenderness that links him to a loved and idealised woman, and tries to satisfy his sensual current with a woman who is very different and usually belittled.” (Nomine 2007a p. 2)  
11 The father and the Name of the Father have become semblants with the fantasy. Mathematized logic became important for Lacan because he moved away from the semblants of the oedipal myth, the father and the Name of the Father. They were merely semblants that furthered the foundational fantasy. In the late 1960s he moved to “formulating things at the level of structural logic.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 62-3)  
12 “The structure of masculine libido makes man unable to love, desire and enjoy a one and only object.” (Nomine 2007a p. 2) Men continue to search for another woman, an ideal woman but “he can never reach [her]. That woman has no existence in reality, no representation.” (Nomine 2007a p. 3)
weak only a minor modification in the form of a change of discourses occurs. (Nomine 2007a p. 4)

2.2 Colour’s Threat to Old Discourses

Colour is a threat even if it only creates weak modifications because it can still shift discourses toward the creation of the discourse of the site. Shifts within discourses occur when designations in a discourse change positions. Lacan presents two theories about these shifts. One involves a movement of designations between existing discourses, the other is a crossing of the bar. The latter is particularly pertinent in Lacan’s discourse of the site. The former involves love, which is most evident in the reciprocal speech of lovers, particularly within the declaration *I love you*. The beloved who receives such a declaration must declare her love in return and when she does she changes place with the other. 14 One of the lovers takes the desiring position, which triggers a desire in the other, and the changing of places. (Nomine 2007a p. 4) The latter shift, signifierness, is a movement from above the bar to beneath it, from desire to surplus jouissance. Dislodgement occurs in an individual’s drive circuit. The specific shift that can occur for a viewer of colour in painting is a dislodgement of an unknown pertaining to the Real in the scopic drive. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 54) The movement in the master’s discourse between S1 and S2 is disrupted. A repetition of the drive circuit dislodges the movement and S2 is unable to re-present an old knowledge. The ongoing repetition in the circuit is dislodged by a presentification of an unknown factor. It is a chance encounter where chronological time is confronted with an unknown from the Real. In other words, the presentification requires an unknown or non-existent: “it does not respond to the impact of a single punctual scene.” (Harari 2004 p. 101) Two scenes involve an effect in one, which is triggered by the first. S2 returns to S1 and then S1 back to S2. The presentification does not re-signify and sense is undone. 15 The effect is

13 Such a change to the master discourse is the becoming of the hysteric discourse. The neurotic viewer realises a different social bond with the change.

14 There are two unconscious knowledges involved when “the one who is loved becomes the lover.” (Nomine 2007a p. 1) (Lacan 1998 p. 144)

15 In Freudian terms “the etiology is only effective at the time of the binding of, and with, the second traumatic scene.” (Harari 2004 p. 101)
a signifierness between the Real and the Symbolic with the two scenes S1 and S2.  

If supplementation occurs with signifierness, that is, with a strong intensity in the discourse of the evental site, an extra signifier ruptures the site and old signifying knowledge. Lacan’s process of localization has occurred. I discuss this process in detail in the last chapter.

As I have shown, mobilization and protestation may achieve weak modifications or reforms with equality or equivalence. Nevertheless, it doesn’t change the founding fantasy and collective knowledge. In fact, an offensive such as protestation only completes the obstacle, the obstacle for women being prevailing male dominance, because equivalence only silences operational difference. (Lacan 2002k p. II, 10)

[The protest] consolidates the discourse of the Master by completing [it], and not simply with surplus value. [The protest consolidates it] by encouraging the woman to exist as equal. Equal to what? No one knows because one can also very well say that man is equal to zero because he feels the existence of something that denies him in order for him to exist as all. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 9)

The relation of two with equivalence is founded in universals. The question ‘how does the universal man relate to the universal woman?’ is imposed upon us with the initial movement between S1 and S2 in discourse. In fact, the imposition is founded upon this question. If there were no discourse or question “we would not have to bring the universal into play.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 57-8) The question is prior to sexual fantasy because, as I stated above, discourse is modelled on mathematical functions and logical operations. Equivalence fails because logic concurs with mathematical functionalisation and the logical necessity of discourse is the art of production. The propositional function, “what is posited is true,” is the phallic function and it makes false that which is negated. It starts its existence within the formulation of mathematical topology and

---

16 It is only after the production we trace the productive condition in a progressed reading on symptoms. (Harari 2004 p. 102) Harari describes a production of jouissance as a slant on the unary trait despite an old swarm of S1s with a symptom.
marks that empty place for a number of things to take such a place. (Lacan 1971-1972c pp. 61, 59) Every discourse has to receive “its sense from another one” and because “what constitutes it is very precisely constructed from the absence of sense.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 2) The discourse of the site is created with artifice to encompass new information arising from the sense that occurs from the changes of sense from one discourse to another. Every time sense arises, from what Lacan calls the phallic function constructed upon the absence of sense, it occurs with an equivalent phallic function in another discourse. In other words, for every apparent variable $x$, the mathematical function for All in the phallic function treats every signifier the same. (Lacan 2002k p. II, 10) However, logic completely changes its meaning according to where each discourse takes its meaning. 17 The discourse of the site, created as artifice, embodies the absence of sense with the third term. (Lacan 2002k p. I, 1) The absence in the artifice allows for undecidability where new meaning or new knowledge can only emerge through recognition of the third term. Once logic questions the empty space, the Not All that is established with the All, the space is revealed in the disjunction between two seemingly equivalent terms. 18 In short, the two terms require a third, and the requirement creates an evental site as discourse.

The site takes sense from other discourses then it “closes in on itself” and articulates what it has received. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 2) Man determines what does not exist from a position in the masculine ‘norm’ of the master’s discourse and it is from the Real of inexistence that woman takes on her role. This is precisely what gives the sense that “closes in on itself” to the discourse of the site. The necessity of an extra signifier pushes towards emergence in the absence of sense, which as Lacan states, illustrates very properly why the extra signifier or signifier of the event is a “matter of discourse.” It literally requires discourse. Moreover, the nothing of sense can only appear as the logical necessity of discourse with a human animal. What is necessary is that the production renders existence possible. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 2) Thus evental change is a

17 What further complicates the matter is the Real affirms itself in the impasses of logic. (Lacan 2002k p. III, 3)

18 Thus the Not All space points to negation in discordance. The negation is not foreclosure. (Lacan 2002k pp. I, 4, 2)
matter of discourse and its production is a logical necessity. In other words, the product of the site, which was always a necessity, is the actualization of the extra signifier as “proof.” It was previously supposed to be inexistent and at the source of the symptom. Supposition of the signifier is with an existing symbol, which designates its non-existence. (Lacan 2002k pp. IV, 2, 3, 4, 5) For example, the viewer sights a supposed inexistence in a visual symbol of colour and such inexistence is not nothing. It is a number that forms part of the series of whole numbers. 19 Thus colour’s absence or inexistence equates with the ground breaking mathematicized logic in the twentieth century. It connects to the feminine side in Lacan’s Formula of Sexuation, specifically to the negation which bears on the universal signifier involved with Not All: one of the two in a relation is emptied out because it is where the inexistent is inscribed. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 3) Lacan’s Not All of the site declares “There is one who isn’t subject to the phallic function.” The functional usage of inexistence within human sentience only happens with signifierness in the discourse of the site.

[It is] an after-effect from which there arises necessity. ... This necessity is to reduce itself where it manifested itself before, ... proving it this time at the same time as I am stating it. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 6)

The necessity is the repetition in the Symbolically constructed drive circuit. “This necessity is repetition itself, in itself, by itself, for itself,” that is, existence for the sentient tie is only necessitated by discourse. Logic is produced in this repetition as it appears to “rejoin as semblance what is carried out in a message.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 6) However, logic and maths go in different directions, that is, the contingency of the site and the reflexivity with the extra signifier is articulated with mathematics rather than with logic. (Bartlett 2014 p. 1) (Badiou 2009a p. 109-111) It is the finitude of an

19 It was inaugurated in the status of numbers by Frege with mathematicized logic. However, Frege opposes the meaning of the phallus, the proper name, to meaning as sense, which corresponds to the sense of a proposition or an argument proposed in contingence by the sexual value of woman. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 8) The logic of supposition is confronted with whole numbers and Frege’s questioning of this led to his placement of number one upon absence. Bertrand Russell, following on from Frege, developed what has been termed Russell’s paradox. He showed a contradiction can occur with the natural assumptions of set theory and therefore set theory had to be modified. The contradiction is - a set is a member of itself if and only if it is not a member of itself and this is contradictory. (Evans 1996 p. 495)
extra signifier that ends colour’s infinite displacement. Localisation of the signifier with the viewer involves the self reflexive: “Something appears to us suddenly to be reflected back from the very foundation of what brought it about.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 6-7) Lacan describes it as “one among all others ... as local in the accidental sense.” It is the discourse of the site that notices this. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 7) As I discuss in Chapter Six and later, the site in painting as colour ensnares the gaze of the viewer. It provides the potential for colour to be an event because it lays bare within a painting’s envelope a contingency for an extra signifier which installs finitude to end colour’s infinite peripatetic succession.
Chapter Three

Philosophy and Human Sentience

3.1 Plato’s Writing

Previously I discussed Lichtenstein’s research on colour in painting. Here I continue to discuss her proposition that a battle in Western art history between discourse and image was internal to philosophy. (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 2) She blames Plato for the marginalization of the image. Colour, along with the image, was reduced “to a simulacrum on the walls of a cavern, a mere shadow” of itself. (Lichtenstein 1993 pp. 2, 1) Plato disparages painting in The Republic. He considers that it has no serious value and that it can’t be relied upon. (Plato 2007 pp. 344, 346) He asserts both poetry and painting have a low degree of truth because both deal with “a low element in the mind.” (Plato 2007 p. 348) There is no doubt, as Lichtenstein’s research shows, that Plato’s criticism has been detrimental for painting and specifically colour in painting. Although his criticisms of painting abound, a close analysis of The Republic reveals allusions to how painting can subtractively strategise with its semblance. I discuss this below and his many references to viewers of painting. I examine strategies in his writing and his definition of a philosopher. This chapter, along with the following two chapters, is also an examination of philosophy and the definition of a philosopher. In Chapter Five, I discuss in detail how Lacanian psychoanalysis addresses philosophy in discourse.

Badiou states that an authentic philosopher is “not an academic, armchair, or TV philosopher.” 21 In Badiou’s words, according to Plato, a philosopher is an individual who is able to “master the ordinary flow of time and contemplate that aspect of Being which is exposed to thought [and] is thus transfigured by the powers of a Subject.”

---

20 In Cratylus, he declares a representation is only a copy of form and colour. (Plato 1997 432b, 434e) Plato’s view was “art is merely the imitation of an imitation and should therefore occupy a subordinate role in society.” (Maulter 2000 p. 428)

21 I refer to Alain Badiou’s translation of Plato’s Republic. Badiou’s interpretation of Plato speaks through his translation.
In Plato’s words, philosopher’s “hearts are fixed on the true being of each thing [and they] are to be called philosophers and not lovers of opinion” (Plato Penguin 2007 p. 204) In Badiou’s *Plato’s Republic*, Plato states that an authentic philosopher “is willing to promote the natural becoming of an Idea befitting the real that underpins its existence. ... A Subject is defined by [her] full and complete participation in the process whereby being is exposed to thought.” (Badiou 2012 p. 182) However, unfortunately most that call themselves philosophers are usually only academics, and thus, as Badiou defines the term, they are precisely not authentic. According to Lacan’s theory such inauthentic philosophy constitutes a master’s knowledge. (Lacan 2007 p. 148-9) In Chapter Five and Parts B and C, I discuss how philosophy relates to discourse.

According to Badiou’s theory a truth procedure is a prerequisite condition for philosophy. (Badiou 1992 pp. 39, 141) Subtractive strategies with truth procedures facilitate conditions whereby the act of philosophy can seize truth out of the sense of a world. The strategies implicate “the undecidable, the indiscernible, the generic and the unnameable.” (Badiou 1992 p. 141-3) A viewer in an ‘Artistic Truth Procedure’ confronts inexistence, which Plato defines as the very being in-itself of an object. It is the pure non being of the one. (Badiou 2005 pp. 34, 35) The viewer confronts a lack of certitude. ‘Does an inexistent belong or not belong to existence?’ I argue a duplicitous subtractive strategy necessitates this undecidability, which ensnares viewer engagement. Badiou places such a strategy with a site in Plato’s writing. He describes the undecidability in Plato’s dialogues as aporetic.

The undecidable is the reason behind the aporetic style of the dialogues: the aim is to reach the point of the undecidable precisely in order to show that thought must make a decision with regard to an event of being, that thought is not primarily a description or a construction but a break (with opinion, with experience), and hence a decision. (Badiou 2006 p. 54)

---

22 In later chapters I discuss Badiou’s theory of the subject in detail.
23 There are four types of truth procedures in his theory, which relate to science, art, politics and love. (Badiou 1992 pp. 38, 141)
As such Plato’s writing presents a generic procedure, an ‘Artistic Truth Procedure,’ the same as a poem or a painting presents a site. In other words, Plato’s aporetic writing is a condition of philosophy. Its site is within the artifice. The artifice of the Lacanian clinic also involves the site and subtractive strategies. Its site engages an analysand and involves an analyst in the Not All position. 24 As I discussed previously, in 1972 Lacan analyses topology and the functionalisation of mathematics and situates the Not All position with the undecidable, that is, with an inexistent third term with a relation of two. 25 In turn he places this with his analyst’s discourse or what I am calling the discourse of the site. Thus Lacan’s clinic is a condition for philosophy. 26 It doesn’t matter what kind of artifice is involved with an evental site, the fact remains the truth procedure is a prerequisite for a philosophic act. I argue Lacan’s clinic is an ‘Artistic Truth Procedure’ intermixed with a ‘Love Truth Procedure.’ 27 Lacanian psychoanalytic practice embodies an aporetic strategy, which necessitates an analyst is in a position of semblant, the Not All position for undecidability within discourse of the site. It also embodies an aporetic strategy of discontinuity which makes undecidability possible. 28

Two points about Plato are relevant to later chapters. The first is his criticism of painting, the second his aporetic writing as a truth procedure, which points to where philosophy sits in relation to discourse. I discuss both below.

3.2 Plato, Philosophy and Human Sentience

As I stated above, Plato claims that painting only operates in pleasure, the lowest element in the mind. (Plato 2007 p. 348) Lower parts of “our minds are clearly liable to all sorts of confusions.” He accuses painting and other artistic forms of duplicitously

24 In Chapter Two I discussed Lacan’s analyst’s discourse or discourse of the site.
25 A strategy with the undecidable is intrinsically tied to mathematics. (Badiou 2006 p. 55)
26 The aporetic void sustains the philosophic act. (Badiou 1992 p. 144)
27 Although he doesn’t refer to Lacanian psychoanalytic practice, Badiou discusses how art is a mixed procedure and that two generic procedures can intermix. “Art, a mixed procedure, supports truths of love.” (Badiou 2005 pp. 340, 341)
28 Discontinuity within psychoanalytic sessions occurs when the spoken text of an analysand is cut with interpretation and when there is an arbitrary cutting of sessions. Strategies such as discontinuity enhance the undecidable and the indiscernible within the discourse of a site. Discontinuity is also within breaks and ruptures in Plato’s writing. (Bartlett 2013 p. 1)
enticing viewers to uninhibited indulgence, for example, he considers the viewer gains pleasure from watching other’s suffering within tragic theatre. (Plato 2007 p. 345)

Our better nature ... relaxes its control over these feelings, on the grounds that it is someone else’s suffering it is watching; ... besides, it reckons the pleasure it gets as sheer gain, and would certainly not consent to being deprived of it by condemning the whole poem. (Plato 2007 p. 350)

He applies the same theory about a viewer’s pleasure to laughter and pity. “The effects are similar when you enjoy a joke on stage - or even in ordinary life, jokes you would be ashamed to make yourself.” (Plato 2007 p. 350)

[And with] the sounds and signs of tragic grief, you know how even the best of us enjoy it, and let ourselves be carried away by our feelings; we are full of praises for the merits of the poet who can most powerfully affect us. (Plato 2007 p. 349)

He admits “even the best of us enjoy it.” He judges any appeal to such lower elements as spurious and inauthentic. His theory on mimesis, specifically with his famous cave, contains a view of painting as mere simulacrum with a low degree of truth. (Lichtenstein 1993 pp. 2, 1) (Plato 2007 pp. 344, 346) This theory and his disparagement of viewer pleasure overlook the Imaginary as a necessary part of strategies that entice a viewer engagement with a site. It is true the Imaginary with the viewer’s gaze has to be cut but it is also necessary to hook her gaze, so that her reliance upon it can be cut. Simply ignoring or belittling the Imaginary does not cut it.

Plato’s denigration of viewer pleasure is coupled with a disparagement of human perception. His word ‘form’ is commonly understood to be a rendering of the Greek word eidos or idea. (Lee 2007 p. 192) Amongst other things it is concerned with knowledge of unchanging objects. It resembles the laws of nature and a law is an unseen intelligible principle underlying an unlimited multiplicity of similar phenomena, which Plato supposed to be unalterable. (Raven 1965 p. 176) Human sentience is disparaged in comparison to physical form. Lee explains this occurs with Plato because he was influenced by the Heraclitean School who thought there is no knowledge with
sensible things in flux. Plato supposed full knowledge was not possible with the sensible world. (Lee 2007 p. 193) Another influence was mathematics and the Pythagoreans. Mathematics was considered to be ‘independent’ of the sensible world and have “a level of reality more ultimate than the senses show us.” Sensory knowledge was inadequate. “The world perceived by the senses ... has a lower status ontologically than the realm of forms.” (Lee 2007 pp. 193, 194) The world as it appeared to the senses was secondary and at odds with ultimate reality. Plato had two types of knowledge. The ultimate knowledge (epistēmē) involves how-to. It is professional skill with organised knowledge and knowledge accounted for by rational argument. It is also what an object really is in-itself, rather than what appears or seems. Secondary or sensory reality is knowledge which is opinion, doxa, belief or mere supposition. It fits with the phrase, “it seems to me.” (Lee 2007 p. 194)

As Lichtenstein has shown, Plato’s criticisms have been detrimental for painting, specially colour with painting and viewer involvement. In addition, his theory influenced much of Western philosophy. Hyman writes about philosophy and colour with human perception. Perception is supposed to explain existence, yet we often question the existence we perceive. He asserts the materiality of colour in particular is often considered questionable. (Hyman 2006 p. 13) A reason for this is the influence of Plato’s theory, that human sentience or sensory knowledge is not ultimate knowledge because it makes existent objects seem changeable. Philosophers ever since Plato have questioned colour’s visible existence. According to Galileo, all we need for an explanation about visible existence is size, shape and motion. Hyman concludes this is too limited because size, shape and motion do not account for the nature of light or the physiology of vision. (Hyman 2006 pp. 12, 28, 20) For example, there is a fundamental difference between the visibility of colour and shape. A shape doesn’t depend on the idea of visibility but colour does. (Hyman 2006 p. 16-7) However, the materiality of colour and the fact it appears as visible existence is only questionable because of sensory knowledge. What is questionable is whether human animals with sentience (conscious power of sense perception) experience colour differently to the way colour is in existence. Understanding the difference between physical visible existence and human sentience requires a more complex theory than simply blaming pleasure or the lowest level of the human mind for distortions or considering human sentience as
inadequate or impermanent. A key to the matter is, as I argue below, human sentience with visible existence is a form of appearing in its own right. Furthermore, this different appearing is singular, that is, it involves the sentience of a singular viewer. 29

Plato defined human sentience as secondary because it appears changeable and dependent upon ultimate reality or primary knowledge. I discuss below, colour’s visible existence depends on sight (human sentience) therefore as a consequence, colour per se was considered secondary, that is, within its appearing in human sentience as well as its appearing within physical existence. As Lichtenstein’s research demonstrates, the fact colour was disparaged generally was detrimental for colour in painting, especially colourist painting. 30 Moreover, the double denigration of colour in visible existence (in the sensorium and in painting) and within human sentience, can be traced to philosophy’s questioning of colour’s visible existence and the secondariness of sensory knowledge. As I said, colour exists as a form of appearing within sentience as well as in physical worlds. The double denigration can be traced in a long standing and prevalent philosophical tenet: colour exists only in the human mind. Hyman refutes this.

If every perceiving creature were removed, every perception would be annihilated and abolished from existence. But we cannot infer that the colours and tastes we predicate of bodies would vanish too. (Hyman 2006 p. 13)

Many prominent figures in Western philosophy have held the view that colour is secondary because it is only in the mind and therefore it is deceptive. Hyman proposes that this view, the idea colour is illusionary, questionable or even non-existent, can be traced back to ancient optical theory and rationalism. (Hyman 2006 p. 15)

[As] Goethe said, every philosopher sees red when he hears talk of colours. Colour has always seemed to be the primary explanation of

29 In Chapter Eight, I discuss how Badiou’s theory about pleasure as an affect sufficiently signals an evental change and how artifice doesn’t require the singularity of desire.

30 I discuss colourist painting in Chapter Eleven.
phenomena at the same time it is discounted as a falsification within interpretative discourse. (Brusatin 1991 p. 10)

Its worth digressing here with a brief survey of philosophical thought about the mind, colour and painting to reveal the prevalence of the view that colour is secondary and deceptive. Plato’s and Descartes’ theories had the most influential impact upon colour and representation. (Plato 1997 432b, 434e) (De Rosa 2010) As well as surmising representations imitate yet conceal referents, Descartes’ radical scepticism concluded everything is colourless and our senses are deceptive. (Descartes 1984 Vol. II) His scepticism inspired Berkeley.

The ideas of light and colours ... are in the mind only as they are perceived by it … because .. colours are on all hands acknowledged to exist in it and nowhere else. (Berkeley 2003 pp. 29, 57)

Others such as Hobbes and Locke accepted sceptical representationalist theory but not Descartes’ radical scepticism. Hobbes criticised it and he proposed Descartes’ arguments originated with ancient philosophy. (Hobbes 1984 vol. II p. 121) He thought colour’s supposed deceptiveness could be corrected.

As sense telleth me, when I see directly, that the colour seemeth to be in the object; so also sense telleth me, when I see by reflection, that colour is not in the object. (Hobbes 1928 p. 7)

Landesman proposes Hobbes saw events in the mind as “materialistic ontology.” However, Locke didn’t reduce the mind to matter. (Landesman 1989 pp. 4, 12) 31 As far as Locke was concerned colour is secondary but primary qualities have power to produce sensations of size or shape in space and motion. (Locke 1975 p. 17) Such primary power is a consequence of an object’s being in-itself. Visual form has being in-itself whereas visual colour is a consequence of form. This means colour doesn’t have being in-itself.

31 Landesman estimates Locke’s theory has become the dominant model. (Landesman 1989 pp. 4, 12)
A rationalist and scientific view of colour separates it from primary power. Locke thought shapes were as they appear but there is always deficiency with colour’s appearance. He characterises it as a failure of resemblance because colours as ideas in the mind do not resemble colours as qualities of bodies. (Landesman 1989 pp. 15, 16) Therefore, although our senses tell us colours exist, perception miscategorises the powers of colour. The powers are secondary because they are only productions of sensations from colour’s primary qualities. (Locke 1975 p. 10) The principal reasoning is sensations are internal to us, not internal to existent colours. Hobbes, Locke and Galileo basically agree on causal powers, which are Locke’s secondary qualities. Locke and most others thought colour only exists in the mind and lacks objective status. “The secondary qualities, then, are properties in some way of our representations but not of the objects represented.” (Landesman 1989 pp. 7, 8-10) Hyman summaries the historical roots of the supposed deception and the myth: visible colours don’t exist.

It is widely believed that physical objects are not coloured. This doctrine was already stated by Democritus in the fifth century B.C.: “Colours, sweetness, bitterness, exist by convention,” he wrote, “in reality, there are atoms and voids.” (Hyman 2006 p. 11)

This view became orthodox by the seventeenth century with rationalists such as Galileo, Descartes, and Kepler and it was cemented into place by Newton who made it a permanent feature of the modern scientific picture of the world.

The problem with the tenet, colour doesn’t exist apart from the human mind, occurs because appearing with human sentience is not given credence, that is, colour exists as appearing in visible worlds as well as appearing with human sentience. Painting accentuates the problem with the tenet because it gives prominence to the sentient tie, which is the connection between both existent colour and human sight.  

32 Philosophers grappled with the notion of human sentience. Locke defines the tie as visible colour arousing a particular response in a viewer. Hyman declares Locke’s definition of the tie can be taken in two ways. Firstly, as a variant of Galileo or Descartes’ notion that visible colour doesn’t exist; or secondly in a way which has become a neo-Lockean perspective. He argues that the first is closer to
3.3 Appearing with Human Sentience

A deeper analysis of human sentience and its tie with visible worlds is required. I suggest there are at least three types of appearing with sighted knowledge and they commingle because each type highlights a singular viewer’s sentient history and physiology. The three types of appearing correlate within the sentient tie both to colour in painting and colour in the sensorium. This first type of appearing is with painting. It specifically points to the physiological structure of human sight within sentience. It occurs with a viewer’s physical response to colour. Colour in a sentient tie with a viewer can exist for her in a way that may differ from what is supposedly its colour in physical existence. This difference is not exactly physical because colour’s appearing within the tie relates to the physicality and the physiological structure of her vision.

For example, when a viewer is confronted by an orange object in juxtaposition with a green object, she perceives it as a bluish green. Such an example seems to emphasise the idiosyncrasy of a singular viewer because she has perceived the complement of Locke’s position and the second is untenable. In the first, Locke makes it clear in his theory on secondary qualities that our ideas of colour don’t actually exist with physical bodies. (Locke 1977 pp. 2.8.15, 2.8.19) Hyman suggests Locke presents a reductionist interpretation of Descartes’ view about colours. Newton has a similar idea. Visible objects have “a certain Power and Disposition to stir up a sensation of this or that Colour.” (Newton 1952 1.1) In Locke, colours have to be seen by a sensible creature but colour is only an Idea of a sensation which would be inexistent without a sensible creature to feel it. (Locke 1977 p. 2.31.2) Thus Locke’s view is different from Galileo and Descartes because he thinks physical object have powers to produce sensations in viewers but nonetheless colours only exist within sensations and the sensations are only fictions. (Locke 1977 p. 2.8.10, 2.8.18) Neo-Lockeans hold that visible properties of visible objects do exist. (McDowell 1998 p. 134) However, there are two problems with the neo-Lockeans. “The first is epistemological: it has to do with our knowledge or awareness of colours; and the second is semantic: it has to do with the meaning of colour words.” (Hyman 2006 p. 48) The first is about what is potential rather than actual. Potentialities are not visual properties of bodies. Thus a viewer may see colour but the visible object she sees isn’t coloured. “Like probabilities, they can be known but they cannot be sensed.” (Hyman 2006 p. 49) The second problem with the neo-Lockeans is these powers or potentialities of colour can’t be reconciled with the objects a viewer perceives. The reconciliation relates to what the powers cause semantically in the viewer. If the word ‘red’ defines sensation then sensation itself becomes irrelevant because the word stands in for it.

Following Hyman’s discussion on sentience I use the term ‘sentient tie’ to refer to a viewer’s sighted tie with a visual referent.

And its physical and physiological structure is not necessarily associated with the Imaginary.

As I discuss later, painters use these juxtapositions with complementary colours as a subtractive strategy, that is, to prioritize colour in a painting. Take, for example, a painting where red is predominant, even a small amount of red content can appear dominant because it is highlighted by green areas, green being complementary with red.
orange (blue). However, the green object is green, not bluish green. The viewer has perceived it incorrectly as bluish green because of its juxtaposition with the orange object. Her perception of the green object as being a bluish colour has been effected by the orange object because orange is the complementary of blue. The second type of appearing with the sentient tie involves memory and semantics with associations. Hyman discusses an example which involves the red of an apple. He states the idea that an apple is red is already implicit with apprehensions and there is no need “to refer to its appearance.” (Hyman 2006 p. 15) A red apple is understood to be red even if the redness does not appear with visible existence. A third type of appearing with a sentient tie contrasts with neo-Lockean theory, that visible colour doesn’t exist and sentient knowledge can’t be reconciled with primary powers predicated upon physical bodies. I propose a viewer has knowledge of colour’s deceptiveness with this third type of appearing. An example of this is the colour of an afterimage. “A red afterimage [for example] is described as red because seeing a red afterimage is like seeing a reddish mark or patch of light.” (Hyman 2006 p. 50) In other words, the sense of seeing a green object is analogous to seeing a red after image. Hyman doesn’t explore different types of appearing with sighted knowledge as I am here, but uses this example of an afterimage in his discussion about neo-Lockeans who think the properties of colour can’t be reconciled with the coloured objects a viewer perceives.  

My point is that an afterimage of red is understood to be a result of seeing a green visible object. Thus the afterimage is apprehended as independent from the visible existence. The green colour

---

36 The physiological structure involves wavelengths, which are coded as ratios from three cones in the retina. The ratios become outputs cross connected with types of colour information. Two types are antagonistically coded: red / green and yellow / blue. When these couples have signals of equal length the perceptual field is achromatic. (Hardin 2013 p. 7) Different lengths presented to a viewer enhance singular understandings of complementary couples.

37 He uses the example of an afterimage in his analysis of Locke’s causal analogy: primary properties produce sensations. (Hyman 2006 p. 49) As I mention in a different context, Hyman states if we didn’t see yellow or taste lemons then sense perception would be annihilated from existence. “We taste by tasting tastes [and] see by seeing colours.” (Hyman 2006 p. 26) Galileo and his followers arrive at the conclusion that “we have no reason to believe ... that colours we predicate of physical objects exist.” Whilst discussing Galileo’s claim, which obviously influenced Locke, that bodies don’t have colour, Hyman shows it has arisen from the following thought, “the only phenomena that colours can explain are the thoughts and behaviour of animals that actually perceive them,” and further, “colours are subject to the epistemic jurisdiction of the senses.” (Hyman 2006 p. 26-7) However, Hyman states “colours cannot be impugned for failing to explain our perceptions.” (Hyman 2006 p. 28)
of a visible object exists in visible worlds and exists as a red afterimage when it is seen in a sentient tie. Neo-Lockean theory would define this as a lack of reconciliation with primary powers predicated upon physical bodies.

Human sentient animals know visible green can be seen as a red afterimage. This sentient knowledge shows humans make allowances for how visible worlds present deceptively within perception. Plato refers to this as well.

A stick will look bent if you put it in the water, straight when you take it out, and deceptive differences of shading can make the same surface seem to the eye concave or convex: and our minds are clearly liable to all sorts of confusions of this kind. It is a natural weakness of ours that the scene-painter and conjuror and their fellows exploit with magical effect. (Plato 2007 p. 345)

The sorts of confusions Plato refers to with shadings on a surface, in other words, a painting, and, as I stated in the beginning of this section, the viewer’s mind being liable to confusion, can be connected with his criticisms of the Imaginary and mimetic representation. 38 Two things are relevant here. Firstly this type of appearing exists whether it appears as deceptive or otherwise. And its appearing or existence in the tie means it is bonded in some way with the visibility of colour in physical existence. Secondly, Plato’s criticism of mimesis and his complaint about the artist and the magician is relevant because our minds or sighted knowledge can be duplicitously manipulated. A painting can play upon the deceptiveness of human perception. In fact, all three types of appearing within the sentient tie can be duplicitously manipulated by painters. For instance, the first example of this type of appearing can be incorporated within a painting as a duplicitous strategy to entice a viewer’s physiological response to colour. Duplicitous subtractive strategies are created to entice a viewer to engage with a site which becomes part of her sentient bond with the visible world of a painting.

38 Although, a viewer may have an understanding of perception’s deceptiveness with this third type of appearing in the sentient tie, the concern Plato and the neo Lockeans have for authenticity is well founded with the distortions psychotics perceive. This type of appearing could be placed with sensory hallucinations. I discuss different kinds of misrecognitions and associations in following chapters.
These three types of appearing within sentience are predicated upon visible colour’s existence in worlds. I propose Plato’s form and idea also belong to colour’s existence in the tie, that is, to Plato’s sensory knowledge. This means colour’s being in-itself within the tie is dependent upon, as well as independent from, colour in visual worlds. In other words, not only is appearing predicated upon colour’s existence in visual worlds, in the tie it is also predicated upon human physiology. It has an intelligible principle with underlying unalterable and unlimited multiplicities within the physicality of the eyes and discourse of a sentient viewer. In different words, the knowledge of being in-itself is part of a separate appearing of existent colour in sight. This is particularly pertinent to an envelope when knowledge of the truth of colour’s being in-itself, which was previously inexistent within a disjunctive site, is localized within the tie. Colour’s being in-itself in the tie becomes a new concept of sight. It appears as new truth bonded to but separate from worlds of visible colour.

I return to the question of form with colour’s existence in visible worlds. Although Hyman does not relate his analysis of colour to Plato’s two apprehensions of existence, ultimate and sensory knowledge, he does analyse philosophy’s tenet that colour does not exist apart from the human mind. He declares colour exists in visual worlds, whether a viewer is there or not. Furthermore, a sense exists with a physical object: a taste of the lemon exists with the lemon whether its tasted or not. A colour exists whether it is seen or not. Thus if sensory knowledge is part of visible existence with the form and idea of sense, its existence is “not a condition of the concept’s application.” I quote Hyman in full.

We cannot understand what a smell or taste is unless we have some conception of a sentient animal with the corresponding sense. This is not a condition on the existence of sour things. It does not mean that the existence of sourness entails the existence of sentient animals or that lemons will cease to be sour when sentient animals become extinct. It is a condition on having a clear understanding of the concept of sourness and not a condition of the concept’s application. Just the same can be said about colour. If lemons are yellow, they will not cease to be yellow when sentient animals become extinct. But we cannot understand what colour
is without some notion of the sense of sight. (Hyman 2006 p. 17) 39

Physical visible existence is not dependent on being seen, a viewer does not have to see blue to make it blue in the world. It exists whether it is seen or not, and, as I have shown, colour exists in the tie whether its physical existence in a world is seen or not. A viewer’s sensory knowledge of blue is a form of blue’s appearing. However, the appearing, that blue can be and is seen, is dependent on the viewer. In other words, a form or being in-itself of visible colour exists with appearing in sentience: the sense of yellow or sourness exists with a sentient animal with or without the yellow or a lemon of the visible world. As I discussed above, Plato’s ultimate knowledge encompasses form and idea in a visible world and sensory knowledge is secondary and without its own form and idea. As I have shown, philosophers who thought colour only exists in the mind didn’t attribute form to such existence because they considered both the visible existence of colour and colour in the mind to be deceptive and secondary. However, colour as being in-itself can exist as appearing with the mind along with the physiology of sentience, that is, with the concept or knowledge of sense in perception. Colour exists in a world without a viewer but knowledge of its visibility, its idea and form as sense, requires a viewer. In short, the element of colour’s being is exposed in a sentient relation. Thus both visible colour and colour sensed with human sentience have being in-itself, the latter equally containing an intelligible principle with unlimited multiplicities.

Although Plato considered sensory knowledge to be secondary to the intelligible, he nevertheless did refer to some correspondence between the two. Zuckert has researched the Platonic difference and relation between the sensible and the intelligible. She states “Socrates came to see the place where the sensible and the intelligible are joined is human logos.” (Zuckert 2009 p. 212) According to Zuckert, Socrates, along with all readers of Plato, needs to confront the distinction between humans and nonhumans and note that if the co-joining of “the intelligible and the sensible in human life [were to extend] to the cosmos as a whole [would we could lose] a sense of what is distinctively human by anthropomorphizing the nonhuman.” (Zuckert 2009 pp. 212, 213)

39 My italics.
Nevertheless, the co-joining of the sensible and the intelligible within human discourse connects the knowledges of the two. Logos for the Greeks was speech and discourse. (Zuckert 2009 p. 666) Plato’s Timaeus for example, said speech is both the sensible and the intelligible. (Zuckert 2009 p. 444)

Heidegger also places speech with logos or discourse: “Discourse is existentially language.” He examines what logos in discourse meant to Plato and Aristotle. He states that logos can be translated as reason, concept, and assertion as judgement. Over the course of centuries the structure of logos as discourse came to be understood as being in the world, as form. “The manner in which it was proximally seen was not accidental, and it did not fail to work itself out in the subsequent history of logic.” (Heidegger 1962 p. 201) He refers to the Greek use of discourse as a mode of making manifest by pointing it out, “letting something be seen in its togetherness with something – letting it be seen as something.” (Heidegger 1962 p. 55-6) For example, what is discovered about the something that can be seen is that it is true or false. Logos as discourse discovers colours, points them out. “Seeing always discovers colours.” (Heidegger 1962 p. 57) Just as seeing aims at colours to the extent that colour is accessible through and for sight, perception gauges what is true or false, that is, “because logos can let something be seen, logos can signify reason.” (Heidegger 1962 p. 57-8) Heidegger places a “peculiar phenomena of Being with logos” and he explains discourse has essentially a kind of Being which is specifically worldly. “The intelligibility of Being-in-the-world – an intelligibility which goes with a state-of-mind – expresses itself as discourse.” (Heidegger 1962 pp. 203, 204) “When considered philosophically, [logos as discourse] is an entity, and according to the orientation of ancient ontology, it is something present-at-hand.” (Heidegger 1962 p. 201) Thus colour in the sentient tie equates with being-in-the-world, logos expressing itself as discourse, an intelligibility that discovers colours. However, one can see from the following quote how much confusion has arisen and how philosophers have generally classified physical colour as well as colour in the sentient tie to be secondary and deceptive in the logic of appearing.

The [logos as discourse] gets experienced as something present-at-hand and Interpreted as such, while at the same time the entities which it points out have the meaning of presence-at-hand. This meaning of being
is left undifferentiated and uncontrasted with other possibilities of Being, so that Being in the sense of a formal Being-something becomes fused with it simultaneously, and we are unable even to obtain a clear-cut division between these two realms. (Heidegger 1962 p. 203)

As I said above, inherent in painting is the problem of distinction between the being of colour in a visual world and the being of colour in the discursive tie. In fact, one can see in discourse generally and in the discourse with painting what Heidegger calls ‘the Articulation of Being.’ (Heidegger 1962 p. 205) Painting presents the possibility of Being in both forms of appearing. Furthermore, if a discourse of the site is in a painting a presentation of disjunction between the two forms confronts a viewer with a shift in the apprehension of what exists in both. It is not only colour in the physical world that doesn’t know it can belong to sight, as Plato states, light cannot see. The viewer also questions colour’s belonging with sight. She identifies within the undecidability of an aporetic void in painting, which relates to a lack in discursive sentience. It is often accompanied with an awareness of the deceptiveness of perception and reveals disjunctive discordance between the two realms: being in the physical world and being in the discourse of the tie.

A viewer is integral to such undecidability within a painting’s site although she cannot of her own volition bring about the presentation of such a new idea of colour. The discourse of a site in a painting requires a viewer’s sentient tie precisely for the sake of colour because colour requires the existence of a concept of a sense of colour. The fact visible colour coexists with light as wavelengths means, as I discussed above, visible colour is different to shape in a visible world. Visibility is not imperative for shape in physical existence or in a painting hence shape in painting doesn’t index a concept of sighted sense with sentience as pigmented colour does. Invisible objects can have shapes but if something is invisible it cannot be blue. Blue depends on sighted sentience in the tie. (Hyman 2006 p. 17-18) Furthermore, colour, in fact pigmented colour in painting, accentuates this. Unlike shapes in painting, colour is inert without a viewer. Colour’s appearance can affect a world if it is perceived. As Hyman states, “The behaviour of sentient animals is the bottleneck through which colours … affect the world.” (Hyman 2006 p. 18) Pigmented colour’s dependence on the discursive sentient
tie accentuates for painting what Plato defines as ‘true function:’ painting exists to be seen and to create a difference by being seen. Moreover, just as sighted sentience with the tie is integral to painting, the viewer is its fundamental constituent. Plato misses this fact. His misrecognition is explicit in his discussion about the true function. He specifies three skills related to the true function of creativity. One involves God’s skill because He created truth in form in nature. A second remove from truth is created by a craftsman or carpenter and a third remove from truth is created by an artist. (Plato 2007 p. 337-8) He declares a painter does not make reference to “what is’ but [creates] something which resembles ‘what is’ without being it.” Contrary to my discussion above about logos with the tie and its particular kind of being, Plato describes painting as a representation of apparition, a mere mimetic grasp of phenomenal appearance. (Plato 2007 p. 339-40) The carpenter on the other hand creates furniture for a client and has an ‘eye on form’ for the sake of the person who will use the furniture. The carpenter has a correct belief (doxa or opinion) about the merits and defects of the furniture and Plato tells us he gets this by “associating with and listening to someone who knows. And the person with the relevant knowledge is the user.” (Plato 2007 p. 344) The user knows that the true function of the furniture is equivalent to the knowledge of its form. (Lee 2007 p. 345) Plato considers the painter merely paints a painting of the furniture without knowledge of what is required of the furniture or a correct opinion of what is represented. However, if a painting’s aim is to be seen and to create a difference by being seen, a viewer’s sight is required. The painting’s aims is not to imitate the phenomenal appearance of the carpenter’s product. On the contrary, the aim of the artist’s product, if the artist has an eye on form, is to meet the true function of the product equivalent to the knowledge of its form, and the knowledge is its logos as discourse. The user of painting is the viewer who has a true knowledge about a concept of sight and can see via a discursive tie, the production for this user, the true function of a painting, that the painting is produced for an integral knowledge of the form. Hence the true function for a painting involves an artist with an eye on form who makes reference to what is, visible colour in physical existence, as a remove from the truth of being in its physical form, so as to create a truth of being in knowledge, integral to a

40 As I will show in later chapters, Badiou plays little attention to the integrality of the viewer as well.
user within sentient logos.
Chapter Four

Colour and a Philosopher

4.1 Colour and Sensory Knowledge

Following on from my discussion about how painting requires a viewer’s sight for the existence of concept of the sense of colour, I now turn to an analogy in *The Republic* where Plato refers to colour with light and a concept of the sense of sight. Although he begins the analogy with a description of a viewer of painting as only wanting the pleasure of superficial appearances, he does state everyone wants to find “something that really is.” In fact everyone could become a philosopher because he explains, the good form is something everyone is looking for and a quality a philosopher must have. (Plato 2007 p. 229-30) Socrates gives an account of the good form by way of an analogy with the sun. The light of the sun begets a child of the good. The good is what an object really is or as a contemporary philosopher might say, what x really is. (Plato 2007 pp. 232, 399) Socrates compares the good form or the good of the intelligible to the sun of the visible world. “The particulars are objects of sight but not of intelligence, while the forms are the objects of intelligence but not of sight.” (Plato 2007 p. 232) In the analogy Plato defines both colour and sentience as secondary to light.

If the eyes have the power of sight, and its possessor tries to use this power, and if objects have colour, yet you know that [she] will see nothing and the colours will remain invisible unless a third element is

---

41 Badiou for example states “Every object is considered in its being as a pure multiple,” that is, amongst its elements is an inexistent. (Badiou 2009a pp. 321, 323) “Being is the inconsistency of the pure multiple.” (Badiou 2009a p. 358) “Being does not present itself: being qua being is what presents itself.” (Badiou 2005 p. 27)

42 Unfortunately this amounts to a denial of colour’s being in-itself within a sentient tie. In addition, he describes visible colour as causing human sight within the sentient bond. This is contrary to what I said above, visible colour exists without being seen but it needs to be seen if it is to become known as visible. The origin or cause for the sentient tie could be on either side, with the percipiens or perceived referent. Also sighted knowledge exists without visible verification.
present. ... [It is called] light. (Plato 2007 p. 232-3)

He explicitly describes “the sense of sight and the visibility of objects” as yoked to light, to the sun. However, yoked as it might be, the child of the good turns out to be the sentient tie between visible colour and human sight.

The sun is not identical with sight, nor with what we call the eye in which sight resides. ... Yet of all the sense-organs the eye is the most sunlike. The eye’s power of sight is a kind of infusion dispensed to it by the sun. ... Though the sun is not itself sight, it is the cause of sight and is seen by the sight it causes. ... The good has begotten it in its own likeness, and it bears the same relation to sight and visible objects in the visible realm that the good bears to intelligence and intelligible objects in the intelligible realm. (Plato 2007 p. 233)

Although light causes or illuminates visibility, it begets the tie between visibility and vision. Likewise, although the good form causes or illuminates truth it begets the tie between truth and knowledge. The tie makes colour analogous with sight. Light gives colour within the tie a power in visibility. Although light is not seen to be colour and is not sight itself, it is seen in the tie by colour with the sighted knowledge it causes. In other words, light cannot see itself but it causes colour within the sentient tie to see light and itself in light. In addition, Plato aligns colour with sight, the eye as a sense-organ seeing colour, as having a power comparable to light, as being sunlike. Plato's simile with the sun compares the sun to the form of the good, that is, as Socrates states, the visible world to the intelligible. The faculty of knowledge begets the faculty of sight. Sight or the tie, is the child of the good, “the good has begotten it in its own likeness.”

Plato is not exactly saying visible colour, as it appears in a concept of a sense of colour, has being in-itself but he is alluding to it. Although Plato thinks the tie is secondary and without being in-itself, the power of sight with a viewer’s eyes is, in his analogy, the begotten of the good form tied with visibility. As I mentioned above with Zuckert’s research, there are connections here between the sensible and the intelligible, they are conjoined with logos as discourse.
Given painting and colour suffered marginalisation for centuries because of Plato’s criticism, it seems ironical colour is a main feature in this analogy. Colour combined with light and the sighted knower’s mind is juxtaposed with good form, truth and knowledge. Plato’s allusion to the begotten good in the tie between visible colour and the sunlike power of the eyes of a knower’s mind, could be described as an early development of a theory for localisation. 43 Localization occurs in a relation between an element of an object of colour and a viewer who is a representative member of an object of viewers. An extra signifier that belongs to a pure multiple of colour conveys being to a pure multiple in the other. 44 Plato refers to such a multiple in the viewer. It is “the capacity for knowledge, .. innate in each [individual’s] mind.”

We must reject the conception of education by those who say they can put into the mind knowledge that was not there before. ... Our argument indicates that the capacity for knowledge, is innate in each [individual’s] mind, and that the organ by which [she] learns is like an eye which cannot be turned form darkness to light; in the same way the mind as a whole must be turned away from the world of change until its eye can bear to look straight at reality, ... at ... what we call the good. (Plato 2007 p. 245)

Thus Plato can be understood to be stating such localisation involves what is everyone’s endeavour.

The good, then, is the end of all endeavour, the object on which every heart is set, whose existence it divines, though it finds it difficult to grasp just what it is. (Plato 2007 p. 230)

As I stated above and discuss in later chapters, if an evental change is involved, an extra signifier supplements within the localization process.

43 Plato refers to the “the knower’s mind.” (Plato 2007 p. 234)
44 I refer to Badiou’s and Lacan’s theories of localization in later chapters.
Plato alludes to a localization process between visible physical colour and a knower’s mind but he only considers painting to be a mimetic resemblance of such. Canto writes about how the image for Plato “changes incessantly, multiplies itself, or even disappears.” The essence, the image hides with mimetic resemblance, must be disclosed. (Canto 1985 pp. 125, 124)

There are images and there is realities; the image is most certainly, alongside of (para) the essence. The question that aims to define [the essence] must be questioned – this is the condition for disclosing the image. (Canto 1985 p. 124)

Painting does resemble visible existence with its own physical existence (pigmented colour canvas etc.). However, Plato misses how painting indexes two realms of being; the visible world of the sensorium and being’s articulation in the appearing with the sentient tie. In fact, he disparagingly considers painting to be a twilight world of change and decay, which forms confusing and shifting opinions, and seems to lack intelligence.

When we turn [our eyes] on things on which the sun is shining, then [our eyes] see clearly and obviously have vision. .. Apply the analogy to the mind. When the mind’s eye is fixed on objects illuminated by truth and reality, it understands and knows them, and its possession of intelligence is evident; but when it is fixed on the twilight worlds of change and decay, it can only form opinions, its vision is confused and its opinions shifting, and it seems to lack intelligence. .. What gives the objects of knowledge their truth and the knower’s mind the power of knowing is the form. (Plato 2007 p. 234)

Despite Plato’s disparagement of painting, he admits to a possession of intelligence

---

45 Monique Canto, along with Marcel Detienne, Jean-Pierre Vernant, Harry Berger Jr. and Robert Pogue Harrison, has presented significant counter readings of the Platonic tradition.

46 In later chapters I discuss painting’s existential situation and logical ramifications in relation to imitation and resemblance.
within the begotten tie, which involves more than the mere sight of the changeable flux of the sensory. It is knowledge of truth in visible existence and a truth about visibility specific to a concept of a sighted sense in visible worlds. He alludes to this in his analogy of the sun. Furthermore, he goes to some length to show this appearing of truth is separate to the pure multiple in objects. He states it is wrong to think of a new truth with knowledge as the pure multiple of good form. The new knowledge is a specific existence with appearing. It is a new signifier separate to what was previously seen or known, that is, it is separate to the pure multiple of colour in visible existence or what the knower’s mind already knows. It is a new signifier born via the tie in a localization process, which occurs between the visible form of the good and that which belongs to it, its begotten child. He refers to a movement between forms, although in the following statement he he disregards the sensible and thus the sentient tie: “The whole procedure involves nothing in the sensible world, but moves solely through forms to forms, and finishes with forms.” (Plato 2007 p. 239) However, he refers to a new truth with logos that looks straight “at the brightness of all realities which is what we call the good.” (Plato 2007 p. 245)

Plato’s analysis of the sensible and sensory knowledge displays an impasse. Here I examine sensory knowledge in more detail. As I discussed in Chapter Three, shape, motion, and volume don’t exist in visibility as colour does. Visible colour exists with light. Plato points out its existence is caused by light but, as I have shown, it also has its own distinct existence with a concept of the sense of sight. (Plato 2007 p. 233) Shape, motion and volume require a sentient tie with the sense of touch, sometimes along with

---

47 As I show in Part B and C, Badiou also displays this impasse. He is generous in his praise of Plato in the following quote without being specific about a concept of sense with human sentience or an object of viewers. “No greater error can be committed with respect to Plato than to maintain his thinking is dualistic. The opposition between the sensible world and the intelligible world is fallacious. As far as Plato is concerned, there is only one world; the sensible one ‘participates’ by degrees in the intelligible one in a dialectical process. The dialectic designates precisely the possibility of a process of thought whereby the object of thought is indiscernible from the thought of the object.” (Badiou 2010 p. 114) (Badiou 2012 p. 362) One can assume from the following “the immediate given” is with the sensible. “For the Idea is not a body in the sense of an immediate given (this is what must be gleaned from the opposition between the sensible and the intelligible).” (Badiou 2009a p. 9) I discuss in later chapters how Badiou more or less ignores the viewer and doesn’t place her with the artistic subject or in localisation.
sight. The other senses of taste, smell and hearing also have existence with a concept associated with a sense in sentience. All things in physical worlds exist apart from sensory knowledge but if they are to be known to exist in logos as discourse they depend on sentience. Secondariness related to dependence also occurs for the viewer who cannot know of the existence of visible objects unless they are sensed. This existential interdependence between humans and existent objects is associated in the discursive tie with the secondary status of dependence, which relates to a viewer’s Imaginary. As I discussed in Chapter Two, Imaginary representation relates to fantasy with an individual and a collective, which can be detected in Lichtenstein’s research on colour in painting. She describes a collective prejudice against colour in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries in Italy and France where colour was considered secondary to tone and line in painting. As I explained, secondariness within human fantasy is built upon an error in discourse. (Fink 2002 p. 148-9) Minimality with secondariness indexes the error as a negated absence, an inexistent, within a disjunctive relation of equivalence. It is the inconsistency of a pure multiple. (Badiou 2009a p. 358) What is secondary is emptied for the sake of this relation in discourse. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 55) The place where the error is inscribed is where knowledge is transmitted and the inscription, for example, with colour incompletes the All of visible worlds. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 3) In fact, as I discuss in Part C, the inscription within the discursive logic of appearing is imperative for an event and its transmission. The inscription with colour relates in localization with the inscription with a viewer. The relation between both connects with the minimality of their existential interdependence. Here I examine firstly, the inconsistency indexed by the inscription with existent colour and light in visible worlds, and secondly, the inconsistency indexed by the inscription with sensory knowledge in the tie, and how it relates to existent colour and light. The following is an analysis of the inscription of inconsistency in colour and light in visible worlds and in colour as an articulation of being in sentience (a concept of a sense of sight).

1. Inscription of Inconsistency with Existent Colour and Light in Visible Worlds.

   Inconsistency is implied in Plato’s sun analogy when he states the sun or light

---

48 Badiou describes this but he avoids analysis of the Imaginary and discourse. (Badiou 2009a p. 18-19)
is dependent upon being seen because light cannot see itself. “The sun is not itself sight, it is the cause of sight and it is seen by the sight it causes.” (Plato 2007 p. 233) Light’s secondary status with dependence, that is, its dependence upon the sentient tie for sight inscribes this inconsistency, that something is incomplete in light.

2. Inscription of Inconsistency with a Concept of a Sense of Colour in the Tie.
As I discussed in Chapter Three, colour within the sense of sight can be considered separate from light. It depends on light as the source for its physical existence but also its existence with the idea of the sense of sight depends on its being known as visible in sentience. It exists as known because of the sense of sight, which is distinct from its physical existence. Thus it has being in-itself separate from the sentient tie and also within the tie. This means there is inconsistency within the sense of sight because there is an articulation of being in sensory knowledge. Plato misses this being in-itself and only sees confusion with the lower elements of the mind. (Plato 2007 p. 348) As I said above, his misrecognition reveals his impasse with Imaginary representation which correlates with sensory knowledge. He points to the inconsistency but he doesn’t go further. The inscription of inconsistency is obvious when there is an absence of light. Plato states when our eyes see colours aren’t illuminated it is as though we are blind. (Plato 2007 pp. 233) A viewer is forced to rely on a previously known idea of colour’s physical existence. Thus colour with the idea of the sense of sight has a specific inconsistency within the tie. However, when there is an absence of light, what occurs for shape, volume and motion, which principally require sensory knowledge related to the sense of touch, is that they remain consistent in the tie with the materiality of physical form as their source. 49 When there is a loss of the sense of sight, colour cannot revert to compensation from another sense because it exists solely within the structure.

---

49 It is true when a physical source for each of the senses becomes absent, existential information related to each sense can be remembered, for example, a perfume, taste or sound. Memory is an old sensory knowledge which compensates for a loss in the present of existential information. However, if light is absent then shape, volume or motion can revert to reliance upon the sense of touch related to physical form. Touch can compensate for a loss of visibility.
of light. 50 The sense of sight is inexistent in the dark. “The sense of sight and the visibility of objects are yoked by ... light.” (Plato 2007 p. 232-3, 233) In other words, this is an inscription of colour’s inconsistency in the idea of the sense of sight.

The existential interdependence in the sentient tie reveals this inconsistency. If colour is known to exist, it must be sensed, which means sensory knowledge depends on knowing the concept of the sense. It becomes obvious colour with light causes this idea of sense, and that sensory knowledge about colour is dependent on light to cause it. The absence of light subtracts the idea of sight from existent colour, which reveals the dependence of sensory knowledge and what is made inconsistent for the sake of signifying relations in the tie. In other words, light causes sight but it depends on what it causes to be seen. And the signifying relation in the tie causes sensory knowledge but it depends on what it causes to be known. Sensory knowledge is known by the knowledge it causes, that is, by what the concept has produced in discourse. 51 Sensory knowledge’s dependence upon the concept is the inscription that indexes the error, the inconsistency of sensory knowledge in the tie. The error is a negated pure multiple behind the negativized minimum of its dependence. As I discuss in Part C, inconsistencies on both sides become a relation of nil value in a site for colour as an event.

Inconsistency impacts upon colour’s logic of appearing in the tie as an error appropriate to a viewer’s Imaginary within a representation of logos as discourse. As Plato states, the sense of sight is yoked by light, that is, the specific inscription which indexes colour’s inconsistency doesn’t just relate to its physicality within the structure of light but also to its relation in the tie. If colour is sensed in the tie its existence as sense is known. A viewer cannot know it except by the knowledge it causes. Colour physically

50 I mentioned in Chapter One Bracquemond stated that drawing and line models contour and the volume of form. (Brancquemond 1885 p. 46-7) Roger de Piles discusses how a blind person traces a contour and makes a drawing of a form. However, she couldn’t paint the form as she would not know of light and colour. He refers to a sixteenth century sculptor who worked with wax and could ‘see’ through his finger tips. (Roger de Piles 1677 p. 102-3)

51 I discuss this below and in the next chapter in relation to the symptom.
exists whether it is seen or not, but it is not known unless it is seen. The sense of sight is not yoked to its physicality but to its being seen. It is not whether light is absent or not that is the issue, but that which is negated. Colour and visibility can’t be known to exist without sensory knowledge, which can’t exist as knowledge without the sense of sight. Both depend on existence in the discursive tie and the tie depends on what they both inscribe for the sake of signifying transmission. Colour’s inscription is its dependence on its concept of a sense of sight. A viewer’s sight of colour being apart and distinct from light emphasises its inexistence not from light, but from sight. This is the area most amenable to subtractive strategies in painting because it’s where the negated in colour relates to what is negated in sensory knowledge. Such a relation is disjunctive until the viewer’s Imaginary is cut in the tie’s site.

When an extra signifier emerges from the disjunctive relation it produces a process of localization between the two realms Plato describes as the visible and the intelligible. The form of the good is the intelligible world (the power of knowing the source of being with the mind). The source of being in the sensorium (that light cannot see itself by itself in its realm) is the pure multiple in physical visible existence. (Plato 2007 p. 231) I add to this the source of knowing is knowledge that can’t know itself in its realm. Thus, the source of being with the intelligible world of the senses in the tie (that a concept of visibility cannot know itself in its realm) is the pure multiple in the concept of a sense of sight. The inscription for its inconsistency is its dependence upon the knowledge it produces. The concept is existent because it is known in the tie yet its dependence on a sense of sight with existent colour for its knowledge points beyond its inscription to its inconsistency, to what inexists. Plato asserts there is power in the knower’s mind in the intelligible world. Such a power in the intelligible world of the senses is a concept of the source of being in a sense of sight, that is, of its negated pure multiple.

I am co-joining sensory knowledge with Plato’s intelligible world. Lee states the concept of Plato’s intelligible realm exists beyond the range of ordinary sense-perception and yet in some way the existence of the intelligible realm is dependent upon sense-perception. (Lee 2007 pp. 374, 372) Plato does not spell out how the intelligible realm is dependent on sense perception. Clearly it involves discursive sentience. Plato’s
word for it in his analogy of the sun is ‘the begotten,’ and the begotten is the sun’s likeness in the tie. The power of knowing about the source of being in light’s physical existence, is with the begotten as a likeness with light, a resemblance to light in the tie. The power of knowing involves a concept of the sense of sight or sighted knowledge which relates to an inconsistency in light, that light cannot see itself without sense perception in the tie. Thus the power is a sighted knowledge of the invisible pure multiple of light. Although Plato refers to a viewer’s mind obtaining knowledge about the source of being, he does not refer in detail to colour and visibility in the tie between the two realms. However, he places the power of knowing with a viewer, “the knower’s mind,” and a power with the eyes, “the power of seeing.” He states, “Of all the sense-organs the eye is the most sunlike.” (Plato 2007 pp. 231, 233) He implies this is because sight’s likeness or belonging to the sun relates to its being able to see the sun.

He states that the eyes have the power of sight, but if there is no light a viewer is unable to use this power. If it’s illuminated she will view it via a concept of the sense of sight within the logos of a discourse. However, the concept of the being in-itself, which Plato terms the good, in existent colour involves more than sight. This relates to Lee’s statement that something of the intelligible realm exists beyond the range of ordinary sense-perception but is dependent upon it. (Lee 2007 pp. 374, 372) This something beyond sight occurs with disjunction in the tie. It is here that sighted knowledge appears nonsensical in the intelligible realm because sight seems to suggest something doesn’t appear. A representation of an existent colour appears to be in discord within the tie. The viewer with the knowledge of sight in the tie reflects an illuminated representation back to light. As Plato states, without such reflection light cannot see. Hence the tie’s sight belongs to light, is begotten as likeness. What is produced reflexively is a form of knowledge belonging to the intelligible. 52 Light’s reflexivity has given intelligibility to

52 This knowledge is what the Greeks called an ‘epistēmē.’ Lacan points to a difficulty in knowledge when he defines an opposition between epistēmē and know-how. (Lacan 2007 p. 149) He describes two categories of knowledge. Savoir, ‘knowing that,’ is propositional whereas connaissance is knowledge by acquaintance. There are also two types of savoir. One is epistēmē. It is the so called articulated aspect of theoretical knowledge and the second is, what Lacan calls ‘savoir-faire,’ know-how. (Grigg 2008 p. 134) Lacan defines supplementation with an extra signifier knowledge as ‘know-how’ for an individual. (Harari 2002 pp. 323, 357-8) The resultant evental change creates an epistēmē shared in difference, rather than a relation of equivalence. In Aristotle there is a basis for the modern
an object of thought, a concept of visibility in the tie. However, although the tie is sunlike it is also distinct from the sun. The new knowledge happens after an extra signifier has supplemented the situation, after Real thought have been demonstrated and produced. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 6) It occurs with a viewer as a privileged singular reference to the Real.  

Supplementation is a functional usage of light’s inexistent sight. In Part C, I argue it is localised with a viewer’s singular reference. (Harari 2004 pp. 125, 97) A letter or extra signifier supplements the intelligibility of sentience. Out of necessity, it inhabits light’s inexistent sight so it can be seen by the sight it causes. The signifier stands in for, or supplements, the voided third term in sensory knowledge (that it depends upon what it causes to be known). “There is a transformation which operates between the signifier and the letter, when the signifier is not there, is missing.” (Lacan 2002k p. II, 3) The letter is reflexively produced out of the negated multiple. A transformation occurs when it stands in for the missing signifier that is the inconsistency in sensory opposition between epistêmê as pure theory and technê as practice. “Aristotle refers to technê or craft as itself also epistêmê or knowledge because it is a practice grounded in an ‘account’ — something involving theoretical understanding. Plato ... is fascinated by the idea of a kind of technê that is informed by knowledge of forms. In the Republic this knowledge is the indispensable basis for the philosophers’ craft of ruling in the city. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/episteme-techne/ Lee describes epistêmê in Plato as a split between how-to and knowledge accounted for by rational argument. (Lee 2007 p. 194) Spitzer translates know-how from ancient Greek as skill or technique. Badiou explains the skill is not only with an individual who possesses it but is for others too. (Badiou 2012 pp. 355, 23-4)

If it doesn’t occur, old knowledge repeats in disjunction with a singular viewer, that is, separate from the certitude of a collective Imaginary. She confronts a repetitive failure in her discourse. The failure asks for difference and is the repetition of the different. (Harari 2004 pp. 97, 95)

The specificity of the error influences a viewer’s concept of the sense of sight. It tempers the singularity of her sight. For example, she sees a visible representation via a phenomenological experience “through an image.” Her knowledge of reality is attributed to the representation she sees. (Harari 2004 pp. 123, 125) However, the singularity of her sight is also influenced by shared reality, that is, reality involves a shared and predictable collective code. Routine occurrences can thus be predicted according to a certain command of prevailing codes. (Harari 2004 p. 97) Harari explains society structures reality upon a “plane of similarity.” A collective apprehends images in a customary fashion which is characteristic of the Imaginary and with codes typical of the Symbolic. (Harari 2004 pp. 124-5, 97) Harari states a major change away from old knowledge can “demonstrate” a privileged reference of contact with the Real. (Harari 2004 pp. 125, 97) In other words, her singularity is privileged and can demonstrate or transmit new knowledge about the source of being. However, although the new signifier is not at the service of communication it transmits new knowledge to a collective of viewers.
knowledge. The letter supplements in a process of localization between the referent and the viewer’s image. The supplement relates to at least one of the universal All and is forced to inhabit its absence. (Lacan 2002k pp. VI, 3, 13) (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 97) In short, it is produced reflexively from the pure multiple in existent colour and is localized in the tie with a singular viewer. Its transmission is from where the signifier was missing in colour, to where it is missing in the tie. Lacan states sight renders it possible for a viewer to see herself seeing herself. (Harari 2004p. 113) Berkley’s “to be is to be perceived” is analogous with light’s illumination present in a world as omnivoyer. It pre-exists the viewer. Contrary to Berkley’s idealism, sight confronts the knower’s mind with her own being because she is seen being able to see. Her singular concept of the sense of sight contains an inscription which produces what she does not know. Berkley’s idealism is radically displaced by an enjoyment of what is incomplete in the Other. The viewer enjoys what is behind perception, the nothing that exists behind perception even though her enjoyment is within her fantasy. (Lacan 2002k pp. VI, 3, 2) (Grigg 2013-2014 p. 3) However, the localization provides a new epistēmē, shared in difference and embodied with sight. What is known via sight is an invisible Real, which is an inconsistency within the sight, a previously inexistent new epistēmē.

According to Plato, the power of knowing is with the begotten and the viewer has power with the process of begetting. His sun analogy literally places light of the visible world alongside the good of the intelligible world. (Plato 2007 p. 231) Light as source, analogous with the truth of the good, is begotten as likeness in the tie. Light sees itself by the sight it causes and the truth of the good is known by the viewer. The viewer knows post-eventually there is an inexistent element within light appropriate to an extra signifier as it comes into existence with her as a point for it.

The good has begotten it in its own likeness, and it bears the same

55 Harari discusses this epistēmē in relation to sight and fetishists. (Harari 2004 pp. 128, 129)
56 Session 12th February 2014.
57 As Badiou asserts, “Being is exposed to thought, or of the essential, or of being-in-truth.” “Knowledge is obviously related to the existent and knows it in its being.” (Badiou 2012 pp. 170, 174)
relation to sight and visible objects in the visible realm that the good bears to intelligence and intelligible objects in the intelligible realm. (Plato 2007 p. 233)

Localization with the concept of visibility is the sight of the good in visible realms begotten with intelligence and intelligible objects in the intelligible realm. (Plato 2007 pp. 231, 233)

The power of seeing is the power of knowing with the eye. It is specifically a viewer who comes to know the pure multiple in existent colour. Plato declares a philosopher knows such knowledge. A philosopher must have the capacity to know what the variable \( x \) really is. (Plato 2007 p. 229-30) Likewise, a viewer who is an operative part of localisation has a sighted concept of what the variable really is. (Plato 2007 p. 245) “The good then, is the end of all endeavour, the object on which every heart is set.” (Plato 2007 p. 230) A viewer becomes a philosopher because she has such a capacity for knowledge. 58 A philosopher is involved with a knowledge which relates to what is and the philosopher knows what is as it is. (Plato 2007 pp. 199, 200)

We ... speak of beauty-in-itself, and so for all the sets of particular things which we have regarded as many; and we proceed to posit by contract a single form, which is unique, in each case, and call it “what really is” each thing. (Plato 2007 p. 232)

A viewer in the becoming of a truth is a philosopher. “Those whose hearts are fixed on the being of each thing are to be called philosophers.” Although Plato states philosophers “love any branch of learning that reveals eternal reality, the realm unaffected by the vicissitudes of change and decay,” it has to be said, as I have shown above, the intelligible realm is dependent on the senses in discourse within the sentient

58 However, Plato declares those who simply love looking, listening and learning are only devotees who resemble philosophers. A devotee only holds opinions but “true philosophers [are] those who love to see the truth” (Plato 2007 p. 198)
tie. (Plato 2007 pp. 204, 205) (Lee 2007 pp. 374, 372) This dependence is essential for a power of knowing.
Chapter Five

Philosophy and Discourse

5.1 Philosophy and the Discourse of the Site

Although this chapter, along with the previous two chapters, does not discuss colour in painting, it addresses Plato and philosophical issues which are pertinent to Badiou’s criticisms of Lacan in Part B and my critique of Badiou’s theory of art in Part C. It is also relevant to how colour as an event is nominated and convoked by a subject which includes a viewer.

Following on from the last chapter, the definition of a philosopher may seem straightforward. However, as I show in this chapter, the definition of philosophy is more allusive. It requires an examination of the philosophic act, philosophy’s relationship to discursive structure, and an exploration of how a sentient tie with the viewer and the philosopher connects with the localization of a new singular universal. I begin with the discourse of the site. As I stated above, Plato entices listeners and readers with his aporetic dialogues. In fact, such enticement within Plato’s dialogues indicates his writings contain a discourse of the site. I propose a naming of the extra signifier which emerges from the site occurs with a singular viewer and the artwork. It occurs with Socrates’ listeners, Plato’s readers or viewers of a painting. My thesis is contrary to Badiou’s and differs from Bartlett’s, who states that Plato names the event ‘Socrates.’ (Bartlett. 2011 p. 112)

Plato use[s] the name Socrates to signify the evental irruption of an education by truths. ... Socrates is the name of that which is unpresented for the situation. Plato deploys the name post-eventally. (Bartlett. 2011 p. 113)

The enticement of listeners, readers or viewers is integral to subtractive strategies connected to the function of the site. As Lacan states, the dialogues aren’t really dialogues because they don’t culminate in anything. However, strategies within them
allow the One to speak. (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 7) There is an enticement to this dialogue with One, the negated absence. Listeners, readers and viewers are enticed to engage via the discursive tie. Lacan defines what is at stake is the possibility of gaining knowledge about the Real. There is a difficulty in the discursive site within Socrates’ chats, which is precisely where “one must search for the Real.” The difficulty is good form, which, as Lacan asserts, circumscribes “a gap in what is said. In other words Plato is a Lacanian.” (Lacan 2002k pp. VII, 8, 9) 59

There are two things in Plato’s dialogues relevant to the site, the gap in the discourse, and the signifying structure of the dialogues. The dialogues present subtractive strategies which point to the site. There is an aporetic similarity between Plato’s dialogues and Lacan’s analyst’s discourse.

If something gave me the idea that there is in the Platonic dialogue some first foundation or other for a properly analytic discourse, I would say that it is indeed this Parmenides that confirmed it for me. (Lacan 2002k p. VIII, 4)

However, there is a difference between the dialogues and the analyst’s discourse. Lacan defines it as a matter of discourse. In reference to the analyst in the site, he describes Plato as handicapped. As I discuss below and in later chapters, Plato is handicapped because he is not solidly installed within the site. This didn’t make things easier for him but Lacan states “it certainly helped him.”

I call mental handicap the fact of a speaking being who is not solidly installed in a discourse. This is what gives [Plato’s] value to the handicapped person. There is no other definition that one could give except that of a being a little off beam, namely, wavering between two discourses. (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 9) 60

59 Badiou states this statement adroitly declares “Lacan himself is not Platonic.” (Badiou 2008 p. 236)  
60 My italics.
Obviously one of the two discourses Plato wavers between is the discourse of the site, which incorporates the aporetic void in the site. As I stated in Chapter Three, such a site is proffered within creative worlds, for example, within different art forms as well as with the intentional structuring or artifice of Lacan’s analytic discourse. These sites are created with subtractive strategies that entice viewers, readers, listeners and analysands.

I turn here to the contemporary philosopher Badiou. In his theory, sites are conditions for generic procedures, for example, sites within these intentionally created worlds are Artistic Truth Procedures. They involve the undecidable, the indiscernible, the generic and the unnameable. The truth of being is grasped from such conditions, thus an evental site is a prerequisite for an act of philosophy because philosophy seizes and configurates truths from these conditions. “Philosophy serves as a passage between the procedural actuality of truths and the open question of their temporal being.” (Badiou 1992 pp. 141-3, 39) It seizes the eternal truth of being such that truths not only are, they appear. (Badiou 2009a p. 9) Truth actually becomes thinkable in a structure as count-as-one. It consists.

What Plato wants to get across ... is that there is no form of object for thought which is capable of gathering together the pure multiple, the multiple-without-one, and making it consist. (Badiou 2005 p. 34)

In fact, Plato thinks, “It is necessary that the entirety of disseminated being shatter apart, as soon as it is grasped by discursive thought.” (Badiou 2005 p. 34) The philosophic act grasps an eternal truth of being once it has emerged into the existence of discursive thought. An act of philosophy configurates truths from these conditions. (Badiou 1992 p. 141)

[And] a subject is what deals with the generic indiscernibility of a truth, which it accomplishes amidst discernible finitude, by a nomination whose referent is suspended from the future anterior of a condition. (Badiou 2005 p. 399)

As a local stage of supplementation “a subject is the self-mentioning of an empty language.” (Badiou 2005 pp. 399, 400) This is the act of the subject, the self-
mentioning of an extra signifier. It is a new thinkable situation. “The subject is pure act” but it also has “a being and an appearing.” (Badiou 2009a p. 49)  

The philosophic act which seizes the truth about being is aligned with the subject as act but it can proclaim the subject’s act.

Grasped in its being, the subject is solely the finitude of the generic procedure, the local effects of an evental fidelity. What it ‘produces’ is the truth itself, an indiscernible part of the situation, but the infinity of this truth transcends it. It is abusive to say that truth is a subjective production. A subject is much rather taken up in fidelity to the event, and suspended from truth; from what it is forever separated by chance. (Badiou 2005 p. 406)

The subject is suspended from the indiscernible as knowledge suspended by a truth. Capable of forcing a veracity of knowledge about its production, a subject is a savant of itself. (Badiou 2005 p. 406) The production is truth itself but the infinity of this truth transcends the subject.

Badiou states every “genuine philosopher” such as Descartes registers at the point where ontology and logic rub up against each other. Such a necessity Badiou calls a ‘materialist dialectic.’ (Badiou 2009a p. 6) Such placement between ontology and logic in discursive thought means philosophy can relate to Plato’s straddling of two discourses. Badiou asserts that ontology as the science of being-qua-being or the presentation of presentation is realised as the thought of the pure multiple. “Ontology thinks the law of the subject, not the subject itself. It is this law that finds its guarantee of being in ... forcing.” Such forcing involves a subject emptily naming the universe to come. The guarantee of ontology adheres with such forcing because forcing involves the future anterior. (Badiou 2005 pp. 411, 517, 401) With the grasping of the truth of being-there is a forcing of veracity about the being of what was previously indiscernible. In other words, ontology is not being but it is guaranteed of being with

61 According to Badiou the theory of a subject is not that of an object but the subject is required to have a being and an appearing. (Badiou 2009a p. 49)
this veracity. What is forced along with ontology’s thought about the law of the subject is a statement that names solely what the site presents, which belongs positively to the name of the event and is also bound to the future anterior of the previously indiscernible and inconsistent multiple. Ontology may think the being of the subject in forcing because that is its guarantee of being in the subject’s law but it is not the subject. It is precisely the distinction here that points to how philosophy can straddle two discourses. Lacan’s analysis of Plato’s straddling of two discourses focuses upon the placement of the philosophic act within discursive thought. When Lacan emphatically states philosophy is a master’s discourse he uses the term ‘philosophy’ in a pejorative or derogative sense, because, in that instance, he is referring to the type of philosophy that straddles two discourses: the discourse of the site, which facilitates the condition for philosophy, and the master’s discourse. (Lacan 2007 p. 148-9) His solution or recourse is to transmit a contingency for the subject as act from the discourse of the site rather than educate within the master’s discourse. At issue is whether philosophy aligned with forcing and the future anterior transmits from the position of contingency for the subject as act in the site as Lacan advances, or declares as a master the law of the subject. In the discursive logic of the master’s discourse the non-being-one remains indiscernible behind the master. If the philosophic act becomes an educative declaration for the subject, it declares from ontology’s guarantee of being and thusly completes the master’s discourse. If it does this it becomes the philosophy Lacan derides and disparages.

The site is pivotal to philosophy because its act configurates from the site’s world. The truth the act seizes emerges from disjunctive sense within the evental site in a sentient tie. It arose specifically from culminated changes of sense in the master’s discourse. Lacan defines these changes as occurring between the semblant pole and the pole of phallic jouissance. The semblant position is in the top left hand position in Lacan’s mathēmes of the discourses. 62 Over two thousand years earlier, in Parmenides, Plato also presented a theory of semblance. “Without the one, it is impossible to have an opinion of the many.” (Badiou 2005 p. 34) Plato basically stated “the unlimitedness of

62 As I showed in Chapter One, semblance is visible colour hidden in light in the Symbolic position in the discourse of the site.
unpresentable multiplicity indicates that it is not supported by any thinkable situation.” Badiou explains how semblance is built upon this.

The contradiction between the analytic of the pure multiple and the rejection of any plurality – in both cases on the hypothesis of the non-being one – is then a mere semblance. (Badiou 2005 p. 35)

Lacan’s discourse theory involves an analysis of how “the unlimitedness of unpresentable multiplicity” is indicated in semblance within different discourses and how such multiplicity is “not supported by any thinkable situation.” Thus Lacan’s theory is amongst other things a theory about the condition for the philosophic act. The position of semblant in his mathèmes is crucial. As I stated previously, the sense in the other discourses is from the phallic function constructed in the position of semblance upon the absence of sense. The disjunctive sense of the site comes from the changes within the other discourses, which have involved an equivalent phallic function in another discourse. (Lacan 2002k p. II, 10) The site in its world is also constructed upon an absence of sense in the semblant position but it is different from the other discourses because it presents its world’s aporetic void as agent. (Lacan 2002k p. I, 1) Thus just as the other discourses convey sense upon an absence, so does the discourse of the site but its sense is disjunctive. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 2) Its sense indexes its void. Disjunctive sense in the site’s agent position with an unlimited unpresentable multiplicity implies semblance necessitates an extra signifier stand in for the multiple-in-being. An event ruptures an existing understanding of a semblant and creates a new logical production in the discursive tie. It is a decisive answer to the site’s undecidability. “Either the there exists or the there does not exist; either the all, or the not-all.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 10)

The new signifier or supernumerary letter emerges specifically from a generic procedure as a conceptual construction for the absence of sense, a trans-worldly truth of being. Badiou asserts the construction is an ontological transcription but it is unrecognised or foreclosed by ontology because it emerges as a self belonging multiple, a construction for the unnameable multiple via the undecidability of the Not All with

63 Lacan says it occurs with what was left over knowledge, which is what the unconscious is. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 52)
the aporetic void. \(^6^4\) The letter is a generic multiple localized or subjectivated once and for all. Although it designates nothing because it is generic, its articulation within a generic procedure becomes fixed for all. Its construction is “a multiple that in a given situation solely possesses properties which are more or less ‘common’ to all the multiples of the situation.” (Badiou 2005 p. 356) Thus the Not All, which de-totalizes or incompletes the All, is supplemented with the extra signifier, such that it becomes “a fundamental quasi-complete situation.” (Badiou 2005 p. 356)

As I said, Lacan’s discourse theory culminates in his analyst’s discourse or discourse of the site, which amounts to it being a theory about the condition for the philosophic act. He presents it in such a way as to transmit knowledge contingent upon the subject as act. (Lacan 2002k pp. VI, 5, 12) This means when Lacan is presenting his teachings he is a philosopher transmitting a pure philosophic act. Also his psychoanalytic practice, which incorporates subtractive strategies, is a condition for the philosophic act. He theorises the Not All in the semblant position as part of what produces the condition for the generic procedure. The truth that emerges is grasped as a logical production with discursive thought. He concludes the semblance, which necessitates an extra signifier, illustrates very properly why evental change is a matter of discourse. The signifier that ruptures semblance and supplements for the multiple-in-being literally requires discourse because the concept of the multiple’s appearance is constructed within a logical production. Furthermore, he unequivocally states the logical necessity of discourse “only begins” with a human animal. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 2) It begins with the sentient tie and truth is the fruit of the production. “The only necessity is one that it is said and this necessity is what renders possible the existence of man as a sexual value.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 2) It is a question embodied in the discourse of the site of what exists or inexists which produces the condition required for the philosophic act. The requirement implies supposition is at stake for the human animal. Lacan explains the question asks ‘what was supposedly preliminary to existence?’ “But since we cannot prove [such existence], what has to be produced should in effect be held as inexistent before.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 3) In effect, it must exist and inexist. The ‘there is’ of

\(^6^4\) Badiou gives the unnameable multiple the symbol for woman, ♀. The symbol seems to point to Lacan’s theory, a woman is Not All. (Badiou 2005 p. 356)
semblance necessitates an extra signifier exist for an inexistent multiple-in-being. “In this moment of emerging, this necessity provides at the same time the proof that it cannot be supposed at first except under the title of the inexisting.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 3)  

65 Proof is required of what is supposed to have been preliminary to existence, to necessitate the condition. In the master’s discourse the necessity required labour, in the upper right hand position with phallic jouissance, to actualise its production. The question with the semblant pole within the discourse of the site also necessitates the pole of phallic jouissance actualise or realise its signified production. 66 The grounded inexistent, preliminary to the necessary, is the very “consistency” of the symptom. It is the inexistance of the multiple-in-itself which is the truth of being and which made its mark as presupposition. 67 It must have consistency and come into discourse. He asserts one must pose the question of what is supposed the same as one must pose “every question, when one already has the answer.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 3-4) The question, which one already has an answer for, uncovers a difficulty in knowledge which is an issue for philosophy related to the master’s discourse.

5.2 Lacan’s Philosophic Pure Act

In this section I examine how the master’s discourse connects with philosophy prior to and post evental change. This examination entails a further exploration of Lacan’s discourse theory on pre evental changes to the master’s discourse and the effect of these changes on the site. I also examine how the philosophic act occurs and how it can avoid the master’s discourse. There are three key issues related to philosophy and the master discourse: trans-worldly conveyance of universal truths; protestation with the master’s discourse; and teaching or transmission. I deal briefly with the protestation with the master’s discourse below. The issues of trans-worldly conveyance of universal truths and transmission dovetail somewhat into each other. They involve how half said truth with old knowledge relates to new knowledge with phallic jouissance. Firstly, I

65 Badiou calls the inexistent multiple-of-being the non being of the one that is not. He cites Plato. “It is necessary for the one to be the non-being-one.” (Badiou 2005 p. 32)

66 The semblant pole in Lacan’s discourses is on the left hand side and the pole of phallic jouissance on the right hand side. The realised logical production is in the position of symptom, the bottom right hand of the discourse.

67 It is in the position, as I stated in Chapter One, where visible colour inexists.
examine how Lacan defines truth in discourse prior to the event, which is relevant to how truth relates to knowledge post the event and also how Lacan differs from Badiou in relation to truth with knowledge and jouissance.

As I discussed, semblance with undecidability in the site necessitates an extra signifier, which can emerge from a site after the master signifier in the masculine ‘norm’ of the master’s discourse has changed. 68 The change of sense makes the inexistent, connected with the symptomatic product in the master’s discourse, become aporetic within a site. It becomes the disjunctive sense of the site. It is where man states ‘there does not exist’ and woman takes on her role from the Real of non existence. This role from the-non-being of one is precisely why the sense of the master’s discourse, as Lacan states, ‘closes in on itself.’ When the change of sense in the master’s discourse occurs closure becomes aporetic in the site’s semblant position. The aporetic in the logic of the site is then questioned and disjunction between two seemingly equivalent terms is revealed. 69 After the emergence of the extra signifier the philosophic act seizes the truth of being out of the sense of the site’s world, which is, as I discussed above, from procedural actuality between ontology and the logic of appearing. The act does this in conjunction with the universality of logic across the discourses of worlds because truths are immediately universal and the trans-worldly is universal. (Badiou 2009a pp. 6, 10) It does this without becoming part of the master’s discourse precisely because it does not complete the master’s discourse. However, Lacan’s criticism implies that, more often than not, philosophy completes the master’s discourse. He discusses how this occurs with philosophy’s trans-worldly conveyance. When the philosophic act becomes trans-worldly with universal truths it is confronted with world views that are signifying, that is, the worlds are connected with discursive human sentience. Lacan asserts ontology is such a world view. (Lacan 1998 p. 30-1) The concept of ontology uses the copula in language, that is, a verb to link a human to the complement in a sentence, for example, it is a reflexive construction for an individual, which permits her to state, ‘to be myself.’ Ontology highlights the verb ‘to be’ as a signifier in its signifying world of discourse.

68 The ‘norm’ relates to meaning in the current state of thought in the master’s discourse. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 46)
69 The logic points to negation, not foreclosure, in the discordance. (Lacan 2002k pp. I, 4, 2)
However, if the philosophic act continues to *incomplete* the master’s discourse it must be expelled from it, that is, driven from the world view of ontology. The act thusly does not participate in the idea of the signifier ‘to be.’

In order to exorcise it, it might perhaps suffice to suggest that when we say about anything whatsoever that it is what it is, nothing in any way obliges us to isolate the verb ‘to be.’ (Lacan 1998 p. 31)

The master, S1, or ontology in the master’s discourse that participates in the idea of signifier, speaks for being. As I discuss in the next chapter, it is not the being of the individual but rather the idea of the being of the individual that is made to sustain the individual, that is, the idea in ontology, the pure multiple in the master. The being of an individual only amounts to the One they have in affinity with others of the all. (Lacan 2002k p. VIII, 6) Ontology as S1 produces being as loss in the position of production. Being is at its beck and call. (Lacan 1998 p. 31) Ontology in the semblant position calls the shots for the non-being-one.

Every dimension of being is produced in the wake of the master’s discourse – the discourse of he who, proffering the signifier, expects there from one of its link effects that must not be neglected, which is related to the fact that the signifier commands. The signifier is, first and foremost, imperative. (Lacan 1998 p. 32)

Thus we see nothing of being because ontology as the signifier ‘to be’ emphasises our reflexive construction ‘to be myself,’ such that we are at a loss when ontology shows us what would have been if we understood what it ordered us to do. (Lacan 1998 p. 31) As the signifier ‘to be,’ being is produced at someone’s heel, *pédicule*. Thus

---

70 Badiou asserts his goal is not an ontological presentation. “The thesis ontology = mathematics is meta-ontological: this excludes it being mathematical, or ontological.” (Badiou 2005 p. 13)

71 The discourse of the site is outside the rule of all discourses because it just goes around and around for nothing. (Lacan 1998 p. 32)

72 The word ‘*pédicule*’ is most likely a reference to the Greek which means ‘if’ or ‘unless,’ that is, a part of negation. (Lacan 1998 p. 31)
philosophy based on a world view of ontology completes the master’s discourse.  

Furthermore, a world view is a collectivity which Lacan explains means nothing qua pre-discursive reality. “There is no such thing as a pre-discursive reality. Every reality is founded and defined by a discourse.” (Lacan 1998 p. 32) A collectivity of relations between signifiers is like a sexual relation. “It’s not working out, and the whole world talks about it.” (Lacan 1998 p. 32) It’s not that S1 doesn’t know how to be as being but it consistently poses a question about existence. Inexistence assures S1’s existence, its posing as being. (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 14-5)

Philosophy must hold fast to an incompleteness of the master’s discourse and to its act whilst it nevertheless transports universal truths across worlds. This fidelity to its pure act is a counterpart to the subject’s forcing that names the universe to-come. The difference for philosophy however is contained in the decision to transmit rather than teach. It transmits from the place in the site where “the whole story! (pas tout!)” is not told and where “the inadequacy of the relationship between One and the Other” is presented (Lacan 1998 pp. 57, 49) Instead of participating in the idea of the master along with ontology, Lacan’s philosophic pure act makes being speak for itself. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 7) Knowledge is transmitted from where the error and no sexual relation is inscribed, the place where sexual enjoyment is the negated. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 3) It is where phallic jouissance is drawn from a viewer in the sentient tie. If however, philosophy completes the master’s discourse and negates difference then it conspires toward equivalence with protestation.  

It consorts with the master to play the function of the One, that is, after knowledge of the function is stolen from that which is excluded. As Lacan states, when you proceed to aim for what plays the function of the One of a discourse anyone can make an ontology according to what she supposes beyond the two horizons of the signifier. One horizon is the One, the master signifier, which can be taught. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 72) The other horizon is the one that says not or the one that is not and it is unteachable. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 94) Ontology’s

73 This is a shame. “Ontology is a shame.” (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 7) I discuss ‘shame’ in the last chapters in connection with Lacan’s comments about the May 1968 student uprising in Paris.

74 As I discussed in Chapter Two, an example of how to complete the master’s discourse would be to install woman as equal to man.
supposition from the position of S1 in the master’s discourse does not leave space open for the aporetic. I referred above to this very closure. The sense of the master’s discourse involves the closure of the one that is not, that it be ‘closed in on itself’ as a symptom. Nevertheless, Lacan states philosophy can keep the master’s discourse incomplete. As a successful act, philosophy can seize truth and kill off the simplified repetition of disjunction with the master signifier rather than leave it to its own devices. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 72) Lacan asserts philosophy’s mainspring or the cause of its brilliance is with the master’s discourse, as long as it doesn’t conspire to protestation. This is difficult because the master’s discourse is also exactly where ideology emerges. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 73) Initially the cause of its brilliance is when the phallic function in the master’s discourse’s semblant position changes sense which means the site for philosophy’s condition is created. This causes the aporetic Not All, that is, a gap for undecidability to occur in the site. The second cause is, despite the master’s discourse, that philosophy remains faithful to its act, which involves fidelity with forcing. As I stated above, ontology may think the being of the subject in forcing because that is its guarantee of being in the subject’s law but what has to be forced along with this is the statement that solely names what the site presents. It is the latter in forcing that philosophy must transmit. Perhaps it is a marriage between the subject and protestation in the master’s discourse with ontology, which poses as being, a co-habitation where they rub up against each other. (Badiou 2009a p. 6)

I place heroism on the side of discipline, the only weapon both of the True and of peoples, against power and wealth, against the insignificance and dissipation of the mind. But this discipline demands to be invented, as the coherence of a subjectivizable body. Then it can no longer be distinguished from our own desire to live. (Badiou 2009a p. 514)

However, there is specificity with nomination that must take the lead or being will still be produced at heel. In other words, ontology may find its guarantee in forcing but its being-there is not the subject and no guarantee that the subjectivizable body will condone or absolve its protestation. Whilst conveying a universal truth across worlds philosophy must remain faithful to its act, which means it must transmit what escapes discourse. (Lacan 1998 p. 33) It is the symptomatic production in the master’s discourse
which will, in the site, change the sense from S1 to the one that is not. Philosophy must retain fidelity to the event such that the transmission of the signifier for the one that is not, in a truth procedure, philosophy’s condition, changes the universal ‘norms’ of the master discourse. In short, it is the least that can be said, rather than a systematic attempt to cover all because to say everything involves a truth that postures. (Lacan 1971 pp. I, 4, 5)

Thus the brilliance of the philosophic act requires changes of sense in the master’s discourse for philosophy’s condition and specificity with transmission and nomination. Lacan describes this brilliance as precisely a change of sense with the master’s discourse which changes the universal logic across worlds. A key aspect with the universality of logic is how the phallic function responds to a necessity in discourse. Its response involves denotation, that is, the sense of a proposition connects to what is necessary to denote. In Lacan’s terminology, the phallus is the power of such meaning. In fact, “the signification of the phallus is the only case of equilibrated genitive.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 45) The function of speech, even when it founds no fact, is “the only form of action that is posed as truth.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 44) Speech can or cannot found a fact but when it does found the origin of all facts the fact is a saying and the stated fact is entirely a fact of discourse. (Lacan 1971 p. I, 5) A stated fact is from a place in the discourse of the site which relates to a key question for philosophy: how does transmission rather that teaching escape the master’s discourse? This also applies to how and why old knowledge poses as a truth. The question is ‘Does obsolete knowledge speak?’ and ‘Is the origin of the fact in old knowledge, said or not said?’ (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 44) (Lacan 1971 p. I, 6) The question for old knowledge with sight becomes ‘Is it seen or not seen?’ In other words, prior to evental change old knowledge from the phallic function poses as truth. It is glimpsed in the discourse of the site. Lacan asserts it is what this discourse reveals to each one who simply engages in it in an active way. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 44) The phallus not only denotes meaning it also compensates for what inexists. Along with its signified truth, it relates to the pole of the semblant. It also diverges to the signifier of the pole of phallic jouissance above

I discuss the specificity in the last chapters.
the symptomatic production. When phallic jouissance and the semblant are correlative, that is, equivalent in a mutual relation, they are an obstacle to the sexual relation. They pose together as truth: “man like woman, they pretend.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 45) And ontology poses as the truth of being. (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 14-15) Knowledge that poses as truth arises when the two poles are defined as separate in the sense of the site’s world. Thus undecidability within the discourse of the site is ‘truths’ posturing in the disjunction of the discourse or put differently it is the site’s question to truth. When the phallus denotes an inscription for what inexists, the semblant in the site’s disjunctive sense relates to love in the discourse and it is distinguished from the product or symptom signified in phallic jouissance. It postures as truth for what inexists in the symptom. These two poles of semblant and phallic jouissance connect with the changes in sense with love and signifierness. I discussed this in Chapter One.  

What is important, of course, is not that the signifier and the signified unite. .. Quite the contrary, it’s that the signified of a signifier, .. where one hangs something that may resemble a meaning, it always comes from that place that the same signifier occupies in another discourse. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 51)

One can see from this how a new sense of ‘a’ in the semblant position of the site came from a symptomatic ‘a’ production in the master’s discourse, from that which inexists and is closed in on itself as a symptom. And one can see how the slave’s knowledge

76 The type of change which occurs with love is best described by the example I gave in Chapter Two of lovers changing places with the signifier when they declare love for each other. The type of change with signifierness occurs then the signifier in the phallic jouissance position changes back to the signifier in the semblant position. In the master’s discourse for example there is a movement of S2 back to S1, which is a reverse of its normal movement from S1 to S2. Any changes to the signified positions with love make new meanings for the discourse of the site. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 51) In addition, signifierness involves change to the signified in the position of symptomatic production. There is a movement from the signifier with phallic jouissance to the signified beneath it, from desire to surplus jouissance. As I explained, the dislodgement occurs because of an unknown pertaining to the Real in the drive. The neurotic signifier movement in the master’s discourse between S1 and S2 is disrupted and S2 is unable to re-present an old knowledge. A new ‘presentification’ does not re-signify and sense is undone. Afterwards there is a new “productive condition” with the symptom. (Harari 2004 p. 102) The changes with discourses are crucial if the viewer is to shift from existing discourses to the discourse of the site, and to confrontation with disjunctive sense presented in the formation of a new site.
which came for the master’s discourse becomes signified old unsupposed knowledge in the site.

The issues connected to teaching or transmission as well as to the trans-worldly conveyance of universal truths involve an analysis of the relationship between truth, knowledge and jouissance. One main issue Lacanian psychoanalysis has raised for philosophy is theory about jouissance. It represents a major difference between Badiou’s and Lacan’s theory on the post evental subject. Badiou is adamant about how philosophy should regard jouissance. He makes reference to Lacan’s aligning philosophy to the master’s ‘not-wanting-to-know’ and to philosophy having a “voluntary ignorance of anything concerning the effects of enjoyment (jouissance) at the heart of thought.” (Badiou 2012a p. 53) However, Lacan describes the idea of the master differently: rather than the master ‘not-wanting-to-know’ Lacan states the master doesn’t know what he wants!

The slave knows many things, but what [she] knows even better still is what the master wants, even if the master does not know it himself. ... The slave knows what it is and that’s what [her] function as a slave is. (Lacan 2007 p. 32)

The master robs the slave via her function at the level of knowledge and furthermore the historical function of philosophy that consorts with the master is a betrayal of the slave’s knowledge. (Lacan 2007 p. 22) Nevertheless, the slave’s knowledge is an enigma for the master because it is not known as knowledge. This unknown knowledge relates to the origin of the slave’s obsolete knowledge, that her labour constitutes a non-revealed unconscious.

What we discover in even the slightest bit of psychoanalytic experience is, indeed, of the order of knowledge [savoir], S1, and not of acquaintance [connaissance] or representation. It is very precisely a question of something that links one signifier, S1, to another, S2, in a relationship of reason. (Lacan 2007 p. 30)

What is obscure here about knowledge is the issue of truth. The long held hope of the
master is that truth might appear in the slave’s knowledge. However, truth that poses with the semblant is produced as a symptomatic product. Thus, the slave's knowledge is only a posturing truth which is an old symptomatic attempt to logically produce knowledge. Such knowledge is discordant in the site but new knowledge which comes to “the heart of thought” has to break from what postures as truth for the sake of that which inexists in the symptom. As I said, with the change of sense in the master’s discourse the symptom becomes aporetic in the semblant position of the site. The site presents undecidability as it draws its supposed new knowledge of jouissance from the divided slave, analysand, viewer etc., ‘a’ → S. Disjunction occurs between such knowledge and obsolete knowledge, which is signified as truth but is old, that is, it is not supposed. Lacan states it is precisely here between signified old knowledge and supposed knowledge of jouissance that new knowledge can emerge only from the jouissance of the singular human animal. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 52)

As I said, philosophy can convey trans-worldly universal truths if it incompletes the master’s discourse. It must avoid negating difference which is revealed in relations of equivalence between semblance and jouissance represented in the master’s discourse. (Lacan 1971 pp. II, 2, 5) Such difference is revealed in disjunction despite equivalence. A sign in the site articulates the place defined as surplus enjoying.

Surplus enjoyment is only normalised from a relationship one establishes to sexual enjoyment [which] is only formulated [and] articulated from the phallus in so far as the phallus is its signifier. ... The phallus is very properly sexual enjoyment in so far as it is co-ordinated, is solitary with a semblance. (Lacan 1973-1974 p. II, 13)

Disjunction between the semblant and enjoyment involves truth posturing with semblance. As I have discussed, changes in the master’s discourse are crucial for the installation of a condition for the philosophic act but they also underscore why the two poles, involved with the old knowledge that poses with truth, must be defined as separate in the sense of the site’s world and question to truth. Philosophy can only avoid
negating the difference between the semblant and jouissance if it holds true to its act and the extra signifier which has irrupted from the site’s semblance. The site only discovers the Real because of the function of semblance. This is not like Plato’s *eidos*, which Lacan asserts is a name “stuck onto the real.” (Lacan 1973-1974 p. II, 6) Apart from stating it was not sayable it is obvious that the solution to the question of the idea could not come to Plato. The solution relates to the angle of the function and of the variable and that the Real is what makes a hole in semblance. (Lacan 1973-1974 p. II, 6-7) Lacan explains mathematics can imagine the Real from the Symbolic. (Lacan 1973-1974 p. I, 10) Plato did this because he placed the hole in the Real. The *eidos* for him is the Imaginary as it equates with the image. It was the certain image of things in ultimate knowledge, not the uncertain image of image connected to secondary knowledge. Badiou also does this when he ignores the integrality of the viewer within the envelope of a painting’s world. He thus misses being in-itself in the sentient tie, that is, the inconsistency in the tie connected inextricably with the jouissance of the singular human animal from the pole of phallic jouissance. He only sees being in-itself in the painting. Plato “saw that without the *eidos*, there was no chance that names would stick to things.” His nominalism was Imaginary.

Let us simply consider the terms ‘active’ and ‘passive,’ for example, that dominate everything that was cogitated regarding the relationship between form and matter, a relationship that was so fundamental, and to which each of Plato’s steps refers, and then Aristotle’s, concerning the nature of things. It is visible and palpable that their statements are based only on fantasy by which they tried to make up for what can in no way be said (*se dire*), namely, the sexual relationship. (Lacan 1998 p. 82)

Plato imagined the Real with mathematics in the Symbolic, that is, the order of his approach was that he imagined (Imaginary) the Real in the Symbolic (I.R.S.). The idea provided consistency for the Real. The good thing about Imaginary nominalism, or

---

77 Not that this semblant hid anything prior to this. It is simply a sign of itself that is hidden, that is, it hides itself. (Lacan 1971 pp. I, 12, 11, 15)

78 I discuss Badiou’s lack of focus upon the viewer in later chapters.
what Lacan calls philosophical nominalism such as Plato’s, which is not simply the realism of the name, is that it “pays homage to the effect of the name on the Real, namely, to what is added to it by the fact of naming it.” All nominalism, apart from the realism of the name, involves the Imaginary, for example, what Lacan advocates involves realizing (Real) the Symbolic from the Imaginary (R.S.I). (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 106, 108) Likewise for Lacan the extra signifier amounts to a new logic. “The one, has to be constructed from what is not.” The extra signifier is not the void but is that which “marks an empty place.” In addition, the only way it can “work is that one puts there exactly the same signifier in all these empty places” because it is a signifier of “common error.” (Lacan 2002k pp. 1, 12, 2, 8) Thus, it is trans-worldly. It conveys the truth of being within a universal logic. It “knots three independent consistencies. ... Its radical function is to give a name to things with all the consequences this involves, because it does not fail to have consequences.” (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 109) It is constructed from the flaw in the Real, the common error expelled from discourse. (Lacan 1998 p. 22) (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 108) It is only there for “that (un ça), which is not for nothing, if it takes into account what is at stake.” (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 107) Lacan changes the un ça to une ça because in the end the masculine universal has its base in the Not All contingency of a woman. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 67) “There ek-ists an x ... yes one (une) x in order that she henceforth ek-sists, this one, the ek-istence as one.” (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 7-8)
Chapter Six

The Singular in the Collective

6.1 True Doxas and Plato

The university discourse relates to the master’s discourse. It functions to elucidate the ‘norm’ for the human animal in the master’s discourse. If a philosopher merely teaches the history of philosophy and investigates ontology as signifying in a world of discourse, then such philosophy is within what Lacan defines as the university discourse. He states philosophy as a university discourse is a false ordering or various ontologies which culminate in a “History of Philosophy.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 73) The following is his mathēme for the university discourse.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S_2 \\
\hline
S_1
\end{array}
\]

“Knowledge is put in the position of semblant, that’s what is verified, that is what is confirmed from the very nature of the teaching.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 73) What is taught verifies the One, the master signifier. Knowledge is drawn from the signified S1 and verified in the semblant for students who are identified as ‘a’ and $S$ is produced. The knowledge of the academic philosopher that is taught from the authoritarian position of semblance is sex education, that the sexual relation exists. (Lacan 1998 p.

---

79 As I discussed previously, Lacan refers to genitive phallic denotation. He places the sense or meaning of the objective genitive with all his discourses: the analyst, academic philosopher, master and hysteric are in the semblant position. He describes the denotation of the position as the objective genitive and likens it to a woman’s desire for a phallus. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 47) (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 9) The signified to the semblant position is in retaliation to the objective genitive, that is, a child wants to be desired. The desire for a phallus, “a desire for a child, it is a child that one desires” is with the objective denotation and according to the law of retaliation the objective involves a subjective genitive: “a desire of a child, it is a child who desires, subjective.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 9)
48) However, as I discussed in the previous chapter, everything with a collective world view shows such a relation is not working. (Lacan 1998 p. 32) 

In his analysis of philosophy and the university discourse, Lacan refers to “the famous doxa” which is mentioned in Plato’s *Meno*. Meno’s is an example of the doxa that is not a doxa of the university. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 47) It is Meno’s ‘no, no!’ Plato describes how Meno and Socrates discuss virtue, which relates to the idea or being in-itself. Meno describes the logical difficulty with such a definition, “How can you inquire into what you do not know?” (Plato 1949 p. x) Lacan asserts doxa is understood as probable knowledge related to belief and supposition. Whilst referring specifically to the Meno’s ‘*mais non*, but, no!’ Lacan proposes there are doxas everywhere in university teaching.

But currently there is no doxa as futile ... or even as damned stupid, as it is, that is not lined up somewhere in a university teaching. There is no example of an opinion, as stupid as it might be that is not able to be pinpointed, or even, now and then, by virtue of the fact that it is pinpointed to be taught. That distorts everything! (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 47)

He declares the distortion began with Plato because he literally doesn’t know what to do with doxa and yet he notices that he encounters doxa at every street corner. For Lacan there are doxas distinct from the doxas that are everywhere. He calls them ‘true doxas.’ He assumes Plato knows of them because no one doubts they exist. They are self evident and impose themselves. Although, he may know they exist, Lacan asserts Plato can’t say why there are true ones. In fact, it is true doxas which create a context for doxa not to be normed. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 47) Lacan’s reference to the norm relates

---

80 The result of such teaching is revealed when the university discourse is clarified via its “progress” in the site. (Lacan 1998 p. 16) In fact, it is the minimum or the beginning that feeds the discourse of the site. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 46)

81 *Meno* is homophonous with *mais non*, ‘but, no!’

82 In classical rhetoric, a doxa is opinion, belief, or probable knowledge. It is in contrast to ‘epistêmê’ which is a domain of certainty. As I discussed in Chapter Three, Plato’s secondary or sensory reality is knowledge that is opinion, doxa, belief or supposition. (Lee 2007 p. 94)
to the normal conventional belief of doxa as well as the normed meaning with doxas in
the master’s discourse. It is not a small matter to say a true doxa creates a context for
doxa not to be normed. The implication is true doxas subvert a master discourse
because they can’t be normed. This is the key to the formation of the site and to the
transmission of knowledge associated with the event. What occurs with such subversion
is the signified under the master in the discourse makes the discourse change into a site.
As I discussed previously, protestation only consolidates the master’s discourse. (Lacan
2002k p. VI, 9-10) Protestation plays upon the roles of the master as semblant and the
slave in the signifier position. Plato sees beyond these roles because he knows they can
switch places.

When the masters were made prisoners they became slaves, and when the
slaves were freed well then they became masters. ... Fraternity .. is
designed so that one can sell one’s brother, which is something that never
failed to happen in the aftermath of all subversions which are supposed to
resolve around the discourse of the Master. (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 10)

Such fraternity in the master’s discourse is a commonality (a brotherhood, a
community). True doxas also have a commonality although they are not normed, that is,
with protestation is simply a change in roles. The master is enslaved and the slave freed.
If this happens and the slave becomes equal Lacan asks “Equal to what?”

No one knows, because one can also very well say that [the master] is
equal to zero because he needs the existence of something that denies
him in order to exist as all [tout]. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 9)

Furthermore, the slave participates in the eidos or the S1 of the master. “The slave is
never a slave except from the essence [eidos] of the master.” (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 11)
S2 is never S2 except by participating in S1 and likewise S1 is never S1 except by
participating in S2.

Masters and slaves simply swap places with protestation. However, a true doxa
subversion of the norm in a master’s discourse involves a change of position between
the semblant and the signified truth and a divergence to phallic jouissance which results in a change in discourse. So what exactly is a true doxa? It is specific to an individual and her discursive sentient tie. Just as a pure multiple is the being of every object, the idea is also the being of an individual, if S2 does not participate in it. The individual’s *eidos* is marked in existence, that is, represented in discourse, specifically with Imaginary identification, which repeats. (Lacan 2002k p. IX, 2) As I have shown, it is discourse that gives us the ontological distinction between the pure multiple and existence. Lacan’s question, “Equal to what?” points to a commonality, that the individual is equal to zero and needs the existence of something that denies her for the sake of existence as *all* (*tous*), a one or part of everyone. (Lacan 2002k pp. VI, 8, 9) The individual is the singular of the collective, a representative of an object, which is the collective. (Lacan 2002k p. VIII, 5) However, her existence does not depend on the similar, the semblable. It depends upon the hole with the error marked in representation. “It is inadequate in the Platonic dialogues to make the participation of anything whatsoever [the slave, the male, the individual] existent in the order of similar.” (Lacan 2002k p. VIII, 12) Without the One breaking through the empty set, the hole, at the level of the one *that is not*, the notion of the similar could not appear in anything. (Lacan 2002k pp. VIII, 14, 12) The breakthrough of the One into existence gives the individual existence. Initially the individual comes into the *all* via the unary trait, the error marked in representation. It is part of everyone, that is, each one of the *all*. It is the support of Imaginary identification and where the viewer locates herself. Anything, any object *a*, writes the trait and Symbolically marks the divided subject. Its insistence is Imaginary identification which operates by means of the Symbolic mark. It speaks (*ça parle*) the viewer with the symptom in the discursive tie. What is repeated is Freud’s kernel of truth, Socrates’ soul or Lacan’s knowledge of enjoyment. (Lacan 2002k pp. IX, 1, 2, 3)

---

83 As I have said above, this also occurs with love.
84 “Every object [is] considered in its being as pure multiple.” (Badiou 2009a p. 321)
85 The unary trait is the defining term translated as such by Freud.
86 It is the One of repetition but the repetition doesn’t ground any *all* nor does it identify anything because tautologically “there cannot be a first of them.” What grounds it is Not All. (Lacan 2002k pp. IX, 1)
As I said above, a doxa involves belief and probable knowledge, thus supposition. What is involved with a true doxa, situated by the trait, is supposition and what is supposed is the individual who is “never anything but supposed. ... It is the knowledge that is supposed and no one has ever been deceived by that.” (Lacan 2002k p. IX, 5) Such probable knowledge without divergence to phallic jouissance is only the half said truth, signified sentience, the S of the master’s discourse. Lacan defines a ‘common sonority’ as what is behind the all or part of everyone. The true doxa, along with Imaginary identification, contains the one that is not or the Real One, the Real object a behind the deceptive Symbolic object. The latter is a deceptive decoy in the discourse of the site. A true doxa has commonality with the marked error, common to all, and common sonority with the singularity of one that is not. However, as I discuss below, common sonority with the true doxa is indexed by the sign in the deceptive Symbolic object a for a singular viewer. The deceptive object is within the disjunctive sense of the site.

Participation in an idea sustains the idea, that is, it circumscribes the Real as a gap. This is how Lacan defined the first foundation of the site and he saw it in Plato’s dialogues. He asserts Plato’s dialogues are inadequate because they circumscribe what is real, which gives rise to the illusion that one can arrive at something by dialoguing with someone. (Lacan 2002k pp. VII, 9, 8, 7) This is also the belief in political strategies of protestation, for example, in feminist consciousness raising group discussions. The inadequacy in his dialogues is about the order of the similar. As I cited above, “It is inadequate in the Platonic dialogues to make participation of anything whatsoever existent in the order of the similar (semblable).” The true doxas seem self evident in relation to number because they are associated with individuals who have their own being which is independent from the being of others. (Lacan 2002k p. VIII, 12, 4) However, the completed master discourse, as I discussed previously, is not about the individual but rather the idea of the individual, and such an idea is meant to sustain the individual. Plato’s dialogues and the switching with political strategies amount to only the idea in S1, the pure multiple in the master. Contrary to this, S1 production in the site is not number but the signifier One. In other words, the only thing we arrive at by dialoguing with others is the definition of the Real as a gap and existence with participation in the order of the similar. This only gives us the ontological distinction between the pure multiple and existence, and the ones with individuals amount to the
One they have in affinity with the others of the *all.* (Lacan 2002k p. VIII, 6)

Lacan states, between the individual’s corporeal existence and the idea or one *that is not,* there are elements or points that play a role in the transition of the idea. We qualify as individuals with logical support at the level of discourse, only at the level of the Imaginary and only with the discourse of the site. The Real one’s or the idea’s access is the Symbolic in the site. That is how the individual accedes to it. (Lacan 2002k pp. VIII, 5, 6, 7) The only common factor with common sonority is that the true doxa is sayable within the site. “That is the step taken by *Parmenides.*” Plato knew this. *Eidos* circumscribes the gap in what is said. (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 8-9) He put the one *that is not* or the Real object *a* at the same level as what is involved with being. Lacan defines the level as an element which is perfectly acceptable in the empty set. However, the element One is founded upon it, not sameness with other ones. It is founded upon difference not similarity. (Lacan 2002k pp. VIII, 8, 10, 12) The problem here for philosophy in the university discourse and political strategies of protestation is the one element related to the singular true doxa can’t be taught. It can only be transmitted from the discourse of the site. Philosophy with political strategies however, as Lacan asserts, teaches from the position of semblance in the university discourse. Furthermore, the true doxa may subvert the master’s discourse because it can become sayable in the discourse of the site but to simply define this common sonority is merely to circumscribe the gap. Within the site it is not the number of Real ones that arrive at an evental emergence. It is in the site at the level of the pure multiple in the true doxa with a singular in the collective that an extra signifier emerges as belonging to a Real object *a.* It is Realised in the Symbolic separate from an individual’s Imaginary identification. It is precisely this which is transmitted.

Nevertheless, a switch between master and slave can reveal a limit to general doxa everywhere. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 9) However, what is revealed is general beliefs, normed in the master’s discourse, are only group beliefs based on old dogmas. They are not beliefs based upon probable knowledge. Unless the probability of a true doxa diverges to where it can be part of a production in the site, the switch will only leave the old truth of signified synthesis in place. It will continue to consolidate what is normed. The half said truth, the signified of the semblant position, requires the further
divergence. There needs to be a change in sense with the semblant pole which occurs when half said truth diverges to the upper position of the phallic jouissance pole, that is, to the slave’s position. The semblant is semblant for the production and, as I explained in the last chapter, the symptomatic product is not known to the viewer in the master’s discourse of the sentient tie. Divergence brings about a change in discourse. Old signified sentience is subverted by supposed knowledge. True doxas are probable knowledge based on supposition. The old synthesis has to be shifted with knowledge drawn from the phallic jouissance of the slave, an individual’s discursive tie. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 52) Knowledge is only drawn from the jouissance of the singular in the collective, $S$ in the site. The corporal existence of an individual gains logical support when the singular being, a Real object $a$ independent from others, gains access in the Symbolic of the site. As I have shown, Plato knows of true doxas with signified sentience, $S$, because he places the number of Real ones as sayable in the site but he only circumscribes it as a gap which has commonality. Plato and philosophy in the university discourse are unable to deal with the difference between the two poles. They fail to understand that the disjunction between the semblant and phallic jouissance involves truth posturing with semblance and that the site’s question points to how a truth related to the singular can come into existence. And furthermore, they fail to understand difference rather than equivalence is what is embodied with transmission rather than teaching. (Lacan 2002k pp. VI, 3, 5)

I have shown that although a true doxa has commonality with the marked error, it cannot be dealt with as communal resemblance. Plato disregarded true doxas because he considered them to be all the same, to be semblance. He enunciated his idea of the Idea as ‘the form is Real’ and, as Lacan asserts, “that is simply the form we recognise in a certain number of individuals who resemble each other.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 77) If one accepts that which necessitates existence begins with the undecidable, that a signifier emerges from the undecidable, one could assume resemblance functions toward true knowledge with such emergence because resemblance fuses many together in order to find a one from a two (family or group), the singular from a collective. However, resemblance only fuses a collective, an all, which is necessarily semantic and supportive of the no sexual relationship. An extra signifier emerges from the site’s question, a gap of the undecidable, between the Not All and the one that is not. It is the
Not All that grounds the *all* and locates the singular. (Lacan 2002k p. IX, 1) Lacan begins with the undecidable in his Impossible position in the Formula of Sexuation because the question is a question of the Real. (Lacan 1971-1972c pp. 99, 101) The Not All of the discourse of the site does not claim to transgress or protest against anything yet it effaces equivalence (the norm of the master’s discourse). It is a nodal point of the Impossible and as such presents an encounter with being. It is not a fraternity that switches positions with protestation but it involves the true doxa of an individual.

Namely in the way that each of you believes [herself] to be, on the pretext that you are individuals. It was noticed that there were things that existed in that they constituted the limit to what could hold up the advance of the articulation of discourse. That is what the real is. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 11)

Unlike protestation, the Real’s approach is realising the Symbolic from the Imaginary, which means “the Impossible in so far as it shows itself, does not transgress itself.” (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 11) The subversion of the master’s discourse is not a matter of founding a one from two, but establishing a one element set which emerges for the function of the individual. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 77) An extra signifier realises it in the Symbolic. It simply supplements for what previously in-existed and it is new because it isn’t founded on sameness. It is marked as being grounded on simple difference. (Lacan 2002k p. VIII, 11)

### 6.2 The Singular in the Collective Gaze

**True Doxas and Two Instances of a Sign**

I now analyse how the phenomenology of a singular viewer’s perception is pivotal with the one *that is not* for an encounter with the true doxa. In the previous chapter, I stated a viewer sees visible worlds as a representation linked to phenomenological experience. However, as Plato pointed out, representation in a viewer’s sight can often be in discord with the object in physical existence.

A stick will look bent if you put it in the water, straight when you take it out, and deceptive differences of shading can make the same surface
seem to the eye concave or convex: and our minds are clearly liable to all sorts of confusions of this kind. It is a natural weakness of ours that the scene-painter and conjuror and their fellows exploit with magical effect. (Plato 2007 p. 345)

Plato’s examples relate to how the eye can be deceived. As I stated previously, Plato placed his focus on the hole in the Real not the hole in the Symbolic. He imaginarized the Symbolic in the Real; his *eidos* does not involve the uncertain or deceptive image of an image with secondary knowledge. Hence, as Lichtenstein showed, he disparaged painting. (Lichtenstein 1993 pp. 2, 1) (Plato 2007 pp. 344, 346) Nevertheless, representation with phenomenological experience and a concept of sight in the tie is distorted by a viewer's Imaginary identification. This is because of the hole in the second count and the Symbolic. As I stated above, the viewer comes into discourse via an error where she locates herself in her old signified sentience with the support of Imaginary identification. Any object *a* can write her mark of the error in representation. In sighted sentience the object is Lacan’s object *a* gaze. In other words, disjunctive distortion within visual representation, phenomenological experience and sensorial history occurs with the gaze.

Along with sight, the gaze is constituted with the scopic drive and it is connected to the materiality and signified synthesis of the viewer’s body. A cut to the gaze, in later Lacanian theory, relates, in part, to the Real, the drive and the “entelechy” of the body. (Verhaeghe, Declercq 2002 p. 70) (Lacan 1998 p. 88) The cut disrupts old sighted synthesis, the conflation between knowledge and an individual's supposed intentionality. She cannot continue to rely on the sentient tie which is supposed to tell her she is seeing what she intends to see. For example, she sees green and her sighted knowledge recognizes green-ness. However, sensorial history with the gaze has associations related to green, which don’t necessarily correspond to what the eye sees. In short, a cut to the gaze cuts Imaginary identification because it separates it from the Symbolic. The cut is sudden and instantaneous because it is within Symbolic chronological time and the Symbolic with space. Although the viewer sees with sighted sentience more rapidly than she hears her voice, her sight is not in the present. Nevertheless, the cut seems instantaneous. It is as though the gaze has been “thrown
upon her.” It becomes an immediate experience. (Harari 2002 p. 58) What is relevant here is the phenomenology of perception is necessary if the gaze is to be cut because a viewer’s phenomenological experience contains the presence of the gaze. (Lacan 1979 p. 258) The cutting is an encounter with supposed being, the supposition of a true doxa, because the cut separates an individual’s Imaginary identification from the deceptive Symbolic object $a$, and because after all, it is the Imaginary which supports her and where she is qualified as individual within the discourse of the site. (Lacan 2002k pp. VIII, 5, 6, 7) When the cut separates the Imaginary from the Symbolic the site queries how can a truth related to the singular in the collective came into existence. The question arises, ‘what was preliminary to existence? (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 3) As I stated previously, it is the inexistence of the multiple-in-itself which makes its mark as presupposition. The disjunctive sense with the supposition is immanent in sentience and when the cut occurs there is a change of discourse within the tie.

The phenomenology of perception is necessary for the cut therefore it’s worth noting how Lacan’s theory on the gaze and his approach to phenomenology differs from Merleau-Ponty’s because Lacan links the gaze to the eye. (Lacan 2004 pp. 254, 249) The gaze is not necessarily part of a visible world because it is considered to be particularly present in the Real. (Lysy-Stevens 2008 p. 21) (Miller 1994 p. 47-52) However, Lacan places the gaze within a viewer’s phenomenological experience.

The gaze and the voice are part of the perceptive field; we learn this from the clinic of psychosis. And it is also true for neurosis, except that, there, it is because they are extracted from it that they are part of this field. Except for experiences of the uncanny, the neurotic does not perceive them in fact. (Kusnierek 2008 p. 23)

---

87 Lacan’s object $a$ gaze becomes a Symbolic object, a gift object, a sign of love and so a signifier. (Lysy-Stevens 2008 pp. 19, 20-1)
The gaze was part of the field before it was extracted from it in childhood. (Lacan 2004 p. 269-71) (Lacan 1979 p. 187) This creates a split between the eye and the gaze which manifests the drive at the level of the scopic. (Lacan 1979 p. 73) Kusnierek states Merleau-Ponty wants to “grasp perception previous to organised perceptive reality, to describe the pre-objective world.” (Kusnierek 2008 p. 24) She defines the visual world as the field of constant presence, always already there, and that synthesis or perciptiens does not involve an objective spectator whose point of view depends on the

Also, as I discuss below, Kristeva’s theory specifically connects colour with the child hence the scopic drive. (Kristeva 1980 p. 225)

The following is a brief analysis of the scopic drive with Freud’s and Lacan’s theories. The autoerotic drives are not of the field of the Other. (Lacan 1979 p. 187) They have a movement of outwards and back. Freud labelled two poles of the pleasure of seeing as ‘to see’ and ‘be seen.’ (Lacan 1979 p. 178) There are three stages. The second appears with the drives return and the third does not appear. In the third the human, experiences something new, the appearance of herself which is properly the other. This occurs because of the circular path of the drive. She appears at the level of the other. (Lacan 1979 pp. 170, 178) The drive is pressured to rise from its source, the erogenous rim, and its aim is to return. The autoerotic satisfaction is the object the drive turns around. It is the presence of a hollow, a void. (Lacan 1979 p. 180) However, the demand of the Other intervenes. The circumventing of the object has no relation to the viewer apart from its layering of signifying investments. (Lacan 1979 p. 181) The reversal is with the aim of the drive. To look at is replaced by the passive aim to be looked at. “Reversal of content is found in the .. transformation of love into hate.” (Freud 1986a p. 205) With exhibitionism reversal involves the love of gazing at one’s own body. The drive is inserted into love, the framework of narcissism. It is libido. The essence here is “the change of the object, while the aim remains unchanged.” (Freud 1986a p. 206) Freud describes three vicissitudes. With reversal, an active aim moves to a passive one. Scopophilia (looking) proceeds exhibitionism (being looked at) there was an even earlier stage with scopophilia. (Freud 1986a p. 208) The preliminary stage of scopophilic drive continues to co-exist with the other stages, thus, the ‘original eruption’ of the drive proceeds unchanged. (Freud 1986a p. 209) Stages two and three are added to the original eruption of layering, rather than the drive undergoing any development. The autoerotic at the beginning of the scopophilic has as an object part with the human being’s own body. (Freud 1986a p. 210) The drive changes the preliminary object for the analogous one with the body of another. The stages relate to one another as follows. 1. Preliminary stage - Looking at one’s own sexual organ (autoerotic). 2. Stage (a) - Looking at an extraneous object. 3. Stage (b) - Giving up on that object and turning to oneself with the scopophilic drive, to being looked at by another (exhibitionism). The passive and active merge. Getting oneself looked at can be very active. 4. Stage (c) - There is a transformation of the gaze back on oneself. The object replaces self. A new object looks at self. The turning to one’s own self is not directed to the object. A human appears as agent for the first time. One is being looked at hence, one is an object. The gaze is the object suddenly re-found by the interdution of the other. The drive’s circuit is the reversal of the object. Stage (a) is a focus on the object. Stage (b) is on alienation and erasure. In Stage (a) the object a gaze escapes from both representation and the specula. “From the moment [Lacan] defines object α as ‘what there is that is most me … in the exterior, not so much because I projected it as because it has been cut off of me,’ the traditional dualism, which opposes body and object as two symmetrical surfaces, makes way for a new topology of the body.” (Lysy-Stevens 2008 p. 1) (Lacan 2004 p. 258) The body no longer has the unity of the mirror stage. It is now libidinal: a “body of ‘erogenous zones’ that circumscribe the hole left by the part that is forever separated off.”
position of its body in the world. (Kusnierek 2008 p. 24) However, Merleau-Ponty’s objective spectator has a unity of perception and views the whole from the point of view of the body according to the knowledge of the world which is given to her within her body. (Merleau-Ponty 1962 p. 353) However, psychotic hallucinations complicate things for Merleau-Ponty. The split between the eye and the gaze is particularly obvious with psychosis. He defines the split as fabrication, that is, the psychotic is fabricating a world where hallucinations are separate from any sensory counterpart.

Hallucinations [exist] because through the phenomenal body we are in constant relationship with an environment into which that body is projected, and because, when divorced from its actual environment, the body remains able to summon up, by means of its own settings, the pseudo-presence of that environment. (Merleau-Ponty 1962 p. 353)

Lacan’s approach to the phenomenology of hallucination is contrary to this. He states “Verbal hallucination is not a false perceptum, it is a deviated percipiens.” (Lacan 1979 p. 258) In fact, the percipiens is pivotal for an encounter with a true doxa because the one that is not is present in the percipiens.

However, Merleau-Ponty’s thoughts on colour are pertinent to how signified synthesis is not necessarily tied to perception because he asserts, “Real colour persists beneath appearances as the background persists beneath the figure, that is, not as seen or thought-of quality, but through a non-sensory presence.” (Merleau-Ponty 1962 p. 356) Thus it is not entirely appropriate to simply categorise Merleau-Ponty’s theories as only connected to “a unity of perception.” He defines phenomena as constancy and “colour is only an abstract component of the constancy of things.” A viewer discovers constant colours. (Merleau-Ponty 1962 p. 365) In other words, colours make their appearance in a reflective attitude and can be recognised according to the circumstances of a viewer’s life. He defines this as “colour in living perception” and gives two examples. Firstly, “The perception of colours is developed late in children.” Secondly, New Zealand Maoris perceive a great many colours. They have three thousand names for colours because colours are only related to “objects structurally different from each other.” (Merleau-Ponty 1962 p. 355) However, although he admits to variables, he persistently holds to perception cancelling out all “stray data” because perception should be entirely
sustained by a world of certainty. (Merleau-Ponty 1962 p. 365) Kusnierek shows his insistence upon certainty is a reference to the perception of a normal individual.

She explains Lacan places perception with signifying structure. “The perceptum ... is a signifying chain” and signified synthesis within the master’s discourse is essentially variable and un-unified, “the percipiens is not univocal, but equivocal.” (Kusnierek 2008 p. 25) A good example of this is Lacan’s famous interview with a psychotic woman who went to the pork butchers. She admitted she heard her thoughts as hallucination. (Lacan 1993 pp. 47, 53) She gave one attribution to her thought and the other to her neighbour, which came back to her as the voice of the Other. In short, the synthesis was signified and over ruled by the Other. The voice could not be heard or integrated into the signifying chain. (Kusnierek 2008 p. 27) This object was apprehended as a signified production. Kusnierek asserts what the woman heard was the unspeakable object she was for the Other. What was heard was rejected into the Real of the hallucination and attributed to the Other. This can also apply to the gaze. It is particularly present in the Real and for the neurotic it is more prone to escape discourse. (Lysy-Stevens 2008 p. 20) (Harari 2004 p. 109-10) Kusnierek describes the neurotic’s declaration, “I am the unspeakable object for this Other. I want the master to tell me what is essential to my unspeakable being.” (Kusnierek 2008 p. 28) The psychotic is different. She cannot escape the Other’s gaze – it is everywhere. The psychotic is an object for the Other. (Lysy-Stevens 2008 p. 20-1)

Merleau-Ponty’s experiments with light are pertinent to this discussion about the Other. He uses a black spot, a cone of light shining on it and a piece of white paper. (Merleau-Ponty p. 363) The experiments prove light allows us to see the visual world precisely when light is transparent.

We have in [Merleau-Ponty’s] experiment two states of the Other, which we will treat as equivalent to light: either an opaque and visible state of light, which blurs the view, or a state of light .. transparent and invisible, which allows us to see distinctly. (Kusnierek 2008 p. 30)

The two states correspond with the viewer. Firstly, the viewer is distinguished as
separate from the Other. Secondly, she is drowned in the “consistency of the Other, swallowed up by the light.” In other words, Merleau-Ponty’s experiments demonstrate light allows us to see and hence lighting guides our sight. In fact, light, as that which is part of the constant presence of the visual world, already knows what there is to see before the viewer does and it informs her of what there is to see. (Kusnierek 2008 p. 31) Merleau-Ponty portrays light as a guide that knows before the viewer where she needs to look. Light is the master of the house. (Kusnierek 2008 p. 31-2) “The lighting directs my gaze and causes me to see the object, so that in a sense it knows and sees the object.” (Merleau-Ponty 1962 p. 361) In short, he defines human sighted sentience as ruled and directed by light.

However, in comparison to Merleau-Ponty Lacan’s theory of the gaze is about the senses and what includes us with spectacle. (Kusnierek 2008 p. 33) He states a prior vision must be supposed and light needs to be transparent so we can see clearly. He discusses “a small manifestation of the function to be isolated” and calls the manifestation a “stain.” He associates it with the gaze which marks the supposed pre-existence to be seen, of a given-to-be-seen.

We will then realise that the function of the stain and the gaze is both that which governs the gaze most secretly and that which always escapes from the grasp of that form of vision that is satisfied with itself in imagining itself as consciousness. (Lacan 1979 p. 74)

Kusnierek points to how Lacan’s theory is different from Merleau-Ponty’s theory. There are two functions of pre-existence to be seen, of a given-to-be-seen. Firstly, there is the given-to-be-seen function, which relates to the visible world linked with discourse and to the eye where light is transparent and permits visibility. Secondly, she describes a function that relates to the Other and a given-to-be-seen. It is a disruptive emergence that occurs when suddenly light is seen for what it is, only light. Light’s permission to view the visible is no longer required. Suddenly sentient synthesis incorporates vision as separate from the gaze and the gaze and Imaginary identification are cut. It is a
disruption to the gaze and a shift of signified sentience. Lacan worked on his theory of the cut to the gaze and the Imaginary for decades. 90 The cut or what is called the taming of the gaze is how the true doxa related to the singular viewer subverts the master’s discourse. Signified sentience in the semblant pole diverges to the pole of phallic jouissance. In Part B and C I define the cut as the first suture in Lacan’s theory of evental change.

**Symptom and Symbol**

Colour as signified synthesis appears with childhood memories. For example, Freud had a childhood memory of yellow flowers and black bread. (Gunn 2008 p. 1) It related to the senses of sight and taste.

> The yellow of the flowers is a disproportional prominent element in the situation as a whole, and the nice taste of the bread seems to me exaggerated in an almost hallucinatory fashion. (Freud 1953 pp. 313, 305)

Colour’s link with childhood memories points to its connection to the scopic drive with the gaze. Kristeva declares that colour inscribes drival residues. “The identification of objects, including one’s own image – comes into play after colour perception.” (Kristeva 1980 p. 225) She is declaring identification occurs *after* colour perceptions and asserts perception of colour begins before the fovea is developed. 91 The fovea is

---

90 An early Lacan, 1955-1956, describes the cut for a viewer. (Lacan 2006b p. 486-7) He states the lines of Schema R condition the perceptum – in other words the object. They circumscribe it as well as depend on it. (Lacan 2006b p. 462) The field of reality is of the Imaginary and the Symbolic. Between them are the Moebius strip and the gaze, which is fantasy. The Imaginary has to share half of its half of the schema with the Moebius, because the Symbolic must make them overlap, hence when colour in the gaze appears to be deceptive it is not only because the object is in the Symbolic, it is also with the Imaginary. The I, (ego-ideal) and the M (signifier of the primordial object), places the object in mediation with the signifying chain. (Lacan 1977 p. 333) Imaginary identifications are between iM, in the object. The Real does not occupy any space of the projected plane of the Moebius. Lacan does not let this system of identifications theoretically ground reality. The structure of the fantasy is cut with the Real. This is the extraction of object a. The cut or extraction sustains the field and gives it its frame. (Lacan 2006b p. 486-7)

91 She refers to the mirror stage, an infant’s early experience of its own image in a mirror. Grigg describes the mirror stage. “The child is fascinated with its image because it is here the child
“the part of the eye developed latest in human beings (sixteen months after birth).” 92
The colour first perceived is blue because it has a short wave length. In Giotto’s Joy, she discusses Giotto’s use of blue pigment. 93 Famously, she proposes Giotto’s luminous blue stands ahead of form. It “takes hold of the viewer at the extreme limit of visual perception.” She cites Purkinje’s law; short wave lengths prevail over long ones when light is dim. One sees, blue through the rods of the retina’s periphery while the central cones, the fovea, fixes the objects image and identifies its form. Therefore one perceives blue beyond the object’s fixed form; where phenomenal identity vanishes. 94
She also asserts a chromatic experience can repeat a viewer’s specula experience from early childhood because colour is a drive pressure. It is linked to external visible objects and furthermore, colour in painting indexes this pressure for a viewer. (Kristeva 1980 pp. 225, 235, 219) Her assertion that colour inscribes drive residues and indexes drive pressure is significant for a true doxa and colour as an event. It is not necessarily relevant for an event that colour is linked to the early development of the fovea (eye) before the mirror stage. However, what is important is colour’s link to the gaze and thus the drive because a pure multiple of colour with the drive is colour à propos the unary trait. Kristeva is not aware in Giotto’s Joy of the importance of the distinction between the eye and the gaze. (Kristeva 1980) 95 As I said above, the split between the eye and

experiences itself as a whole for the first time. The reference to the mirror ... emphasis[es] that the ego is built upon an image of one’s own body as it would be perceived from another’s point of view.” (Grigg 2008 p. 10)

92 Creed asserts the self is constituted in the mirror stage. The child perceives its body as a unified whole in an image it receives from outside itself. “Identity is an imaginary construct, formed in a state of alienation, grounded in misrecognition.” She asserts the horror film puts the viewer’s sense of unified self into crisis. It is exactly “where meaning collapses.” Creed designates the act of looking away as the fifth look. “The spectator is able momentarily to withdraw identification from the image in order to reconstruct the boundary between self and screen and reconstitute the self which is threatened by disintegration.” (Creed 1993 p. 29)

93 Kristeva was writing this essay in 1972 at the same time as Lacan was presenting Seminar XX. She attended Lacan’s seminars as she is noted as asking him a question, 17th May 1977. (Lacan 2008 p. 64)

94 She states colour’s link to the drives has a destabilizing effect because it lessens object objectification and fixation upon the phenomenal. (Kristeva 1980 p. 231)

the gaze not only manifests precisely where the gaze was extracted from the field of the Other, thus where the true doxa with the evental site is located, but it is also exactly where an evental suture occurs with the cut. In other words, colour not only relates to the eye (the fovea etc.) before discourse but it also relates to the eye with the gaze before and after the formation of discourse. What Kristeva is pointing to here is the occasion where the gaze and the eye are together before the gaze is extracted. Drawing on Lacan, Creed also points to and beyond this occasion.

The infant does not initially have a sense of itself ... separate from its ... mother. It continues to feel part of her body, a feeling reinforced through breast-feeding. It is at this point, however, that the infant experiences for the first time the thrill of recognising itself as separate and independent. This occurs when it sees the image of itself reflected back through a mirror. (Creed 2005 p. 188)

She refers to where the gaze is extracted. It is the pivotal moment specific to a potential event. Lacan aligns it with a viewer of painting. A viewer approaches a painting in the feminine position of being it. (Lacan 1998 p. 100) He declares the eye has a power to separate the Symbolic and Imaginary registers and he likens this to when a child gazes enviously at a sibling on the mother’s breast. Something for the child, which he calls jealouissance, springs forth from the image. 96 The separation of the registers occurs when the gaze is extracted from the perceptive field. What is pivotal about the gaze with the scopic drive is not that it is aligned to early childhood memories per se but that it is associated with, as Creed states, a specific point.

An early Lacan defines the connection to the drives as elementary phenomena. He initially uses the term in his 1932 thesis in medicine. (Grigg 2008 p. 11) (Lacan 1975 p. 207) It is situated with a combination of elements, which suppose a value or meaning. (Miller 2009 p. 2) Lacan, following Clerambault, defines this phenomenon as a

96 ‘Jealouissance’ is a jealousy of the other gaining the jouissance of the Other at the mother’s breast. “The child who is gazed at has it.” (Lacan 1998 p. 100) The viewer, from the place of ‘being’ it, gazes at the semblant, Imaginary phallus.
differentiated structure, irreducible to anything other than itself. (Lacan 1993 p. 19) He relates it to foreclosure because a signifier is unsymbolised. Miller describes it as an isolated element which presents as a delusion for psychosis and “a minuscule unconscious formation” for neurosis. (Miller 2009 pp. 7-8, 11-2) It is something of a moment, “a curious moment, a product ... which is unfinished or difficult.” It is “a signifier of the elementary phenomena.” (Miller 2009 p.18-20) “The One signifier, S1, is always elementary, that is to say it does not know what it signifies.” (Miller 2009 p. 21) 

The effect of signification anticipates the development of signification therein. What is actually involved is an effect of the signifier, in so far as its degree of certainty (second degree: signification of signification) takes on a weight proportional to the enigmatic void that the first presents itself in the place of signification itself. (Lacan 2006b p. 451)

The mere effect of signification that anticipates signification becomes in later Lacanian theory an extra signifier that is localised via a sign. (Lacan 1998 p. 142) (Miller 2009 pp. 10, 14)

Freud’s yellow flowers and black bread could have been such a sign for Freud which resonated with his gaze. Another example of an isolated unpresented element related to colour is the colour on the scales of a fish witnessed by the architect of the Guggenheim, Frank Ghery. When he was a child he saw the colour on the fish as he watched it in a bathtub. He defined the image as having a very personal significance for him. Laurent cites this example and aligns it with an object a. He calls it a symptom. (Laurent 2008 p. 7) However, he does not go far enough in his definition of the symptom when he states the following.

The symptom of Lacan’s second teaching is an S1 all by itself, which is not related to S2. ... What it produces is an impact, [which] gives us an

---

97 Feltham calls it an impossible point of Real ignorance, related to a pure disjunction. (Feltham 2008 pp. 103, 99) Badiou states an initial operation of intervention is to make a name out of it, that it is an unpresented element of the site. (Badiou 2005 p. 204)
idea of the symptom that is not articulated to S2. (Laurent 2008 p. 9)

The isolated element is not related to S2 because it is not presented. The later Lacan places the symptom with the isolated element of the elementary phenomena. (Lacan 2008 pp. 2, 11) Laurent defines the coloured fish scales as Ghery’s object a and claims his object a or “singular signification” is locatable within his art. Laurent calls such an occurrence of the object a within art an object-spot. He asserts it is made available for collective use, and it provokes a collective gaze. It may provoke our gaze as a deceptive Symbolic object a however, it is not the symptom. The isolated element relates to the sign, which indexes it, that is, a symbol to the symptom. The sign with singular significance is a symbol of what is inexistent or unpresented. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 5) It has the common sonority of a singular true doxa within a collective gaze.

Early Lacan analyses two instances with a sign, which occur when the gaze is extracted from the perceptual field. He associates such an extraction with the affect anxiety. It is an affect that does not deceive because it connects with an object a. When the gaze related to the affect is cut, the object falls from the sentient tie and its fall is inscribed as a sign which indexes the fall, or extraction of the gaze. (Lacan 1990 p. 82, 84-5) The sign becomes a founding image. Richard Klein explores this notion of a founding image with sensory perception that resonates with the gaze. “There can be representation in perception and representation in the conscious.” He cites Lacan’s description of what happens when one wakes from a dream to the sound of knocking. Firstly, the perception of the audible representation is woven into a dream about knocking. Secondly, “the representation occurs in relation to consciousness when [the person wakes] and recovers possession of the representation.” (Klein 2007 p. 182) Lacan describes the representation in the second moment, as a form of property, as “libidinal investment.” Klein describes it as a “belong to me aspect of representations,” which equates with a personal signification. “As soon as I perceive, my representations belong to me.” (Lacan 1979 p. 81) The first of the two instances with a sign occurs for example when a child notices “the breast belongs to the mother,” not itself. It previously thought it

---

98 It is however, in the unconscious. (Lacan 1998 p. 129)
99 I discuss this affect in Chapter Eight.
belonged to itself because the child considered “the image to be a presentation and not a representation.” (Hoens, Pluth 2002 p. 4) (Lacan 1990 p. 85) The Other snatched the gaze from her.

Suddenly through some accident .. that image of [herself] within the Other appears to be [her] as shorn of [her] recourse. Here the entire chain in which [she] is held captive by the scopophilic drive comes undone. (Lacan 1990 p. 86)

The gaze is split from the eye but the symptom remains a non-sensical kernel in the Symbolic unconscious. (Lacan 1977 p. 59) Since 1956-1957 Lacan theorised a point where there is an “objectification of signifiers.” It is a structuring relation in the Symbolic sensorial history of a viewer. He described the unpresented point as “the form of a pure sign.” (Lacan 1994a p. 119) (Hoens, Pluth 2002 p. 5) It is not integrated into the Symbolic with other signs. The unary trait marks it as the error in the tie.

The later Lacan also theorises a second instance of a sign. The sign is of something for someone and someone sustains the something that is the sign. An early Lacan states three signifiers is what the sign is about. The return of the third to the first turns the first into a sign and someone becomes accessible to the sign. “The neurotic wants to retransform the signifier into what it is the sign of.” (Lacan 2002b pp. IV, 11, IX, 11) The point is “to sustain that something someone needed at the point of the cut [and] that someone does not exist.” (Rupolo 1987 pp. 60, 61, 62) In later Lacanian theory on suppléance, the first suture or cutting of the gaze suddenly presents something which was previously unpresented as a concept in her sense of sight, that is, with the eye in the perceptual field. It is localised via the inscription of a sign. In other words, localization occurs via a nominated sign with an individual and it acknowledges an isolated element. The viewer’s signified synthesis in the master discourse of the tie shifts suddenly. 101 The element resonates with the extraction of the gaze from the perceptual field and with

100 Sessions 6th December 1961, 24th January and 14th March 1962.
101 In later chapters I discuss how this first suture can only be a weak modification if it doesn’t simultaneously occur with Lacan’s second suture.

What I have been discussing commences with the Symbolic object $a$. Above the bar in the discourse of the site, it is “a site of a decoy.” (Lacan 1990 p. 87) It is a semblant with representation. (Klein 2007 p. 181) It’s a deceptive trap embedded in painting for the singular true doxa in the collective’s gaze. The Real object $a$ or unpresented element is glimpsed within the deception of the image. In 1962 Lacan asserted it is the founding image of desire.

[The moment is] a presence … inscribed … in the light of something new. … It is the loss of something essential in the image [that] people do not know how to go beyond for want precisely of knowing how to formalise it. (Lacan 2002b pp. xiii, 9) 102

The moment reveals the presence a founding image, inscribed within the signified synthesis of the master’s discourse in the sentient tie. It occurred because the Other did not respond to a demand, or the response did not suffice. The individual was “not enveloped in the All” and was thus, represented “by the existence of a hole.” (Lacan 2002b pp. xiii, 12) 103 Two years later, Lacan discussed the moment again. He placed it with a viewer of painting and defines it as a suture, which determines a subject. (Lacan 1979 p. 118) The nomination with the sign which resonates with the extraction of the gaze and true doxa supposition emerges from the evental site. The second instance of the sign becomes a nomination within the localisation process. It belongs to and substitutes for a previously unpresented element. The element “does not consist” but the resonance with the gaze becomes a consonance which consonates to the name and consists like a consonant. (Lacan 1994 p. 4) 104 The extra signifier “is the only adequate support of what is confined by the empty set, [and] held to be real.” (Lacan 1994 p. 4)

102 Session 14 March 1962.
103 Session 14 March 1962.
104 Session 18th November 1975.
Previously the Imaginary was homogenous with the element which fell back into the Imaginary as unpresented. This occurred when the void and the unpresented element were counted as a couple. (Lacan 1994 p. 5) It made the unpresented element a signified without meaning, a mere sign of the non-arbitrary choice between two signifiers. (Lacan 1994 p. 5) When the element is glimpsed as an unpresentable access in the two signifiers in painting it is behind the decoy in the site, that is, within the combination of the gaze and the Imaginary phallus of the image. Lacan declares “S2 is where the artistry is, in that through the joining of the two signifiers it is able to produce the object a.” (Lacan 1994 p. 7) Furthermore, the sign of the unpresentable is a visible hole until an extra signifier connects with consistency in an arrested instant.

Harari asserts the extra signifier occurs with creative artifice and initially a viewer identifies with the visible hole. (Harari 2002 p. 350-3, 284, 22, 38, 41) He theorises the involvement of two identifications and defines the hole as a symptom which involves a hysterical identification with the hysteric’s question. The question, related to S2, seeks meaning from the unpresented in the symptom. However, the symptom is obscure in the signifying chain with appearing. (Lacan 1994 p. 3) In other words, the unconscious exists with a symptom unless it is unhinged by the extra signifier. It is then that an individual can, according to late Lacan, unsubscribe from or “dis-invest” in the unconscious. (Harari 2002 pp. 226, 246-7) The second identification occurs with evental change. She approaches the painting with the first identification. If evental change occurs she identifies with fidelity to the extra signifier. (Harari 2002 pp. 241, 263, 352)

This chapter concludes Part A, which presents background material for Parts B and C. For example, Chapter One explores the marginalization and secondariness of colour in painting, which provides background material for an analysis of the nil value relation.
between colour and a viewer in Part C. Also Chapters Two and Six analyse of how colour’s disparagement becomes a site for an event. Chapters Three, Four and Five on philosophical issues, relate to Badiou’s criticisms of Lacan and my critique of Badiou in Part B and C. Also Chapter Six links Lacan’s criticisms of philosophy with the singular symptom and colour with the site.
Part B

Badiou, Lacan and the Viewer of Painting

Part B introduces Badiou’s theory in more detail and presents his criticisms of Lacan. Although the chapters barely mention colour in painting they principally addresses my argument that, following Lacan, a viewer is part of the artistic subject. Thus the chapters critique Badiou’s claim the artistic subject is only with the art work and his claim that there is no subject in Lacan’s theories. Part B also addresses whether Badiou’s philosophy prohibits compossibility with Lacan.

B.1 Badiou’s Criticisms

Chapter Seven begins with theoretical differences between Lacan’s suppléance and Badiou’s event and examines Badiou’s and Bosteels’ criticisms of Lacan. I show both Lacan and Badiou present theories on the extra signifier and I argue there is a subject in Lacan’s theories. Chapter Eight examines how Badiou’s theories relate to affect and the subjective form, Lacan’s theory on the transhuman, and jouissance with the subject-body. Chapters Nine expands upon Lacan’s theories on the evental site and the subjective process.

B.2 A Viewer

Chapter Eight begins an exploration of why it is necessary to have a focus on the viewer and the symptom with the site and the subject-body. The viewer is placed with the site’s specificity.
Chapter Seven

Badiou, Lacan and the Subject

7.1 Lacan and Badiou’s Theories

I refer to Lacan and Badiou because they are more advanced in areas relevant to my argument than any other theorists to my knowledge. My focus is principally upon the correspondence between their theories, although it is necessary I address the relevant differences between them and hence address Badiou’s criticisms of Lacan’s theory. In later chapters, I criticise Badiou’s emancipatory philosophy and his lack of focus on the singular symptom. Nevertheless, I use both their theories to argue an event emerges from its site with painting as colour and that the site encompasses within its world a singular viewer who is a member of a collective of viewers. Both advocate an individual is an element of a generic group. Badiou’s theories look beyond the individual to a generic public and Lacan analyses the individual beyond the structures of neurosis, psychosis and perversion and theorises the individual as the singular within a universal. The development beyond structure, the individual and the psychoanalytic setting in Lacan’s thought is often ignored and unappreciated by many Lacanian analysts and Badiouians alike. Particularity, as opposed to singularity, is abolished in both their theories. (Badiou 2005a p. 154)

Both Lacan and Badiou use the word “supplement” for event’s extra signifier, that is, the signifier of the event. The “event” is Badiou’s term and although I use his term, I show Lacan was developing his own theory on the event, well before Badiou, in his 1960s and 1970s seminars. \(^\text{110}\) For example, although he refined the theory in the mid and late 1970s, he referred in 1964 to a sudden instant associated with a viewer of painting. He declared there can be an instant of subjectification with a viewer of a painting. (Lacan 1979 p. 118) \(^\text{111}\) His theory of this instant of subjectification developed

---

\(^\text{110}\) Also he began to analyse elementary phenomena in the 1930s. (Grigg 2008 p. 11)

\(^\text{111}\) Also see note 29. (Lacan 2006b p. 48)
into what I call his first evental suture. He explicitly refers to the extra signifier, suppléance, subjectivization, the subjective process and his evental nominations in the early to late 1970s. He uses the word ‘suppléance’ for a substitutive process which occurs with the extra signifier. ‘Suppléance’ relates to subjectivation but it is also used for a subjective process which results from subjectivation. In *Seminar on “The Purloined Letter,”* in 1966, Lacan states, “subjectivization progressed hand-in-hand with a reference to the analysis situs in which I claim to materialize the subjective process.” (Lacan 2006b p. 48) In the mid to late 1970s Badiou was very critical of Lacan’s signifier of the event and subjective process in a series of seminars, since compiled as *Theory of the Subject.* Twelve years after Lacan, in a 1978 seminar of *Theory of the Subject,* he cites Lacan’s 1966 concepts of “subjectivation” and “subjective process.” He obviously took the terminology “subjectivization” and “subjective process” from Lacan. (Badiou 2009b p. 244) At this stage Badiou hadn’t developed his formulation of the event. Nevertheless, he termed Lacan’s chance event of fortune as different his “forced subjective rationality,” that is, his “forced event” can be aligned in *Theory of the Subject* with what Cohen terms ‘force.’ (Badiou 2009b pp. 60, 170, 202) However, as I discuss below, apart from references to Cohen’s forcing in his 1970s seminars, Badiou has no clear definition of an extra signifier of the event, only theories of a topologicalization of the algebraic (matrices of destruction, conflictual and heterogeneous consistency).

Copjec asserts Freud alludes to something being added, which produces an altering effect. It is “a supplemental element, called an ‘incentive bonus’ or ‘fore-pleasure.’” (Copjec 2005 p. 124) She defines suppléance as the forging of a new signifier which substitutes itself for an absence. (Copjec 2005 p. 123) Lacan states that the substitutive new signifier is only based upon the essence of a signifier, an element It occurs because there is “a requirement of the One,” which we humans desire to be. In fact, it is the sole One that interests us. (Lacan 1998 pp. 10, 5, 6-7) The divided subject believes herself to

112 “Suppléance” is a term from eighteenth century rhetoric. It was synonymous with catachresis, which is an abuse of a trope or metaphor, the wrong use of one word for another. (Parker 1990 pp. 72-106) Lacan also uses the word ‘sinthome’ for the extra signifier. (Lacan 1994 p. 1) Session 18\textsuperscript{th} November 1975. It is an ancient spelling for “symptom.”
be this One, which is why she is divided. (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 4) As I discussed previously, in the early 1970s Lacan theorises how undecidability in the site calls upon a sign of this unpresented element to constitute an extra signifier. This relates to the true doxa which resonates with the gaze. Qua formal medium, the sign of the element is at least what passes for such. (Lacan 1998 p. 142) An extra signifier legitimately substitutes negation for a proven apprehension of the non-existence. (Lacan 1998 p. 142-3) “The symbolic impasse that confounds every attempt to construct a sexual ratio, can be supplemented, or ‘made up for’ by this … supernumerary One” (Copjec 2005 p. 123) Copjec states it doesn’t replace anything; it stands in as a name for the absence. Lacan theorises it as an addition, added as a fourth knot. (Harari 2002 p. 339)

In the 1980s, Badiou theorises an event as the supplementation or exceeding-of-being. (Badiou 2009d p. 2) He uses the word “supplementation” for the extra signifier and acknowledges Lacan theorises this name as an instance of the letter, an instance borne out by the mark of the void. (Badiou 2006a p. 41)

Lacan’s genius lay in seeing that ... the answer is already contained in the question. If a truth cannot originate from its being given, it must be because it has its origin in a disappearance. I call event this originary disappearance supplementing the situation for the duration of a lightning flash. (Badiou 2004 p. 124)

The aleatory supplement is a trace of the event that founds it. (Badiou 2004 p. 154) In Being and Event, following Cohen, Badiou calls the supplement a generic multiple because it possesses properties more or less “common” to all the multiples of a situation.

113 “Supplement” is Derrida’s term. He in turn took it from Rousseau, who described masturbation in his Confessions as a dangerous supplement. (Derrida 1981 p. 110) Rousseau saw writing and masturbation as synonymous because both supplement natural intercourse. (Derrida 1974 p. 142) Derrida points to “desire to presence” with both, for example, masturbation substitutes for the absence of a sexual partner. There are two meanings for “supplement” in French: addition and substitution. (Derrida 1981 p. xiii) Derrida understands a supplement is a substitutive signification for something not exactly present. It gives integrity to a signified. (Derrida 1974 pp. 158-9, 167)
[It is] a supplementary letter. This extra signifier – to which, in the beginning, nothing which is presented in the fundamental situation corresponds – is the ontological transcription of the supernumerary nomination of the event. However, ontology does not recognize any event, because it forecloses self belonging. What stands in for an event-without-event is the supernumerary letter itself, and it is thus quite coherent that it designates nothing. (Badiou 2005 p. 356)

He describes the process as “the supplementation of being, that is the event (in non-ontological situations) comes after the signifying supplementation, which in non-ontological situations, arises [with] the evental site.” (Badiou 2005 p. 357) The Real change of an event in *Logics of Worlds* involves existence ascribed to the site made maximal which becomes the existence of what was the proper inexistent of the site. (Badiou 2009a p. 585)

The extra signifier sutures being to being-there. Previously I discussed Lacan’s two instances with a sign which connect to a singular viewer’s concept of sight with colour. The second instance of the sign involves colour as an event. The cutting of the gaze suddenly presents what was previously unpresented within the perceptual field. An extra signifier with the second instance is localised as a trace with a viewer. It is the second instance of the sign because it inscribes the element discursively and as a sign it is specific to her singular symptom. The trace with the sign nominates and consonates with the element in localisation as an evental nomination in the discursive tie. (Lacan 1994 p. 4) 114 Localization occurs because a signalled signification acknowledges an isolated pure multiple in the perceptual field and the nomination stands in for it. The viewer’s signified synthesis in the master discourse shifts suddenly with the cut. If Lacan’s second suture is simultaneous with the first cut the extra signifier occurs alongside the element. “It is in relation to the para-being that we must articulate what makes up for (supplée au) the sexual relation qua nonexistent.” (Lacan 1998 p. 45)

114 Session 9th March 1976.
Despite decades of Lacan’s theory about subjectivization with an extra signifier and the occurrence of evental change, a subjective process with a subject, Badiou and Badiouians deny there is a subject in Lacan’s theories. Badiou states as such in many places. (Badiou 2005 p. 431-5) (Badiou 2009a p. 477-82) As I discuss below, this denial began in Badiou’s mid to late 1970 seminars, compiled in *Theory of the Subject* where he criticises Lacan for being tied to structural lack as cause. (Badiou 2009a p. 477-81) Badiouians such as Bruno Bosteels and Justin Clemens follow Badiou’s criticisms. I discuss Bosteels’ criticisms below. Clemens thinks there is no subject in Lacan, only a divided subject, who is “not just a slave to love” but “essentially a slave as a consequence of the encounter between bodies and languages.” (Clemens 2013 p. 62) He posits that love, which addresses itself to knowledge, is “buried” in Lacan’s psychoanalytic clinic hence knowledge doesn’t become truth. Moreover, he surmises as the clinic is bound to Lacan’s ethics, “Never give up on your desire,” and desire doesn’t want to know anything, the analysand ends up with no knowledge of truth. The outcome of Lacan’s clinic then for Clemens is subjective destitution. (Clemens 2013 pp. 62, 60-4)

Lacan’s use of the term “subject” is misleading in relation to Badiou’s subject. Lacan’s general use of the term must not be confused with his subject of suppléance. He uses the term “subject” for a speaking being, a divided subject, subjected to and divided by the signifying chain. In Seminar XXIII, he refers to the subject of suppléance as not divided and chooses to use the term “individual.” Harari states with suppléance there is “no trace of the symptom and so nobody feels torn apart.”

The ‘individual’ designates that which is undivided. .. Lacan is in the process of outlining a psychical formation that is precisely distinct from the unconscious and its formations, the *parlêtre*, the S1. .. It is no longer a question of a subject that is torn, divided, broken, or barred. (Harari 2002 p. 228-9)

---

115 I avoid the term “speaking being” because it appears to place emphasis on language rather than discourse and it confuses the issue of being with being-there.
‘Speaking being’ relates to Lacan’s condensed term *parlêtre* (‘speech’ *parler* with ‘being’). As Harari declares, a subject of suppléance is “an individual ... is *par la letter*: the letter constitutes him or her.” (Harari 2002 p. 228) An individual is constituted by the letter, which is extra to being. Lacan’s subject of the event incarnates the extra signifier in a subjective process. “What we must get used to is substituting the “para-being” (*par-être*) – the being “*para,*” being beside – for the being that would take flight.” (Lacan 1998 pp. 44, 45, 44) He refers to the individual as LOM, a pun on l’homme, “man.” Harari cites Lacan’s 1975 lectures at Yale University. The individual constituted by the letter, is a “paradigmatic instance of l’homme.” (Harari 2002 p. 229) (Lacan 1976 pp. 28, 31, 33) The individual has been at “the extreme point of incarnating” the extra signifier and is reduced to the very structure of lom (man). (Harari 2002 p. 229) The signifier, extra to the unpresented element, is beyond the noumenon, the thing in-itself.

### 7.2 Criticisms of Lacan’s Theory of the Event

Here I begin an analysis of Badiou’s mid to late 1970s seminars because they are where Badiou chiefly began his criticisms of Lacan and where he outlines the root of his reasoning that there is no subject in Lacan’s theories, the root being Lacan’s evental R.S.I. nomination. I have selected to analyse these *Theory of the Subject* seminars because I propose they are Badiou’s response at the time to Lacan’s refinement of his theories on evental nomination. My proposition isn’t hypothetical given that Badiou’s seminars occurred when Lacan was presenting his last seminars on suppléance and evental nomination. In these *Theory of the Subject* seminars, Badiou specifically examines Lacan’s 1975-1976 Seminar XXIII, knotting, the Borromean Knot and also Lacan’s extra signifier. (Lacan 1994 p. 2) **116** Badiou is obviously keeping a close eye on Lacan. In fact, he even knows exactly what Lacan stated in response to a question at a conference in Yale University in 1975. (Badiou 2009b p. 138) Later in *Theory of the Subject* he refers to Lacan’s extra signifier and quotes Lacan’s 1974-1975 Seminar XXII.

**---**

**116** Session 13th January 1976.
In his article *Alain Badiou’s Theory of the Subject: The Recommencement of Dialectical Materialism*, Bosteels refers chiefly to Badiou’s *Theory of the Subject*. He criticises Lacan’s theory as tied to a structural lack as cause. He explains Badiou criticises Lacan for an impasse which amounts to there being no subject for Lacan.  

For Badiou, the problem with [Lacan’s] doctrine is precisely while it never ceases to be dialectical in pinpointing the absent cause and its divisive effects on the whole, it nevertheless remains tied to the structure of this totality itself. (Bosteels 2006 p. 139)

Bosteels doesn’t examine Lacan’s later theories. He only cites Lacan’s first seminar of 1953-1954 and refers chiefly to Badiou’s *Theory of the Subject*. Following Badiou’s criticism of Lacan, he estimates there is no allowance in Lacan’s theory for a new truth because it remains without consistency. Bosteels states “for Badiou, most of Lacan’s work stays within the bounds of a structural dialectic” and although Bosteels grants the absent or de-centred cause may have shifted in Lacan’s later work he still sees it bound to structural causality. He insists Badiou’s theory goes beyond Lacan to what “consists in the coherence of a forced lack.” He dismisses Lacan’s topological investigations as obscure and bound to the structural dialectic. (Bosteels 2006 pp. 153, 128, 141)

Žižek analyses Badiou’s event in *The Politics of Truth* and Bosteels in *Alain Badiou’s Theory of the Subject: The Recommencement ...*, describes Žižek’s stance merely as a focus upon “the empty place of the real.” He insinuates that the lack as cause with Žižek, as well as with Lacan, is “somehow already the act of truth itself.” (Bosteels 2006 pp. 154, 153) Žižek incorrectly interprets Badiou’s post evental truth, and it doesn’t help matters that he describes the event as a ‘Truth-Event.’ (Žižek 1999 p. 130) He places the subject’s truth in the symptom. (Žižek 1999 p. 131) Many Lacanians also labour under this misconception. (Allouch 2007 p. 3-25) A lapsus, such as dreams and compulsive acts, is where the error fails. It indexes disjunction within the site. It is

---

117 The only subject they see in Lacan’s theory is his divided subject which is a signifier that represents a subject for another signifier. (Lacan 1979 pp. 207, 236)

118 Bosteels is the translator of *Theory of the Subject*. 
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where the knot slips “due to the consistence of the unconscious.” As I discuss below, Lacan’s extra signifier “is produced at the very place where an error occurs” in the site. (Lacan 1994 p. 3) 119 What Žižek is interpreting as truth is a Real blockage in the Symbolic or a false hole.

Bosteels perceives Badiou estimates Lacan’s subject is only a subject of lack.

The debate with psychoanalysis indeed depends on the location of the void: whether on the side of the subject as lack (for Lacan) or on the side of being as empty set (for Badiou). (Bosteels 2006 p. 154)

Bosteels proposes Lacan’s subject is only a lacking divided subject who is merely about “symptomatic slippage which exposes the fact that the symbolic order itself is incomplete.” (Bosteels 2006 p. 154) He misses the fact that Lacan’s divided subject’s identification with being as empty set is pivotal to the emergence of the event from the discourse of the site. Indeed, the best result for Lacan’s divided subject is a pinpointing of incompleteness to reveal a site of undecidability. Lacan’s subject of suppléance however, occurs because an element re-presents as a new signifier. (Lacan 1994 p. 2) 120 This re-presentation involves the self referentiality of the unpresented element in a site. A voided human animal lacks because of the impasse of being but the supernumerary extra signifier “passes for such” lack.

According to Bosteels, the requirements for a theory of the event are two Reals.

[They are] the real of evanescence which is in a position of cause for the algebra of the subject, and the real of the nodal point, which is in a position of consistency for its topology. (Bosteels 2006 p. 140)

He asserts an uncanny element of the Real was foreclosed in earlier Lacanian theory and there is still a problem with the object in the Symbolic if such an order in the Real is to gain coherence. (Bosteels 2006 p. 138) He sees Lacan’s Real object as confused

119 Session 17th February 1976.
120 Session 9th March 1976.
with the Symbolic object and that both objects are rooted to structural cause. He doesn’t appear aware that both objects are pivotal within Lacan’s suppléance. Furthermore, as I discuss below, there are two Reals in Lacan’s theory. A Real nodal point, different to a Real object as cause, is what supplies consistency for Lacan’s new truth.

Bosteels doesn’t refer to Lacan’s 1970s seminars but, as I stated above, Badiou does in Theory of the Subject. Badiou sees a primacy of knots over the chain, of consistency over causality in Lacan’s 1970s seminars, and he states Lacan rises up to the problem of materialism, that its division according to algebra and topology has to be tied. However, he then assumes because he misrecognises Lacan’s extra signifier, “the element of the cord, the consistent cord,” that Lacan’s Borromean knot only involves a chain. (Badiou 2009b pp. 136, 228, 131, 191) (Lacan 1994 p. 2) He thus assumes Lacan doesn’t make the dialectic of the two Reals explicit, that this amounts to a weak consistency and an algebraicization of the topological (Borromean chains, consistency of interdependence). Badiou’s approach (without any clear definition of an extra signifier apart from Cohen’s forcing) is a topologicalization of the algebraic (matrices of destruction, conflictual and heterogeneous consistency). He doesn’t acknowledge the consistency with Lacan’s extra signifier, a knot that re-ties the knot, and estimates that Lacan gives primacy to cause (algebra over topology). Although he states there are “two Lacans,” one of the lack of being and the other the being of lack (the latter bringing out a “more-than-real in its domain), he ends up denying the latter in Lacan. (Badiou 2009b pp. 232-3, 133,141)

Lacan’s Not All with the evental site opens a place for decision. (Lacan 1972 p. 9) The undecidability asks: ‘Does the extra signifier of the event belong to a situation.’ In 1972 with the Schema of Correspondence Without Certainty, Lacan states, what incompletes the whole is a presentation of undecidability. (Lacan 2002j VII, p. 27) An event initially depends upon the gap in the site to incomplete wholeness and pinpoint

121 Session 13th January 1976.
122 Session 1st June 1972.
the site. 123 “What necessitates existence [starts] from ... the gap of the undecidable, in other words, between the Not All and the not-one.” Throughout the 1970s Lacan develops his theory of Not All which involves a set with the hole of an unnamed element. (Lacan 1994 p. 4) 124 He shows how the discourse of the site is dismantled with a subjective process because the Real in the hole of the Symbolic related to the symptom, is no longer stuck in the ongoing circularity of the site. (Lacan 2008 p. 41-2) Although Bosteels asserts the Real is part of the site for a newly consistent truth he doesn’t refer to undecidability with the site. However he connects it with Badiou’s theories. “The decisive question is rather whether the real cannot also, on rare occasions become the site for a newly consistent truth.” (Bosteels 2006 pp. 140, 134, 142) He doesn’t appear to know of or understand how Lacan’s theory of undecidability relates to the site, nor did Badiou when he criticised Lacan’s Not All theory associated with woman. (Badiou 2008 p. 211-227) 125 Feltham asserts Lacan’s theory of the feminine side “inscribes a thought of incompleteness using a framework derived from set theory.” (Feltham 2008 p. 68) The Not All position is with “a set, not a whole, where the condition of the hole is respected.” Badiou misrecognised Lacan’s Not All de-totalizes The woman but it does not rupture totality thus it is just a variation of the law of castration. (Harari 2002 pp. 30, 213, 215) Only an evental change ruptures totality. Feltham explains Badiou’s criticisms of Lacan’s Not All come from a time when Badiou had not developed his theories of incompleteness, that is, at the time of The Subject and Infinity. (Badiou 2008)

Badiou’s thought of incompleteness remains undeveloped at this stage of his argument, but it is deepened further as his investigations of set theory unfolds. (Feltham 2008 p. 69)

In Theory of the Subject, he places Not All with truth half said, the hysteric (which is different to The woman) and those who are revolutionary. However, later in Theory of

123 However, as I discuss in Chapter Nine, in Seminar XXIV Lacan pushes his theory of the evental site further.
124 Session 9th March 1976.
125 Many years later in Being and Event, Badiou theorises undecidability with the event. He explains the evental signifier evokes the void and interposes itself between the void and itself. (Badiou 2005 p. 182)
the Subject he places woman with what inexists in the whole. (Badiou 2009b pp. 173, 262)

As I discussed above, Bosteels states two Reals are required for a theory of an event. (Bosteels 2006 p. 140) Lacan explored two holes which involve the Real. As I stated above, Lacan’s 1970s seminars presented a refinement on his theories of evenal nomination. In that sense Lacan’s seminars were the context for Badiou’s mid to late seminars and his criticisms of Lacan’s preferred R.S.I. (Real, Symbolic, Imaginary) nomination. Lacan’s preferred nomination is with the Real, Realized in the hole of the Symbolic. It occurs at the Real point in the site. The new signifier makes a false hole into a true hole in a present instant. It provides consistence, what was excluded is accounted for logically. (Lacan 1994 pp. 3, 2) 126 Lacan defines the Real point as an ‘infinite line.’ It is the extra signifier in Lacan’s process of localization which becomes truth with consistence. 127 It also substitutes for the second hole with the Real, the hole of the unnamed element, which is the Symbolic hole in the Real. He describes the false hole (Real hole in the Symbolic) in artifice as a split between the duplicity of the symbol and the symptom, that is, the symbol in a situation and the symptom. (Lacan 1976 p. 16) 128 The split between them links with the question evoked in the gap of undecidability. Truth with consistence arises from Lacan’s preferred evenal nomination. In 1975, Lacan explains the truth that results from supplementation is specific to the true hole in the Symbolic, which was previously a Real deprivation with a divided subject within the logic of the local being-there. “One must choose the way by which truth is to be grasped ... that is to say, having recognised the nature of [suppléance], not depriving oneself of the logical use of it.” Evental change with the true hole is accounted for: “The true hole [is] something representable.” (Lacan 1994 pp. 3, 2) 129 It is a body of truth. Despite these statements, Bosteels and Badiou declare Lacan’s theory is tied to structural lack as cause. (Badiou 2009b p.131) (Bosteels 2006 p.146) However, Lacan’s theory about the true hole obviously influenced Badiou, for

126 Sessions 18th November 1975, 9th March 1976.
127 I discuss Lacan’s and Badiou’s theories on localization in the last chapter.
128 Session 18th November 1975.
129 Sessions 18th November 1975, 9th March and 10th February 1976.
example, the following quote refers, in similar language to Lacan’s, to the piercing of the false hole to make a true hole with consistency. (Lacan 1994 p. 3) Badiou stated in 1998, “Art ... produces truths. ... [It] arranges forms of knowledge in such a way that some truth may come to pierce a hole in them.” (Badiou 2005a p. 9)

In 1976 and 1977, Lacan identifies the Real with matter and material. (Lacan 2008 p. 22) At the level of “enjoying substance,” there is a terminus which brings jouissance to a halt. (Lacan 1998 p. 24) “The difference between the same and the other is that the same is materially the same.” In fact, everything that isn’t founded on matter is a scam. It presents as consistency, “which holds together like a cunt,” that is, it consists as “a hole rather than a whole.” (Lacan 2008 p. 10) The Real nodal point with localization from being to being-there involves an extra signifier distinct from the false hole of logical consistency. “We have to put the real, without our being able to know where it stops, in continuity with the imaginary – and so it begins in the middle of the symbolic.” (Lacan 2008 pp. 35, 30) Lacan is presenting theory about the emergence of truth as consistence and the coherency of the Real residing with a substitutive extra signifier and he was presenting this theory during the first half of Badiou’s 1970s seminars. (Lacan 1998 p. 142) In 1977, Lacan referred to the extra signifier localized with nomination.

Under the name of the sign, ... a sign of negation, [it] ... presupposes ... something that is stated as positive that we can write [as] negation – and this is what I really posited in The Instance of the Letter – as congruence, ≅, of the sign and the real. (Lacan 2008 p. 58-9)

Suppléance negates logical negation as the Real in consistency. In an instant, the event makes exist the proper inexistent in the site. Lacan describes an artistic event with psychoanalytic artifice: “Psychoanalysis is what creates the true ... out of semblance.” “It is a flash of meaning. It’s a sens-blant.” (Lacan 2008 p. 62)

In Theory of the Subject, Badiou criticises Lacan for his theory on two Reals. Although he admits Lacan was theorizing subjectivization and the subjective process up to the

130 Session 10th February 1976.
mid 1960s and especially after 1968, and quotes Lacan as such, he nevertheless infers there is no subjectivization with Lacan. He cites a session, 11th February 1975, in Lacan’s seminar on nominations to back his criticism that Lacan’s theory of the emergence of truth is only consistency re-ascribed to the Imaginary. (Badiou 2009b pp. 233, 244, 233, 245) In other words, he doesn’t agree Lacan theorizes a new Real separate to the Real as cause. However, in the session Badiou cites, according to Lacan, this Real can hold the knot together and the Imaginary is taken in its proper consistency. Yet, “it is not the Real that is Real. The Real is something common to them [Symbolic and the Imaginary] in their consistency.” The new Real makes a mental knot, which is a meaning effect that is not Imaginary. It isn’t Symbolic either, it is Real. (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 77, 74) 131 It is not Real as cause or the Real ring. It’s supplementary, substitutive and extra. It is equivalent, that is, it corresponds, it realizes as it supplements the Symbolic’s emergence with consistence in the Imaginary. As I discuss in Chapter Twelve, this correspondence connects to the Imaginary precisely at a designatable point. The following year, Lacan states, “If the error is put right at the place where it occurred, [then anti-symmetry occurs and] the two sexes are no longer equivalent.” (Lacan 1994 p. 3) 132 The Real extra signifier substitutes for the error and thus makes a new Imaginary. (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 77, 83, 74, 77)

If we can bring it about that the Imaginary ek-ists, it is because another Real is at stake. I am saying that the meaning effect ek-ists, and that in this it is Real. (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 78-9) 133

A Real meaning effect of truth’s consistence “lasts and holds together.” It is an R.S.I. nomination where a new Real, realized in the Symbolic, emerges in the Imaginary. “It involves a construction whose consistence must not be imaginary.” The new Real is a new “supplementary torus” and Lacan states its consistence is a mathematical topology. It is a consistent cord that ties. (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 83, 79, 80) 134 Lacan seems to be

131 Session 11th February 1975.
133 Session 11th February 1975.
134 Session 11th February 1975.
speaking to the Marxist Badiou when he says “it is hard to see how a knot [this different Real] would constitute a progress, from the simple fact that it is a minimum. It surely constitutes a progress in the Imaginary, namely, a progress in consistency.” Furthermore, it’s in contrast to Plato’s dialogues. Lacan is plainly referring to philosophy which straddles two discourse when he states “I can only dialogue with someone that I have fabricated to understand me at the level at which I speak.” (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 84, 79) 135

Badiou disagrees with Lacan’s preferred evental nomination and uses his mid to late 1970s seminars in The Theory of the Subject to counter the R.S.I. nomination. He posits his Real of subjectivization and a subjective process “without the mediation of the Imaginary.” His Real with algebra and topology incorporates interruptions and re-composition. (Badiou 2009b pp. 257, 246, 259) He defines Lacan’s extra signifier.

The Real is thus this vanished element represented in One that it causes to exist. It is the object-cause, the One-of-the-knot, wherein any one whatsoever of the three loops marks its lack. (Badiou 2009b p. 245)

He sees Lacan’s signifier’s consistency as being guaranteed in the Imaginary rather than the Real “except that the Real causes the Imaginary consistency to ex-ist,” that is, between the object-cause and ex-istence. He estimates Lacan “lets consistency drop into the Imaginary,” and thus remains with structure as cause, algebra of the same. (Badiou 2009b pp. 245, 246) Thus Lacan’s consistency from the Real is a key factor.

Subjectivization raises the question of cause, to which Lacan responds with the real as object; subjective process, that of its consistency, to which Lacan henceforth still responds with the real, but in what guise.

This is where he leaves us behind. (Badiou 2009b p. 244)

However, and this is important for Lacan’s R.S.I. nomination, Lacan’s extra signifier isn’t the object-cause wherein any one of the three loops marks its lack. It is not object

135 Session 11th February 1975.
a in the centre of the knot, object-cause, although it supports it as what Lacan terms as os-bject a, which is distinct from object as cause. (Lacan 1994 p. 57) It emerges as a new Real, a point in a circle, from the centre of the hole that is the Real ring, which is a false hole in the Symbolic. “Topology shows us there is a hole in the middle of a circle.” (Lacan 1994 p. 57) Lacan’s R.S.I. nomination involves a new Real which pierces the Real ring and makes it into a representable true hole, a truth with consistency. (Lacan 1994 p. 2)

In *The Theory of the Subject* seminars, Badiou accounts for algebra and topology as “mathematical domains” but, apart from a detailed summary of these domains and some references to Cohen’s theory of a generic set and “forcing,” he does not propose an extra signifier as Lacan does. Lacan presents the extra signifier, which represents a truth with consistency. As I stated above, Badiou hasn’t developed his theory of the event in the 1970s. Cohen’s ‘forcing’ is as close as he gets to it. “The subject-effect is the split articulation of a structural vacillation around an empty place and a forced excess over this place.” (Badiou 2009b pp. 210, 271, 277) He only sees Lacan’s new Real consistency for the subjective process as Imaginary; a circularity; a chain and succession of cause. And if the knot remains a chain, Lacan’s theory maintains an algebraic focus on structure and homogeneity. Although he states Lacan ventured into the topological with this one-of-the-knot he deduces after assuming its consistency is with the homogeneity of the chain that Lacan’s theory of a new Real is only an algebraicization of the topological. (Badiou 2009b pp. 245, 231-2) Despite his judgment, Lacan’s subjectivization process does balance algebra and the topological, for example, he theorizes the generic with the neighborhoods of the topological. 139 In Lacan they are associated with point by point decisions in the subjective process with fidelity. 140 As I discuss in Chapter Nine, Lacan places the points with fidelity to a new

136 Session 11th May 1976.
137 Session 11th May 1976.
138 Session 10th February 1976.
139 Badiou states the generic essentially resembles the topological, which “disidentifies the element in favor of neighborhoods.” (Badiou 2009b p. 272)
140 Badiou states the open set serves as neighbourhood for each of its points. (Badiou 2009b p. 2011)
generic value of Lacan’s extra signifier and thus its resemblance with the topological.
(Badiou 2009b pp. 231-2, 272, 274)

Despite the fact Badiou wants “consistency over causality,” he states the genius of the
communist can “hold up the principle of consistency,” “according to topology,”
because communists don’t miss “the signifier that vanishes as Real,” the revolutionary
cause with algebra. They can “seize the moment … not missing the signifier of that
which vanishes.” They can “braid the cord” and consist because they are both
revolutionary and communist at the same time, and “to consist in one’s cause is not
easy.” (Badiou 2009b pp. 236, 229) His second Real appears to be the seizing, or
holding for a moment, the Real as cause, held before it disappears, held so that
consistency can occur in cause. Lacan’s Real with the subjective process differs from
this precisely because it’s not consistency with the Real of the cause which vanishes. It
is a new Real consistency, which ex-ists as a new signifier, extra to being. However,
Badiou sees it as “The Real is thus this vanished element represented in the One that it
causes to exist.” He understands Lacan’s new Real is another Real, the element re-
presenting, but he calls it “object-cause” because he thinks the Real as cause caused it,
and this new Real finds “its consistency in the imaginary rather than the real,” its
“topological form” is “figured in the one-of-the-three, the imaginary.” This creates a
problem.

[Thus Lacan’s other] real causes the imaginary consistency to ex-ist,
whereby it touches upon the scission of the very being of consistency
into object-cause (object-knot), on one hand, and ex-istence, on the other.
(Badiou 2009b pp. 245)

Instead of seeing two separate Reals he sees a split between the object-cause and what
ex-ists. Thus he is not convinced Lacan’s truth emerges into consistency. The

---

141 Session 1 June 1972.
142 See footnote 19. (Lacan 1998 p. 44-5) (Badiou 2009b pp. 124, 349) As I discussed above the par la
letter: is the new Real, the letter, which constitutes him or her. (Harari 2002 p. 228)
problem has arisen because he doesn’t understand Lacan’s other Real arises from within the Real ring the Real hole in the Symbolic, not the object as cause. The new Real ties the three rings and supports object \( a \) but it is not object-cause. Although it has belonging with the object-cause as it was produced from a reflexive set, it is a re-presentification of the element and exists alongside it, that is, what makes up for (supplée au) is an appearing, par-être, “ap-be-aring beside” or “appbesiding.” (Lacan 1998 p. 45)

Lacan defines the site: “One can arrive at the hole because of the set.” (Lacan 1994 p. 2) 144 Although the unpresented multiple re-presents as an extra signifier or provides presentative support, what Badiou fails to recognize is the element for Lacan doesn’t cause this re-presentification. He hints that Lacan hasn’t theorized subjectivization but it’s precisely Lacan’s subjectivization that causes the extra signifier. Lacan’s nomination occurs suddenly with subjectivization (the act) whereas as Badiou’s nomination is retroactive. Badiou’s occurs later, subjectivization receives “its names” from the subjective process. (Badiou 2009a p. 258) One could say we name it afterwards when we have conscious certitude. However, in relation to Badiou’s analysis of Lacan’s 1945 apologue about three prisoners, which is also included in Theory of the Subject, as Pluth and Hoens state, “the act precedes certainty that should have led up to the act.” (Lacan 2006b p. 161-75) Reasoning is prior to the act but reasoning “creates a void of uncertainty out of which the act will come.” The act isn’t without reasoning but the act interrupts and “suspends its logic.” (Pluth & Hoens 2004 pp 185, 186, 185) Without directly referring to Lacan’s R.S.I. nomination, they point out the act is not just Real.

The real without a name is simply anxiety, and not an act. … The real is not without the symbolic, and the act is not without the line of reasoning. … While the act is not a product or result of the line of reasoning, it is not without a relation to it. (Pluth & Hoens 2004 p 187)

---

144 Session 9th March 1976. A later Badiou in Logics of Worlds describes the site as a reflexive set which presents itself to itself in transcendental appearing. (Badiou 2009a p. 366)
The act is an R.S.I. nomination with subjectivization which combines algebra and topology. Subjectivization interrupts algebra (reasoning) but reasoning’s logic resumes after the act with topological consistency. Pluth and Hoens describe the resumption as containing “the dimension of truth.” (Pluth, Hoens 2004 pp 186-7) Such consistency is algebraic and topological.

Apart from Badiou’s Real without a name, Pluth and Hoens describe another difference between Badiou and Lacan.

Badiou locates haste at the first halt; Lacan places it at the moment of conclusion itself. … Haste for Lacan is not about doubting one’s conclusion after it is made: haste is a constitutive feature of the conclusion itself. (Pluth, Hoens 2004 p 185)

Nomination occurs with subjectivization in the haste of the conclusion because something that belongs to someone is not about doubt. The something is a sign correlating with a singular symptom for someone. As I cited in Chapters Six, Klein describes it as a “belong to me” aspect of representation.” (Klein 2007 p. 182) (Lacan 1979 p. 81) (Lacan 1990 p. 86) The sign of the unpresentable is a visible hole until an extra signifier connects with consistency. (Lacan 2002b pp. xiii, 9) In Lacan’s apologue on the prisoners, he states that after a “certain time” the act occurs. (Lacan 2006b p. 162) As I stated above, the error is put right at the place where it occurred. In Chapter Twelve, I discuss how the extra signifier emerges specifically where the error occurs in the site. Pluth and Hoens allude to this: “The real emerges at a particular place and at a particular moment, one actually prepared by the line of reasoning.” (Pluth, Hoens 2004 p 187) Lacan’s nomination with subjectivization not only escapes Badiou in the 1970s, he also misses it in his reading of Lacan’s 1945 apologue. Lacan’s sudden nomination with subjectivization forces the event to decide, that is, his other Real, the extra signifier, to emerge. As such it is his subject which convokes the new Real, not

---

145 When the gaze is cut it is recognized or named with a symbol or sign.
146 Session 14th March 1962.
the Real as cause. 147 Badiou fails to notice Lacan’s extra signifier, which makes a new Imaginary, effectively destroys “the old law.”

Badiou’s main focus is on the topological because his emphasis is to counter the predominance of the algebraic, to highlight how the subjective process places the force, and to link it with the generic. Such a focus creates an emphasis appropriate to his collective political subject, that is, the tendency toward taking things “as a pack,” the combinatorial capacity toward varied sub-sets, neighborhoods and the local variations of belonging. (Badiou 2009b pp. 264, 272) However, on the other hand, the algebraic explores materialism under the aegis of the individuals who belong to it and how they relate to one another. (Badiou 2009b p. 215) A focus on the topological with the heterogeneous collective rather than a balance with the algebraic and individuals appertains to his criticism of Lacan’s preferred R.S.I. nomination, which correlates with the Real point in an individual’s symptom in the centre of the hole in the Real ring and the site. In Theory of the Subject Badiou disparages Lacan’s R.S.I. nomination. He concludes that Lacan’s subject is a consistent Symbolic repetition where the Real exists. He describes his own subject as a destructive consistency where consistence has primacy over cause, and being is forced to destroy the object and exceed to the subject. (Badiou 2009b p. 238)

7.3 Lacan’s Suppléance and Badiou’s Event

Decades after the presentation of mid to late 1970s seminars, Badiou implies Lacan’s suppléance is an event.

One must come to conceive of truth as making a hole in knowledge. Lacan is paradigmatic on this point. The subject is thus convoked as a border-effect or a delimiting fragment of such a hole-piercing. (Badiou 2009d p. 2) 148

Badiou discusses the Two and love. What composes a Real Two by itself or in its being

147 A later Badiou states this: “A Subject convokes itself to a decision. … Situated in being, subjective emergence forces the event to decide the true of the situation.” (Badiou 2005 pp. 429, 430)

148 Cited pagination from a print out.
is a non-rapport which agitates the lure of the object. (Badiou 2009g p. 1) Badiou links Lacan’s theories on suppléance and love with his own theories on the event and describes himself as presenting “a commentary on Lacan’s statement that love comes to supplement the lack of sexual rapport.”

The event that must be registered as love is what, in my language, establishes that the sexual is of the order of being. It is what Lacan asserted when he professed that love is an approach, or a “coming aboard:” “Being is love which comes aboard in the encounter.” The encounter is, in effect, the name of the amorous chance, inasmuch as it initiates the supplement. It is, of course, the encounter guided by the obscure star of the object, but in excess of it, since it goes straight to that aspect of the object from which the subject draws its little bit of being. (Badiou 1999 p. 1)

In 1989, he focuses on Lacan as a theoretician of love. He states that Lacan’s theory on love is “an event and a condition for the renaissance of philosophy.” (Badiou 1992 p. 82-3)

Lacan is event-making for philosophy since he organises all kinds of subtleties about the Two, and arranges the generic paradoxes of love within it. ... Not only does he propose a concept ... he also proposes an analysis of conjuncture. This is why the anti-philosopher Lacan is a condition of the renaissance of philosophy. A philosophy is possible today, only if it is compossible with Lacan. (Badiou 1992 p. 83-4)

He asserts Freud and Lacan are philosophers because they “have contributed to putting into concepts the general space wherein the generic procedures of the time have come to find the shelter and welcome of their compossibility.”

149 Cited pagination from a print out.
150 My italics.
They will have had the immense merit of maintaining and founding the category of the subject. ... Perhaps they were only able to accomplish this by rebutting the status of the philosopher, indeed in drawing their inspiration, as did Lacan, from anti-philosophy. (Badiou 1992 p. 82)

As I have shown, Badiou is incorrect in his estimation Lacan is restricted to lack as cause. Lacan “responded with the Real” but with a different Real to the Real ring and the Real as cause. (Badiou 2009b p. 244) (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 77, 83, 74, 77) And he organised and constructed clinical artifice as a procedure to seize truths which then involved a philosophic act. 151 Badiou asks if psychoanalysis is a generic procedure belonging to the conditions of philosophy. (Badiou 1992 p. 81) As I stated in Chapter Three, I argue it is and it fits predominantly with an ‘Artistic Truth Procedure,’ which as Badiou states supports truths of love. (Badiou 2005 p. 341) After all Lacan said psychoanalysis is poetic artifice and it “creates the true.” (Lacan 2008 p. 62) However, “inasmuch as it touches the subject, being, truth and ethics, psychoanalysis must traverse and make holes in philosophy.” (Badiou 2008 p. 246)

151 (Badiou 1992 p. 127)
Chapter Eight

Body of Truth and Lacan’s Subject

8.1 Truth and the Body

Badiou’s Dissension with Lacan

The chapters in Part B are not about colour in painting but they address my argument that a viewer is part of the artistic subject. This chapter critiques Badiou’s claim that there is no subject-body in Lacan’s theory, which correlates with Badiou’s claim the artistic subject is only with the art work.

As I stated above, there are some texts, years after his 1970s seminars where Badiou implies Lacan’s suppléance is an event. However, although he admits to being influenced by Lacan, overall he does not recognise Lacan’s later theory as a theory of the event with a subjective form. 152 The article shows that by the early 1990s he basically still holds to his criticisms from the 1970s seminars. He obliquely refers to Lacan’s later theory in an article Art and Philosophy. (Badiou 2005a) 153 In this text he alludes to Lacan’s theory about the Real in the hole of the Symbolic; ‘extimacy’ (a term used by early Lacan to highlight the Real in the Symbolic); and he also implicitly points to Lacan’s 1964 theory of an arrested moment with a viewer of painting. (Lacan 1992 pp. 139, 71) As I have previously stated, this arrested moment relates to Lacan’s first evental suture. (Lacan 1979 p. 117) Badiou describes the moment as what ineluctably captivates the gaze and he estimates the moment reveals a hole in the Symbolic which is a Real blockage. However, he makes no reference to how Lacan’s theory could relate to the event. Firstly he sums up Freud and Lacan’s theories on art.

152 He has made dismissive reference to Lacan’s ‘sinthome’ in Logics of Worlds. (Badiou 2009a p. 481) “Sinthome” is one of several words (suppletion, suppléance, fourth knot and the letter) Lacan uses for the extra signifier.

The object of desire, which is beyond symbolization, can subtractively emerge at the peak of an act of symbolization. In its formal bearing, the work leads to the dissipation of the unspeakable scintillation of the lost object. (Badiou 2005a p. 7)  

He then declares art remains Imaginary for psychoanalytic theory because of the dissipation of the object.

The work of art links up to transference because it exhibits in a singular and contorted configuration, the blockage of the symbolic by the Real, the ‘extimacy’ of the object petit a (the cause of desire) to the Other (the treasure of the symbolic). This is why the ultimate effect of art remains imaginary. (Badiou 2005a p. 7)

In other words, object $a$, which emerges with subtraction in painting, is dissipated in the arrested instant because a viewer with transference love, connected to the hole with an extimacy, maintains the object’s link with the Other. I discuss below how this dissipation can occur but it is not related to Lacan’s first evental suture. My point here is these oblique references are backhanded acknowledgements of Lacan’s evental theory and his R.S.I. nomination. For example, whilst criticizing Lacan, Badiou unwittingly acknowledges four points of importance in Lacan’s theory on the event and the artistic subject. Firstly, the delineation of the blockage of the Symbolic by the Real is decisive for Lacan’s preferred nomination; secondly the arrested instant shifts this blockage. The third and the fourth points relate to the importance of a singular individual’s symptom.

1. As I have shown, the Real blockage is decisive for undecidability within the site. It is Lacan’s disjunctive false hole related to the unpresented element.

2. Lacan’s arrested instant cuts through this blockage. If a strong modification

---
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occurs the rupture involves the emergence of the extra signifier. Furthermore, when Badiou states Lacan theorizes a subtractive emergence with object $a$, he knows, because of his own theories on subtraction, Lacan is deliberately theorizing the use of subtractive strategies so as to disclose an unpresented element (the Real object), Real as cause. This disclosure is required because the element has to be juxtaposed with Not All for the sake of undecidability in the site. (Lacan 1972 p. 9) Thus there is an implicit awareness within Badiou’s text not only about the importance of the Real blockage, which has become a site, but also that Lacan is theorizing how the site makes way for the emergence of the signifier of the event. Given his Theory of the Subject criticisms of Lacan’s new Real, Badiou is unwittingly acknowledging Lacan is not tied to structure as cause.

3. Furthermore, Badiou acknowledges something crucial is avoided when the “unspeakable” object is dissipated. The fact he connects the peak of an act of symbolization with the ineluctable capture of the gaze and the Real in the hole of the Symbolic, implies he knows it is precisely at the arrested instant a viewer is confronted with an unpresented element, Real object $a$ within the site.

4. After mentioning the capture of the gaze, he refers to how a work of art links to “transference because it exhibits, in the singular and contorted configuration, the blockage of the symbolic by the Real.” Thus in addition, whilst stating how the viewer is captured in transference and connected to the hole in the site of a work of art, he unwittingly acknowledges a viewer has an Imaginary identification with an unpresented object and that there is a chance a viewer’s identification could precede beyond the Imaginary. Moreover, the implication is a singular viewer’s Imaginary identification within a discursive tie is necessarily involved in subjectivation, that is, it must be engaged such that it can be ruptured with the emergence of the extra signifier for the artistic subject-body. Badiou

---

155 As I discuss in coming chapters, a strong modification involves Lacan’s second suture with nomination and localisation.
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inadvertently acknowledges this relevance and hence the significance of the singular symptom with art. This inadvertence is important because his theory doesn’t place a viewer with the artistic subject-body. His artistic subject is only a work of art. (Badiou, Tarby 2013a p. 69) However, his inadvertent acknowledgement implies the viewer, ineluctably captivated via her Imaginary identification, can proceed beyond the Imaginary because of the extra signifier.

These last two points connect with my analysis of viewer engagement within the site of artifice and with the subject-body.

Despite these implicit acknowledgements, Badiou states in *Art and Philosophy* that Lacan’s theory does not develop beyond the 1964 theory of the arrested moment. When he complains a captivated viewer remains within a form of extimacy which simply leans with transference upon the Other, he is asserting it can never be otherwise, art will remain Imaginary in Lacan’s theory. Further along in *Art and Philosophy*, he discounts all Lacan’s theory as only amounting to his early theory, that is, that it did not progress beyond saturation with “the self-consciousness conferred upon it by the complete deployment of a theory of desire.” (Badiou 2005a p. 7) Some seven years after *Art and Philosophy*, in a section of *Logics of Worlds*, he is still saying all of Lacan’s theory only amounts to his early theory. In the latter text he discusses his main point of dissension with Lacan. (Badiou 2009a p. 477-82) I have broken his dissension into two parts. The first part concerns the subject-body, which is “the name of the subject.” (Badiou 2009a p. 479) The second part involves the ‘transhuman.’

I begin with the first part, that is, his criticisms of the body. He commences with the divided subject’s physical body. (Badiou 2009a p. 477) In the last part of the section he finally mentions Lacan’s theory of the sinthome and only does so in one sentence.

It is only as a transhuman body that a subject takes hold of the divisible body of the human animal. The breach is then on the side of creation, not the symptom, and I am not persuaded that the ‘case’ of Joyce – ‘Joyce-the-sinthome,’ as Lacan says – suffices to dissolve the one into the other. (Badiou 2009a p. 481)
He barely acknowledges Lacan’s later theory. As I stated above, he knows about Lacan’s extra signifier because, in *Theory of the Subject*, he cites Lacan’s session 11th February 1975, which is about Lacan’s evental nomination, his R.S.I. nomination. (Badiou 2009b p. 245) However, even as late as 2006 within *Logics of Worlds*, he persistently compares his own theories of the subject of the event with Lacan’s old theories of the divided subject, rather than Lacan’s theories on the subject of suppléance. Thus his theory can appear to be the only theory about a subject produced by the extra signifier and Lacan’s to be tied to structural lack as cause and the divided subject. If Lacan’s theory of the subject-body produced by the extra signifier is persistently ignored then Badiou can safely state his is “an entirely original theory of the subject-body.” (Badiou 2009a p. 99) However, his resultant analysis of Lacan’s divided subject in comparison to his own evental subject is spurious. And as I discuss below, the difference between Lacan’s divided subject-body, divided by the master signifier, and his own subject-body, is ridiculously extreme. For example, he begins by stating Lacan argues for the master signifier against the human body, that the subject is constituted by this signifier more than the body and the body resists the subject. He is referring to Lacan’s divided subject. He asserts “the body is what resists the subject, so that – recalling Plato – the subject is negatively consigned to the body, rather than born by it.” (Badiou 2009a p. 477) The subject born by the body is not Lacan’s old divided subject. It is Badiou’s new subject. There is no mention of Lacan’s old subject of suppléance. Badiou’s reference to the subject born by the body relates to previous definitions in *Logics of Worlds* about his new subject-body.

[We] suppose that a real rupture has taken place, ... which we call the event, together with a trace of this rupture, ε, and finally a body C, correlated to ε (only existing as a body under the condition of the evental trace). The formal theory of the subject is then, under condition of ε and C (trace and body), a theory of operations (figures) and destinations (acts). (Badiou 2009a p. 50)

---
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His subject is between the physics of the body and the name or trace of the event. An example he provides of a body is the new body of slaves which form an army with Spartacus. The conjunction between the body and the name (ε) governs the strategies of Spartacus and it is “these strategies [which] are the subjective form borne by the body.”

158 The “subjective identity” born by the military movements of the body passes into different operations, which are “subjective deliberations” beyond these military movements, for examples, “the slaves ‘as a body’ (as an army) move into a new present; for they are no longer slaves.” Thus Badiou states the institution of the possible becomes a subjective production. “Its materiality is constituted by the consequences drawn day after day from the event’s course.” (Badiou 2009a p. 51) Lacan’s new subject of the extra signifier is also between the body and nomination. It is within the finite and embodies a new truth. “The true hole [is] something representable.” It is a body of truth. (Lacan 2008 p. 10) (Lacan 1994 pp. 3, 2, 2) 159 However, despite the fact Lacan was working towards a theory of subjectivation in the 1960s and 1970s as evidenced by his theory in 1964 about the gaze with the arrested moment and his 1970s seminars, Badiou prefers to see Lacan as stuck in the 1960s. Earlier in Logics of Worlds, before the section on his dissension about Lacan, he describes a question confronting the category of the subject in the 1960s related to the (political) subject with post Heideggerian deconstruction.

In France of the sixties only Sartre (in a reactive mode) and Lacan (in an inventive mode) refused to play a part in this drama. Consequently, both found themselves faced with the dialectic between subject (as structure) and subjectivation (as act). (Badiou 2009a p. 50-1)

One can expect in the later the section on his dissension about Lacan in Logics of Worlds that Badiou will decide Lacan chose the divided subject as structure.

Badiou asserts that in Lacan’s theory the body is secondary because a language-effect structurally imposes itself as affect upon the body. (Badiou 2009a pp. 477, 478) He

158 My italics.
159 Sessions 18th November 1975, 9th March and 10th February 1976.
doesn’t explore the differences between language and discourse, or how his own subject-body and its institutions of the possible avoid or relate to discursive structure. (Badiou 2009a p. 9) The comparison between Lacan’s divided subject’s body dominated by the master signifier and Badiou’s body with the signifier of the event could not of course be more extreme. He declares there is no action with Lacan’s divided subject’s body but the body in Badiou’s theory is an active support for truth to appear as subject-form. (Badiou 2009a p. 478) Furthermore, his incessant criticism about how Lacan’s divided subject’s body is inhabited by language is ostensibly a smoke screen to hide his refusal to deal with the fact that discursive structure is part of the logic of appearing and a development of the structure of count-as-one. Although he does however make statements such as the following in an earlier text: “All thought supposes a situation of the thinkable, which is to say a structure, a count-as-one, in which the presented multiple is consistent and numerable,” and he refers briefly to Lacan’s theory on the four discourses in different texts, he doesn’t analyse in Logics of Worlds how his subject-body or subjective process relates to discursive structure. (Badiou 2005 p. 34) (Badiou 2005a p. 1) (Badiou 2009b p. 246)

In Anti-Philosophy: Plato and Lacan, he discusses the discourses in more detail. He is aware Lacan placed Plato with the master’s discourse and states by subtracting Socrates from Plato, “Lacan was able to attach to Plato the ironical distance that the master’s discourse levies.” (Badiou 2008 pp. 236-7, 239) In Chapter Five, I stated that Lacan perceived Plato was straddling two discourses. Badiou also acknowledges this: “Plato was inclined to occupy the position of analytic discourse and that of the master.” (Badiou 2008 p. 239) He thinks these two discourses together are what Plato founded as philosophy and it is fine for philosophy to be “always diagonal to the four discourses;” to be the “free play” between discourses; a “subversive traversal” of discourses. It has free play between aporia with the analytic discourse (the site) and atopia (asocial or across discourses). Philosophy with atopia is denied location. This “enables it to instruct [to teach] through the example of deadlock.” 160 Later in the article he confuses the analyst’s discourse (aporia) with the asocial atopic, for example, he estimates both

160 My italics.
Lacan’s and Plato’s teaching are atopic with transference love in the analytic discourse, which he calls an “atopic asocial intensity of amorous *de-liaison.*” (Badiou 2008 pp. 239, 245) Lacan is quite precise in his criticism of how philosophy teaches from the master’s discourse and that his own transmission is from a different position to that of the analyst’s in the analyst’s discourse. As I previously stated it is the symptomatic production in the master’s discourse which will, in the site, change the sense from S1 to the one *that is not.* Philosophy must retain fidelity to the event such that the transmission of the one *that is not* in its conditions changes the universal norms of the master discourse. If Badiou’s philosophy is asocial (outside the social bonds of discourse) and traversing all four discourses it can settle in any discourse for unspecified reasons or durations, for example, in the master’s discourse to “instruct,” or to “interrupt” with the hysteric’s discourse, or simply just straddle the analyst’s discourse and the master’s discourse. This is not a “subversive traversal” of the discourses or “an avulsion” of the prevailing situation. Rather it is an avoidance of two issues, firstly that philosophy can, as I discussed in Chapter Five, complete the master’s discourse and secondly it doesn’t encourage analysis of a new social bond which sustains fidelity and the subject-body. In the next chapter, I discuss Lacan’s theory on a new discourse which is “able to hold the place of truth, and even make it have locatable consequences.” (Lacan 2008 p. 41-2)

The issue of how truths are and appear with discursive structure is critical. Although Badiou is adamant truths are processes in the world it is not enough to simply fasten them to a materialist dialectic. 161

The primacy of the signifier over physiological data is first and foremost a polemical thesis, which in no way excludes that the body is *also* the name of the subject. It is simply necessary to understand that it is so within the parameters of the materialist dialectic, which obliges the body to comply with the ideal conception of the true. (Badiou 2009a p. 478-9)

161 Interestingly Lacan coined the term ‘materialist dialectic’ in 1970 *Radiophonie.* However, Badiou says he considered it carefully before he used it to define his enterprise. (Badiou 2006b p. 3) (Badiou 2009a p. 3)
Just as Lacan’s divided subject is not the issue here, the primacy of the signifier over physiology is more than a controversial thesis. The pertinent issue is not whether the master signifier excludes the body, which is the name, but rather that discursive structure is pivotal to the point-by-point furtherance of the subjective form. Truths are exceptions to existence and nothing outside our thought. (Badiou 2006b pp. 3, 4) Certainly old discursive structures are ruptured by the signifier of the event such that truth with the subject-body can be actually thinkable. In a rare reference to the discursive Badiou states “the entirety of disseminated being [must] shatter apart, as soon as it is grasped by discursive thought.” (Badiou 2005 p. 34) The resultant occurrence is that the philosophic act grasps an eternal truth of being once it has emerged into discursive thought. Discursive structures are inevitable when truth is thinkable and just as assuredly language is involved. My point is that it is not enough to state truths are part of the world where ontology and logic rub up against each other in a materialistic dialectic. (Badiou 2009a pp. 9, 6) More exposition is required about how the philosophic act is placed with discourse and what is the fate of the subjective form when philosophy plays an educative role in discursive structure.

As I discussed in Chapter Five, ontology as the science of being-qua-being is realised as the thought of the pure multiple. (Badiou 2009a p. 93) It thinks the law of the subject and finds its guarantee of being in forcing. It is not the subject itself. (Badiou 2005 pp. 411, 517) Ontology along with mathematics as ontology is guaranteed of being, which was previously indiscernible, with a forcing of veracity. What is forced along with ontology’s thought about the law of the subject is what belongs to the name of the event and is also bound to the future anterior of the previously inconsistent multiple. It is precisely what occurs with forcing that points to how philosophy can straddle two discourses: the discourse of the site, which facilitates the condition for philosophy, and the master’s discourse. (Lacan 2007 p. 148-9) Philosophy needs to transmit a contingency for the subject as act from the site rather than educate and declare the law of the subject as a master. As I stated in Chapter Three, ontology’s supposition in the position of S1 in the master’s discourse means the non-one remains indiscernible behind the master and the philosophic act deteriorates into an educative declaration for the subject. Thus the issue is not the primacy of the signifier over physiology. It is rather how the philosophic act, related to human sentience, can come to exclude the
subject. This is at the core of why Badiou and Badiouians relentlessly criticize and label Lacan as an anti-philosopher. Badiou attacks Lacan’s focus on language’s habitation with the divided subject’s body because he can effectively sideline Lacan’s theory on the subject-body in comparison to his own and also take the focus away from discursive structures, principally Lacan’s theory of how philosophy in the master’s and university discourses exclude the subject-body. Lacan’s discourse theories not only point to his extra signifier and the subject-form but they also represent a threat to philosophy which supports the master’s discourse. Nevertheless, it can still be said that if Badiou has a subject-body whose organs treat a world point-by-point, such a subject-body relates precisely to the discourse of the site. And if the subject-form continues to treat a world point-by-point, philosophy is transmitting a contingency from the site for the subject.

The other significant issue Badiou avoids with his lack of analysis about discursive structure is the relevance of a singular individual to the event. Badiou grapples with this in art. As I discussed above, Badiou only unwittingly acknowledges the relevance of the singular symptom to the site and the emergence of the event. It is unwitting because he doesn’t place a viewer with the artistic subject-body. His artistic subject is embodied only in works of art. (Badiou, Tarby 2013a p. 69) He states art raises questions about multiplicity, being and appearing, and is thus open to the event and truth.

Art raises these resolutely specific questions because of its *strange multiplicity, the basis of which is fairly difficult to elucidate.* It is hardly satisfactory to link this to the multiplicity of the senses. In fact none of the classificatory principles totally accounts for it. (Badiou, Tarby 2013a p. 67) 162

What is unsatisfactory in the link between art’s multiplicity and the multiplicity of the senses is that the sentient tie is discursive and precisely dependent upon a singular representative of the gaze of others. As I mentioned in Chapters One and Six, the singular representative’s identification of and with being is pivotal to the emergence of the event because it creates a context for the subversion of meaning with the

---

162 My italics.
conventional collective doxa or gaze of others in the master’s discourse. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 47) And as I discuss in Chapter Thirteen, this comes to the fore with the universal exponents of an exposed relation. The difficulty for Badiou is to elucidate the multiplicity involved with discursive sentience within the logic of appearing and specifically in the sentient tie with art. The difficulty with art’s questioning of multiplicity and its presentation of undecidability in relation to being and appearance is that it requires and necessarily envelopes the singular viewer via subtractive strategies for the sake of an aleatory event. This necessity for the specificity of a singular symptom, which Badiou ignores, is the main reason the viewer combined with an art work or a series of art works, is an artistic subject.


If we accept that the body of truth comes to be through the incorporation of some available multiplicities - among which there may be “bodies” in the ordinary sense of the term - we will penetrate the meaning of that enigmatic, and almost pre-Socratic, formula from *Radiophonie*: “The first body makes the second by incorporating itself within it.” (Badiou 2009a p. 480)

He believes Lacan’s theory of the divided subject splits the subject into two bodies and he refers to the divided subject as having another person’s body at its disposal and this other person’s body represents a specific symptom.

The subject is effectively split into two bodies: one which he “has,” and which, as objective body or living object, bars access to the one which he uses, this body-place-of-the-Other where his speech makes him. If man has a body, “he has no other despite the fact that, on account of his speaking-being, he has some other at his disposal without managing to make it his.” This second body is generally a symptom for something Other and not a possession or basis for a new subject. This is proven by the canonical feminine example: “a woman is a symptom of another body.” (Badiou 2009a p. 480)
He criticises Lacan for proposing the second body is able to possess a new subject. (Badiou 2009a p. 480) He cites as proof Lacan’s “canonical feminine example: ‘a woman is a symptom of another body.’” Of course Lacan’s second body is not a subject-body, a body of truth. Badiou assumes, as he did with his criticism of the arrested moment, Lacan does not progress from a symptomatic Real blockage in the Symbolic. Once again his criticism conveniently places Lacan’s old theory of the divided subject up against his own theory of the subject-body. As I discuss below, Soler shows the second body is not posited as a body of truth. It exposes disjunction with the symptom.

### 8.2 Subject-Body in Lacanian Theory

Soler examines the discordance a divided subject feels with her body. Early Lacan approached the body from the logical terms of appearing. (Soler 1984 p. 3) Discordance attributed to sensory experience is measured against a supposed unity or logic of appearing. Soler presents two examples. One is with a psychotic who senses her head is a meter above her body. Does her sense of her body truly exist in relation to corporeality and appearing? The second example is a neurotic, whose arm is paralysed. Her body image is not affected but her body is affected. (Soler 1984 p. 4) Referring to Lacan’s 1970 *Radiophonie* she states a body in appearing is “a system of internal relations.”

> It is “the body of the symbolic,” an incorporeal body, ... which by embodying itself, gives you a body (“the first body makes the second by embodying itself”). In other words, this body which you call your own is bestowed upon you by language. (Soler 1984 p. 5) (Lacan 1970 pp. 61-3)

The discordance between the body and its supposed cohesion in appearing is a false hole. As divided subjects “we are disjunct from the body.” (Soler 1984 p. 5) If a Real blockage in the disjunction is a strong intensity it presents undecidability with a site.

---

163 Early Lacan stated the materiality of the logic of appearing abhors a hole. (Lacan 1993 p. 176) Woman appears without the materiality of the penis. She represents a symptom for man.

164 Cited pagination refers to a print out.
The site’s question is, ‘Does sensory knowledge exist or not?’ In other words, Soler states disjunction in the logic of appearing results from signifying structure.

In Lacan’s *Radiophonie*, the second body is structured from the first. It is signifying structure with the logic of appearing. The first develops with a succession of numbers to become representable, which is an incorporeal or intangible embodiment in the corporeal body. Disjunction between the two bodies evokes a Real hole or symptom. As I have stated above, Badiou assumes Lacan supposes the second body is a subject-body. However, Lacan is discussing a divided subject, whose division is with the signifying structure. Thus Badiou’s assumption makes it seem Lacan does not progress beyond the disjunction. Lacan explains a succession of numbers creates a representation with whole numbers which only encloses a hole. (Lacan 1998 p. 127) It is a Real in the hole of the Symbolic which evokes undecidability from whence a new body emerges. The disjunction connects with a new subject-body and subsists in appearing. It is “corp-sistent” because it holds a unity. (Lacan 2008 p. 10) Lacan begins to present theory of his subject of suppléance, a subject-body, in *Radiophonie* but it is not the second body. He states “there is no appropriate signifier to give substance to a formula that is sexual relation.” What is required is a new signifier, an extra signifier. (Lacan 1970 p. 66) It begins with the indexation of a sign: there is a sign for someone which signals something.

[There is] “something” into which the psychoanalyst, by interpreting, brings about an intrusion of the signifier. ... If [she] wants to make someone of it, it is the same thing, because it goes from the personality to the total person. (Lacan 1970 p. 66)

He asserts a materialist dialectic has a greater rigor at the source of the sign. It means the noumenon gives more than just a sign of nous. It signals something from nowhere. (Lacan 1970a p. 15-6) He states two is made of the place the sign indexes.

The least [slightest] memory of the unconscious requires, however,

---

165 Session 9th April 1970.
maintaining at this place some two [the two of some kind], with Freud’s supplement that would not know how to satisfy any reunion [unification] except that of logic, which is written: either the one or the other. (Lacan 1970a pp. 14, 8) 166 (Lacan 1970 pp. 55-99)

One of the two is behind the fault in the sexual relation and the two of some kind is what is made, the self belonging of the element in the reflexive site. Two is made of the unpresented element and it supplements the fault. He declares it is “a supplement from Freud. [It occurs] when the signifier turns into a sign.” As I stated in Chapter Six, an extra signifier becomes a nomination of what a sign for someone signals, a subject-body which is the name. The signifier made from the unpresented element drops to the sign. It is not the signifier of the second body, it is an extra signifier which falls to a sign that is someone and this is the third body in Radiophonie. “This (ça) is someone.” (Lacan 1970 p. 55-99) (Lacan 1970a p. 9) Despite Badiou’s focus on Lacan’s second body and his silence about the third body, Radiophonie presents a theory of the localisation of the extra signifier. In short, Lacan is theorising the event and the subject-body, his subject of suppléance. Decades later Badiou’s signifier of the event or evental multiplicities relates directly to Lacan’s extra signifier. 167 In 1973 Lacan states there is a sign, which is an effect presumed by a signifier. The effect is the subject-body when it is known as the subject’s sign, which is separate from its meaning effects in the chain. (Lacan 1998 p. 50)

Lacan tells us, in Plato’s work, form is the knowledge that fills being. Form doesn’t know about this because it is Real, that is, the Real is unknown in appearing.

[It is an] impossible knowledge [that] is censored or forbidden. ... We have to expose the kind of real to which it grants us access. We have to show where the shaping (mise-en-forme) of that metalanguage, which is not, and which I make ex-ist, is going. Something true can still be said

166 Session 9th April 1970.

167 It is an extra signifier because the event is constituted by an illegal self belonging. (Badiou 2005 pp. 356, 85, 507, 179)
about what cannot be demonstrated. (Lacan 1998 p. 119)

The something true is a body of truth. What can’t be demonstrated is the element behind the fault in the sexual relation which is revealed as the false hole in the site. The sign indexes what’s undemonstrated. As discussed in Chapter Six, a divided subject supposes what’s undemonstrated is something preliminary to existence. An encounter occurs with this supposed inexistente when the cutting of the gaze separates Imaginary identification from the Symbolic. The question arises, ‘what was preliminary to existence? What in effect was held as inexistente before?’ (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 3) We want evidential proof of the inexistente multiple-in-itself. Something of the Real is blocked and what is evoked is the inexistente. Accessibility to this Real makes it fleetingly possible to expose the inexistente to signifying knowledge and it is nominated with an extra signifier. In Radiophonie, Lacan’s proof of what’s undemonstrated is the proof that it is born. It is brought into existence, even if the birth appears then disappears.

My proof [epreuve] only concerns being, insofar as it gives birth to being from the rift produced by the statement of existence. However, its course is negated so that the emergence of being is already a disappearance. (Lacan 1970 p. 78) 168

The emergence is within an instant. It brings change because something new is included in the situation. 169

The second part of Badiou’s point of dissension is about the transhuman body. “It is only as a transhuman body that a subject takes hold of the divisible body of the human animal.” (Badiou 2009a p. 481) He assumes Lacan’s focus is only on a divided subject’s symptom therefore his theory doesn’t deal with the transhuman. In Lacanian theory however, the presented extra signifier is re-presented with the gaze of others. In

168 My translation.

169 As Badiou states ontology forecloses self belonging. The supernumerary letter stands in for the event-without-event. (Badiou 2005 p. 356)
Radiophonie, Lacan likens this involvement of others to the “pass” upon which his psychoanalysis can “shed light.” He places the pass, a passage for a materialist dialectic and plus-de-jouir, between the first and second body to the third, a subject-body. The plus-de-jouir surpasses Marx’s “surplus-value” because a body of truth exposes the operations of surplus-value.

When one acknowledges the plus-de-jouir to say “this is truly someone” one will be on the right track towards a materialist dialectic that may be more active than party meat [chair of the party], used as the baby sitter of history. Psychoanalyse can shed light with its pass. (Lacan 1970 p. 67)

When one acknowledges truth with the subject-body and plus-de-jouir, there is an acknowledgement of the singular universal, which is re-presented in this case with the gaze of others. The third body, the subject-body, connects with others. Soler writes about these others, which, in Radiophonie, Lacan called the “bed of the other.” She describes Lacan’s third body as “a devitalized body,” which functions and signifies as fragmentation. The erotic with the extra signifier makes a bed with others. The subject-body has relations with jouissance and knowledge. It “makes the bed of the other via the operation of the signifier.” (Lacan 1970a p. 58) The bed of the other is a categorical passage, a pass into appearing. It’s a singular viewer counted within the universalizing gaze of others. In Radiophonie, the bed is minus one, the inexistent. “Minus one is made in advance, before intimacy or extimacy. Thus they mean the same.” (Lacan 1970 p. 61) They are self same or it is itself. Minus one has a relation as the same between both the singular and the universal. The extra signifier names an irreducible element which pairs as relational with sub elements. The halting point of minus one is thus linked and its difference retained. Badiou seems to miss all this in Radiophonie.

In Radiophonie, Lacan proposes funerary objects as an example of the third body, a subject-body. A new truth is understood with them and it has form. The extra signifier

---

170 It can be said Badiou surreptitiously likened exponentiation in category theory to Lacan’s pass, that is, like a categorical passage where the ontology of set theory can pass as declared, such that it is a forcing. (Badiou 2013 p. 26)

171 My translation.
forges within a site and is indexed by the affect of anxiety. The forging of the signifier between intimate and extimate minus one relations is in a passage between the singular intimate counted with a universal extimate. The subject-body exists, in this case with funerary objects and the singular universal with associations of an embodiment, which is literally “dead or alive.”

Don’t go with the wholeness of corporeality. Only the sign of a negated mark rises above with a body that is separate to the corporeality of clouds and water, with jouissance, which accounts for a separate body to corporality. Modern logic doesn’t account for the assemblage of an ancient burial. The empty set of bones is the irreducible element [halting point], which is ordered [paired] to other elements that are instruments of jouissance, sub-elements, which bring enjoyment back to the body. (Lacan 1970 p. 61) 172

The trace or subject as a sign with the funerary objects in the discursive tie is localised with the being-there site. Here in Radiophonie is Lacan’s theory of the relation within localization. Although this theory is in its early stages in 1970 it is twenty two years before Badiou’s in Logics of Worlds. 173 The extra signifier becomes a new body with nomination. He refers to an extra signifier as a sign of a negated mark of the minus one, of the element in the empty set. The extra signifier that has dropped to a sign. Modern logic does not account for it but it is a new signifier which enters consistency. It is embodied, re-presented in sentience with corporeal funerary objects. Lacan states the subject-body is the appearing of a supplementary signifier which stands in for a previously undesignated element identified with the funerary objects and within the sentient tie. It is realised or paired with other elements of jouissance, that is, localised in the being-there site with human sentience. In other words, the localisation of the signifier with jouissance is in the tie between a pure multiple in the empty set of bones and the minus one jouissance of a viewer. The element of the bones is nominated and

172 My italics.
173 I discuss Badiou’s theory of localisation in the last chapter.
paired to other elements of the first body of jouissance with each viewer of the bones. The universalizing gaze of others recognises the extra signifier of an exposed relation because of a relation in the tie between the minus one with a representative viewer and the funerary objects.

The issue here with the signifier of the event in relation to the transhuman and the subject-body is extimacy which has an aleatory alignment with the “bed of others.” Lacan places an erotic quality with jouissance. It is eroticisation of as well as identification with being which is conveyed in the bed of others and the trans-individual. Such identification is pivotal to the site and part of Lacan’s subject-body, which intervenes as a “third term” between knowledge and jouissance. There is a difference between Badiou and Lacan in their theories on jouissance and affect. Lacan’s theory is about the integrality and erotic quality of jouissance and Badiou only seems to see jouissance with the first body. In 1991, Badiou defined jouissance as an unforceable point, “the unnameable.” (Badiou 2004 p. 132) In Subject in Art, published in 2005, he refers to jouissance as one of three levels of the signification of being. He does not see its integrality with a subject-body, rather he sees it disparaged with the corporeal body and an experimentation of death in life. (Badiou 2005b p. 2) Lacan’s subject-body, between knowledge and jouissance, has affects, which are logically cohesive with signifying structure. Badiou also theorises affect and asserts affect signals the subject-body. He posits “pleasure,” specific to an artistic event, as an affect with a new perceptual intensity. Pleasure is a sign of “the immediate and immanent experience that one is participating be it in an elementary fashion, in the becoming of a truth, in a creative subject-body.” (Badiou 2009a p. 76) However, in psychoanalytic theory, pleasure’s homeostasis is a barrier to jouissance and therefore to Lacan’s subject-body.

“Lacan completely split the term jouissance from all its associations with the register of pleasure.” Pleasure in Freud’s theory was a minimal excitation and an agreeable sensation. It “consists in doing fuck all ... wanting one’s good in the sense of well being.” (Soler 1984 p. 8-9) Pleasure “is a purely mythical experience. It is the idea of a primary satisfaction [with] the body that would not yet be marked.” (Soler 1984 p. 11)

174 I discuss this in the next and last chapters.
175 Cited pagination refers to a print out.
It is ironic that although Badiou criticises Lacan’s theories as struck with structural cause, Badiou’s choice of pleasure as affect with an artistic event, makes his subject a mere continuation of Freud’s trait, which involves dissatisfaction. (Soler 1984 p. 11) It is perpetual dissatisfaction stuck with structural lack as cause because it pertains to the second body. Freud defines pleasure and desire as barricades against the errancy of jouissance. (Soler 1984 p. 9) They are threatened by the errancy it’s associated with. Thus pleasure bars what could otherwise be convoked by the event. Ironically, although Badiou chooses not to acknowledge the void’s eroticised quality and that it has affects prior to and post the event, he states the errancy of the void is convoked by the event. (Badiou 2005 pp. 132, 433)

The significance of Badiou’s pleasure as an affect which signals an artistic event reveals two differences to Lacan’s theory. Firstly, as I have shown, Badiou’s choice of pleasure is contrary to Lacan’s truth body with jouissance. Secondly, Badiou has a different placement of affect. Lacan places the affect of anxiety as signalling within the site a relinquishment or ceding the moment of the event. Anxiety, although within signifying structure, has a direct passage from the incorporeal of the first body. Its passage is pertinent to the site. Crucially, in its passage from the first body Lacan’s affect of anxiety signals undecidability in the site. Badiou misses this because he only sees pleasure as retroactively signalling an artistic event. Lacan’s affect is beyond feeling in the second body but it indexes a relinquishment that yields to the emergence of the event from the first to the third body, subject-body. The affect of anxiety with the subject-body becomes the “enjoying substance” of jouissance. (Lacan 1998 p. 23) Pleasure as affect is without object, that is, it is restricted to the second or divisible body, to the divided subject. Jouissance relates to the affect of anxiety’s passage to the object from the incorporated first in the second to the third body. Thus jouissance traverses all three bodies. In Lacan’s subject-body anxiety becomes jouissance with

176 Years later in 1998, Badiou refers to what amounts to Not All. It exists as a standalone position but it also exists in a crisis with the site. (Badiou 2006a p. 59-60) However, in his Logics of Worlds dissension he still misses how Lacan’s Not All is standalone and with a site and, as he did in Theory of the Subject, where Lacan’s subjectivization occurs when anxiety yields. Lacan’s theory for this began in the 1950s and it is fundamental to the artifice of his clinic. Undecideability also became the bedrock of Badiou’s edifice in the 1980s. (Badiou 2005 p. 181)
knowledge.

8.3 The Name and Transhuman Body

As I stated in Chapter Seven, Lacan’s R.S.I. nomination is not retroactive: when the emergence occurs with subjectivization, the full jouissance of the first body is divided or cut in the second body and there is a provision of possible proper names for the extra signifier. In other words, his nomination occurs with subjectivization. And his names relate to fragmented jouissance. Badiou defines the names as material resources for the subject. (Badiou 2009d p. 5-6) His theory of proper names aligns with Lacan’s theory in that the names have no referents in the situation but are terms presented in a new situation. However, Badiou’s names seem to associate with existing signifying structure. They relate to what Badiou calls confidence or “an educated belief.” Names are “an arsenal of words which make up the deployed matrix of fidelity marks.”

Consider “faith,” “charity,” “sacrifice” and “health” (St Paul), or “party,” “revolution,” and “politics” (Lenin), or “sets,” “ordinal numbers,” and “cardinal numbers” (Cantor), and everything which then articulates, ramifies and stratifies these words. (Badiou 2009d p. 6)

Badiou’s theory about referents in the future anterior appears to align with Lacan’s subjective process, “knowing how to do things (savoir-faire) with language.” (Lacan 1998 pp. 44, 139) (Badiou 2009d p. 6) Yet they both see the name as new thought with a subject-body.

The singular relationship of a subject to the truth whose procedure [she] supports is the following: the subject believes that there is a truth, and this belief takes the form of knowledge. (Badiou 2009d p. 6)

However, Lacan’s jouissance is integral. There is a “necessity of plus-de-jouir in order for the machine to run.” (Lacan 1970 p. 86) His subjective form with truth between jouissance and knowledge amounts to jouissance being thought, or that “being thinks.” (Lacan 1998 p. 105) Knowledge becomes an apparatus for jouissance. (Lacan 1998 p. 55)
Lacan calls the link between the name, love and the subject-body, a “love letter.” Although love dwells with nothing or the unnamed, it wants it to be counted.

Love also wants to be one. That is why Lacan situates it ... at the junction of the imaginary and the symbolic. ... To desire to know the meaning of a signifier ... is ... a sign of love, as the [divided subject] cannot love what is unknown.” (Wolf 1999 p. 4) 177

This supposition of knowledge involves signifying structure, which is distinguished from the unnamed because the Other is a subtraction from it. The Other is one-less. Love aims at the sign’s effect which is the subject. (Lacan 1998 p. 50) Lacan states, “what makes up for (supplée au) the sexual relationship is quite precisely, love.” Love wants to make the sexual relationship exist, so it supplements for it. Love is the mathematical letter for an element, which becomes a truth of being “beside the referent.” (Lacan 1998 pp. 44, 45) The individual’s recourse is the extra signifier in the form of a nomination. “Letters don’t just designate sets they create sets on the basis of naming what is.” (Lacan 1998 pp. 44, 41, 47)

In Badiou’s dissension, he implies Lacan has no theory of the transhuman body. However, apart from his theory of localization in Radiophonie, Lacan’s theory of the transhuman began in 1945 with the apologue about three prisoners in Logical Time and the Assertion of Anticipated Certainty, which I discussed in Chapter Seven in relation to subjectivization. Identification occurs with two. The One plus a involves the social link, a form of knowledge with the gaze of others. In a 1973 text on love, suppléance and a new social link, Lacan refers to the 1945 article and the gaze of others. (Lacan 1988c)

[It is] something like intersubjectivity. [An individual is] one among others, [she is] in the gaze of others. In other words there are three of them. ... There are two plus a. This ... can be reduced, not to the two others, but to a One plus a. (Lacan 1998 p. 49)

177 Cited pagination refers to a print out
As part of an enquiry, the singular is counted as “one among others,” through “the gaze of others.” There is access to a previously unnamed element alongside the referent in appearing. “It [is] posited that the attribute ‘negative’ can only come into play in the case of a number of subjects’ minus one.” The attribute alludes to the psychoanalytic function, One-extra, “just a one.” (Lacan 1988c pp. 18, 20) (Lacan 2006b p. 401) (Evans 1996 p. 20) A cartel with plus one recognised as a leader can be reduced to a minimum by making a function of plus one. (Lacadée 2011 p. 3) Plus one uses the division of the divided subject because she declares in the product of the cartel, the previously unrecognised trait of each member of the group. Lacan’s transhuman body is different to Badiou’s. It involves the elaborations of a group induced via identification to a hole in knowledge embodied by the plus one. In fact, plus one with a cartel is described as trans-individual. It is not transhuman but trans-individual because the work of each individual, one by one, “is acknowledged by consenting to a trans-individual elaboration.” (Lacadée 2011 p. 5) The individual is thought with the inclusion of the Other. (Miller 1999 p. 10) (Lacadée 2011 p. 6) Plus one “stands outside the “all,” the collective, in order to give the collective its authority.” It says something is “Not All.” (Mellard 1998 p. 3)

There is a duty to the singular because “jouissance .. is always narcissistic.” This singularity, pertinent to joui sens in the position of love between the Imaginary and the Symbolic, becomes “symptomised into the universal.” (Wolf 1999 p. 7) Lacan’s theory of universalised singularity with the trans-individual corresponds with a subject process and his theory of localization, a universally exposed relation.

8.4 Lacan: Extimacy, Affect and the Singular Universal

Extimacy and the Transhuman

I continue to address my argument that a viewer is part of the artistic subject, which is contrary to Badiou’s claim the artistic subject is only with the art work. I return to his Art and Philosophy and discuss how extimacy relates to his dissension and Lacan’s Radiophonie. Extimacy is about the Real in the Symbolic. (Miller 2008 p. 2) Intimacy or what is interior has a quality of extimacy or externality. As I cited above they are self same in reference to minus one. However, when there is no extra signifier and intimacy leans upon extimacy as upon the Other there is a confession of the heart. This is the
transference love Badiou is referring to in his criticism of Lacan’s arrested moment. Without the extra signifier an analyst represents extimacy for the analysand’s confessions of intimacy. Miller explains it is a universal problem when we question the alterity of this Other, if there is an Other of the Other. The problem implies a question of grounding. It is “jouissance [which] grounds the alterity of the Other when there is no Other of the Other. It is in relation to jouissance that the Other is really Other.” (Miller 2008 p. 5) Alterity, in comparison to a succession of numbers, is not answered effectively by universality. However, if we look to what in the Other is object we can understand the object as Real.

[This] founds not only the Other’s alterity, but also what is real in the Symbolic Other. It is not a matter of integration, of interiorization, but of an articulation of extimacy. (Miller 2008 p. 7)

The Real object empties the Other because there is antinomy between the two. Such inadequacy pertains to a potential for the trans-individual. (Lacan 1998 p. 49) In fact, the efficacious Real object is a result of the Other. The implication is that although it is not part of belonging one still experiences it. It has errancy: “it escapes categories because it does not have the same énoncé.” (Miller 2008 p. 9) However, instead of just positing extimacy as alterity to the Other, Miller aligns extimacy and the Real object with the analyst “as presence.” This is an incorrect analysis of Lacan’s theory of the subject-body. As I discuss in the next chapter, the analyst is only part of the site for the event. Miller’s theory prohibits the extra signifier’s articulation with extimacy and only references a site and the universality of the symptom.

Miller plays into Badiou’s criticism. (Badiou 2005a p. 7) As I discussed above, Badiou states the second body is not the basis for a new subject. “This is proven by the canonical feminine example: a woman ‘is the symptom of another body.’” (Badiou 2009a p. 480) I describe “woman as a symptom” as an extimacy that leans upon the Other. Although, it is a universal symptom, it is also the mise en scène for the singular universal. The crux of Badiou’s dissension about the symptom is that he presumes Lacan is stuck with just the singular symptom. I quote in full the paragraph related to the transhuman.
It is only as a transhuman body that the subject takes hold of the divisible body of the human animal. The breach is then on the side of creation, not of the symptom, and I am not persuaded that the ‘case’ of Joyce – ‘Joyce-the-sinthome’, as Lacan says – suffices to dissolve the one into the other. Rather we observe the gap between, on one hand, the transcendental laws of appearing, and on the other, the present engendered by a subjectivizable body, a present that initiates an eternal truth. This is also the gap between the multiple-body of the human animal and its subjective incorporation. (Badiou 2009a p. 481)

However, as I have shown, Lacan’s theories of the trans-individual with the subject-body embrace the universal with the singular. An individual and her symptom are integral to the collective subject-body because she represents a hole in knowledge for the collective or universal symptom. In psychoanalytic artifice the subject-body is thought not via the analyst who is supposed to know but rather an experimenter who stands outside the “all” with knowledge of cohabitation with jouissance. (Lacan 1998 p. 141) (Mellard 1998 p. 3) Such an experimenter is a universal exponent for an exposed relation with localization. In other words, knowledge involves the trace with enjoying substance. (Lacan 1998 p. 84-5) Furthermore, this collective exponentiation experiments in painting as the gaze of others. The incomplete-ness of the All presents to universalize an exposed relation between being and someone who represents an object in being-there within the trans-individual. A universal symptom repeats in human bodies within the sentient tie between the gaze of a viewer and an art work. It repeats as a hole, which correlates with the errancy of jouissance. Moreover, it pinpoints the site. Its disjunctive presentation for viewer/s involves sensory experience tangled with affect and the supposed cohesion of the logics of worlds. As Lacan states “affect is intangible, incorporated within Symbolic structural logic.” (Lacan 1970 p. 61) The cohesion is a doxa agreed upon within social links. Whether something of the hole belongs or not is a repetitive point of undecidability. However, a singular viewer's declaration about a disjunctive hole in appearing is a symptomatic “experience” for others. In Lacan’s terms her declaration is part of a possible new situation along with the extimacy of a collective.
8.5 **Affect and Jouissance with the Event**

The third body, Lacan’s subject-body in *Radiophonie* relates to jouissance, which entails an erotic quality of “enjoying substance.” Jouissance is not generally defined as affect. However, the subject-body between the name, with knowledge and the signifier, relates to the body, and jouissance affects the body because anxiety becomes an enjoying substance. The body “enjoys itself only by ‘corporizing’ [corprifier – to give consistency] the body in a signifying way.” (Lacan 1998 p. 23) The extra signifier makes jouissance belong as a logical consistency in relation to other included sub sets. Thus jouissance connects with anxiety’s passage to the object, from the incorporated first in the second to the third body. Miller notes in Lacan’s seminar on anxiety the errancy of the Real object with jouissance escapes categories and humans cannot avoid experiencing it. It repeats as minus one and when it does it is aconceptual in the Other, that is, not a signifier. (Miller 2005 pp. 14, 19) Affect and jouissance relate because anxiety is “not without an object.” Jouissance is the Real object and anxiety is “not being without having.” (Lacan 2002c p. 4) 178 I suggest the difference between affect and jouissance is that affect as anxiety involves double negation (“not without an object,” “not being without having”) whereas jouissance interrupts knowledge as errancy. The double negation within the discursive tie signals the threat of errancy to the logic of the Symbolic with the Imaginary object a gaze. If the threat is strong, anxiety with jouissance becomes a site for a disjunctive gap in the Symbolic, which requires one suspend all agreement to being fooled by image in the logic of appearing. Lacan describes this as a difficult emotion with the symptom. There is stoppage and discomfort in the confrontation between emotion and the signifier. Discursive sentience cannot account for the effect of the affect.

I refer here briefly to a piece of text which places Lacan’s theory as pioneering for some of Badiou’s main theories in *Logics of Worlds*. In this seminar, presented ten years after the seminar on anxiety, Lacan theorises how the knowledge of affect and being come into existence. (Lacan 1998 p. 139-146) Proper names for the extra signifier pertain to

---

178 Session 9th January 1963.
The unconscious doesn’t know the function of these proper names; it only exists because language tries to know the function. The hypothetical unconscious is formed to evince knowledge. It cannot demonstrate knowledge of being. “The unconscious is not the fact that being thinks.” It cannot bring being into existence. Centring on being is not enough. “It is obvious that nothing is, if not in so far as it is said that it is.” (Lacan 1998 pp. 138, 104, 137, 104) This theory advances beyond “the unconscious is structured like a language.” (Lacan 1998 p. 138) He asks, “How can being know?” How can it become thought? He states it occurs with a change in discourse when being is suddenly questioned.

What change thus came about in discourse in order for people to suddenly question that being regarding the means it might have to go beyond itself, that is, to learn more than it needs to know in its being to survive as a body? (Lacan 1998 p. 140)

He is alluding to the extra signifier and self belonging, which is the means being has to go beyond itself. Lacan is also talking about the exponentiation of the master signifier. For being to know anything whatsoever, to come into existence, he insists “what is important is that the question of knowledge is transformed here into that of learning,” into new knowledge. (Lacan 1998 p. 140) “The supposed subject of this being has to ... learn how to learn.” It is a learning by “a series of trials and errors,” point by point decisions. The subject in the subjective process learns to know-how via change with signifier emergence. There is a “knowing how to do things with la langue.” (Lacan 1998 p. 139) An individual discovers new knowledge which survives within the existence of the trans-individual. It is a subject-body based upon an extra signifier figured beyond the status of unconscious knowledge. (Lacan 1998 p. 141)

He states that being doesn’t come into the logic of appearing with the introduction of difference between relations. As such it only cohabits with the unconscious of a divided

179 Fink defines la langue. “It is at the level at which polysemy is possible due to the existence of homonyms.” See footnote 15. (Lacan 1998 p. 44)
180 My italics.
subject represented by a signifier for another signifier. (Lacan 1998 p. 142) However, in his theory on localization in *Radiophonie* two years earlier, he stated a “signifier can be called upon to constitute a sign,” “to play the part of a sign,” which is someone’s sign. In Seminar XX he points to this.

Qua formal medium, the signifier hits something other than what it is quite crudely as a signifier, an other that it affects and that is made into a subject of the signifier, or at least which passes for such. It is in that respect that the being turns out to be. (Lacan 1998 p. 142)

In other words, an extra signifier that drops to someone’s sign is the exposition of a subject in appearing, of which it is the support. 181 A sign becomes the evental trace in appearing which enables the exposure of an individual’s relation to being. As a sign it is “external.” It has extimacy with the trans-individual and, as Lacan implies, only the trans-individual notes the declaration of the subject-body’s copulation as a sign of new knowledge. (Lacan 1998 p. 141) In Badiou’s theory, thirty three years later, the singular member of an object exposes that which a further object universalises. (Badiou 2009a p. 317)

---

181 Skelton states “from Seminar XX onwards [Lacan] returned to the concept of the sign, [which] is defined as ‘something that represents something for someone.’ While signification or the signified is created retroactively from the difference between signifiers the sign is more directly tied up with the Real.” (Skelton 2006 p.430) However, as I have shown Lacan’s use of the sign with the localisation of the extra signifier occurred earlier, certainly in *Radiophonie*. 
Chapter Nine

Lacan’s Subject-Body

9.1 Lacan’s Subjective Process

In the last two chapters I addressed Badiou’s criticisms of Lacan. This has been necessary because, although I use both Badiou’s and Lacan’s theory to further my argument, I am expanding upon both, principally following Lacan’s and being critical of Badiou’s. In this chapter, I am still addressing Badiou’s criticisms but I also begin to show why and where Lacan’s theory is more appropriate for my argument. I argue colour is an event because an extra signifier emerges from its site in painting. Its site is a reflexive set with an unpresented and irreducible element related to pigmented colour in painting. The second part of my argument involves the artistic subject, that the extra signifier with transcendental indexing emerges in a relation which is exposed via a relation between an element of colour and an element, an individual representative of an object of viewers, and that together colour in painting and its viewer/s are the subject form. I argue this because a viewer is a being-there site for localization and enveloped with painting as colour. This chapter focuses upon Lacan’s later theory which explores how an individual comes to be part of the artistic subject and how this subject-body is sustained.

Lacan theorizes how the Real gains consistency with new truth. As I have shown, he develops this theory of the subject-body over decades but in more detail in the 1970s. In Seminar XXIV, he specifically changes his analyst’s discourse. Whilst writing on the blackboard, he supposedly makes a “blunder,” which he obviously intended because he refers to it earlier on in the seminar and he also makes several references to intentionality. (Lacan 2008 pp. 17, 53) It seemed to Miller, an analyst present at the time, that Lacan was making a blunder as he had incorrectly written on the blackboard the mathême for his analyst’s discourse. Actually the mathême was Lacan’s new theory for the subjective process. He stated his blunder was about a new discourse with locatable consequences, that is, a new social bond which sustains a truth. The first discourse shown here is his mathême for the analyst’s discourse and the second his new
Analyst’s Discourse

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
A & \$ \\
\text{Symbolic} & \text{Imaginary} \\
\text{agent} & \text{work} \\
\hline
\text{truth} & \text{production} \\
\text{Real} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Whilst presenting the new discourse Lacan states “how is a subject with all [her] weaknesses, [her] infirmity, able to hold the place of truth, and even make it have locatable consequences in that way, namely that a knowledge …” (Lacan 2008 p. 41-2) Miller interrupts his sentence and tells him he has incorrectly written the mathême for the analyst’s discourse. Lacan promptly explains he compiled this new discourse because the analyst's discourse never amounts to anything. The S1 production of the analyst’s discourse is the beginning of a succession of numbers and “nothing but the beginning of knowledge. [It] is always content to be beginning.” (Lacan 2008 p. 42) As
I proposed previously, Lacan’s analyst’s discourse is a discourse of the evental site. Lacan describes the emergence of a signifier of the event from the site and the new knowledge it produces as “a means of astonishment.” The production is S2 knowledge about the Real in a new social bond. And he asserts it is “a new signifier that wouldn’t have any kind of meaning.” (Lacan 2008 pp. 66, 69)

Furthermore, it would emerge from a site in artifice because duplicitous subtractive strategies encourage such potentiality. He points to the strategies of the analyst’s discourse because he asserts the artifice of the clinic, along with art (he specifically mentions poetry), is a swindle. (Lacan 2008 p. 45) The fact that it is a swindle is the reason “why I insisted on making my letters [in the analyst’s discourse] turn around in speaking to you of S1, which seems to promise an S2.” After the new signifier ruptures the swindling discourse of a site, a new social bond holds truth in place for a new subject.

Psychoanalysis is ... a swindle that bears precisely on the relation of the signifier ... that has effects of meaning. It should suffice that I connote S2 not as being the second in time, but as having a double meaning, in order that S1 take its place correctly. (Lacan 2008 p. 44)

In other words, a double-meaning of S2, which plays upon relations with possible pairings and highlights undecidability, is within the swindling duplicity of the analyst’s discourse. An extra signifier emerges from this duplicitous strategy with the double meanings and cuts the succession of numbers. A new discourse is formed. However, the double meanings connect differently as undecidability with a subject-body because a new truth is sustained point by point with undecidability. Back in 1972 he had already theorised how the analyst’s discourse incorporates undecidability and how it results in

---

182 As Badiou explains “a site is simply a multiple to which it happens that it is an element itself.” (Badiou 2009a p. 366)Within such a site, an extra signifier from a reflexive set can be localized with an individual representative of a collective in appearing. Badiou explains the event is the multiple which “presents its entire site, and by means of itself immanent to its own multiple, manages to present the presentation itself, this is the one of the infinite multiple that it is.” (Badiou 2005 p. 180) He theorises the emergence into appearing with category theory, with transcendental indexing. (Badiou 2009a p. 360)
an extra signifier. 183 However, his theory about undecidability with new truth and the subjective form was also developing in the early 1970s. He describes it as fidelity to the new truth. He states, fidelity is required “to locate oneself” and such a faith “can act as a function of truth.” (Lacan 1972b p. 8) (Lacan 2002j p. VII 24) 184 In Logics of Worlds Badiou theorises that truth continues point by point with logical consistency, however, Lacan’s theory about undecidability with the discourse of the site as well as with the subject-body was pioneering in 1972. As I stated in Chapter Seven, this is Lacan theorizing the generic with neighbourhoods of the topological. Undecidability is embedded within the site and the new discourse. For example, the new discourse with the artistic subject is the trace with the relational tie between the multiple of colour, which presents the presentation of itself, and the trans-individual. In 1970 Lacan declared this with the tie between the empty set of bones and viewer/s in Radiophonie. Within the new discourse undecidability with a double-meaning of S2 allows truth to be locatable point by point. Thus the significant connection between the discourse of the site and the discourse of the subject-body is undecidability. The double meaning of S2 evokes undecidability firstly in the site from its position as truth in Lacan’s analyst’s discourse and secondly from its position as production in the new discourse of a subjective process.

One of the double meanings in the site doesn’t involve a drive to knowledge but a passion for ignorance, that is, truth with the subject-body doesn’t relate to an illusion of truth within old knowledge. 185 As Lacan stated in Radiophonie, new knowledge and old knowledge don’t have any relation. (Lacan 2008 p. 18) 186 Lacan’s subjective process involves “know-how,” which holds new knowledge with locatable consequences. 187 This is explicated in the new discourse with a over $S$ which localises

183 His theory about undecidability within his analyst’s discourse was within his Formula of Sexuation. (Lacan 1972b p. 16) The extra signifier “is purely and simply from something supposed.” (Lacan 1972b p. 8) The theory about undecidability is entitled Schema of Correspondence (Without Certitude).

184 Session 1 June 1972.

185 Ignorance is between the Real and the Symbolic in the Borromean Knot and the symptom spreads with ignorance from the Symbolic ring into the Real ring.

186 Badiou states, “The subject is neatly separated from knowledge by randomness.” (Badiou 2009d p. 2)

187 It relates to what occurs after localization.
the proper name of the event over and against old knowledge (unsignifiable knowledge of minus one trapped by old knowledge). S1 over S2 presents two relevant aspects of knowledge: know-how and articulated knowledge. Prior to a subject-body, articulated knowledge “initially arises at the moment S1 comes to represent something through its intervention in … an already structured field of knowledge” and prior to an event, know-how is within the master’s discourse, trapped like the unsignifiable within the site. (Lacan 2007 pp. 13, 21) The object a gaze is captured in the semblant position when an extra signifier is instituted. In relation to plus one theory, a over S holds realisation in a captured gaze as a function of minimum to de-totalise old knowledge. Duplicity with artifice implicates the extra signifier, which can stand in for minus one, and single it out as “notasstupid” as the other signifiers in the swarm of S1s. (Lacan 1998 p. 25) Pairing and the differing of relations with the first count is an issue here.

It is clear the Other cannot be added to the One. The Other can only be differentiated from it. If there is something by which it participates in the One, it is not by being added. For the Other ... is the One missing. (Lacan 1998 p. 143) 188

It is differentiated as alterity in the logic of appearing. The One missing as only the beginning of knowledge has, as I discussed previously, self sameness in both halting points. Topos and category theory define sameness as only a differing of relations in appearing. The relations differ because they involve many related ones for the same one that is structured. They produce a swarm. (Lacan 1998 p. 143) The subjective process as locatable consequence is faithful to a signifier of the event which ruptures the related ones.

Lacan declares minus one occurs with the analyst, a mystic and a woman. The analyst in the position of object a represses what she knows. 189 The mystic also represses her knowledge when she chooses to prefer herself rather than defined paradigms. The

188 My italics.
189 The knowledge represents a collective thought which counts the repression.
mystic and the saint “burn to find the best way to choose.” (Lacan 1972a p. 2) They consume themselves in finding the best way to prefer themselves.” (Lacan 2002j p. VII, 6) A woman chooses the position rather than what Lacan calls The woman universal. However, they cannot hold it for long. (Lacan 1972a p. 5) If an extra signifier emerges, their holding of the position becomes irrelevant. What was inexistent then becomes existent. Lacan’s Not All provides contingency for the extra signifier to emerge. (Lacan 2002j p. 14) As I discussed in Chapter Seven, to be precise the analyst, mystic and a woman create with the Not All “the gap of the undecidable, in other words, between the Not All and the not-one,” that is, a site which involves a set with the hole of an unnamed element. (Lacan 1994 p. 4) A possibility for the Real is made accessible with a decision but it is held in suspension as undecidability with the Not All in the site. The analyst, mystic and a woman only represent a choice as semblant a. As per Lacan’s plus one, they serve in the site as a function of minimum. The Not All allows for a cut to Imaginary transference and awaits the extra signifier.

Once nominated, S1 is placed and held over S2 on the right side of Lacan’s new discourse. In other words, if minus one is nominated, that is, singled out as “notastupid” as the other signifiers, a truth body will have locatable consequences. S1 will be in the place of Other on the top right. All the other S1s (S2) that S1 has relations with, will be placed under the bar in the position of production. As a point for localisation, a viewer declares a designation related to the site with the painting belongs to her symptomatic situation. Points of decision continue to be presented after an event and she must continue with fidelity because, as Lacan states, decisions with points sustain and provide locatable consequences. (Lacan 2008 p. 41) (Lacan 1972a p. 8) His point by point process with fidelity in the new discourse not only has undecidability in common with the site it also has the same agent of choice, the object a semblant. Hence, the site presents object a in the agent position prior to the event, and in the new

---

190 Pagination is from a print out.
191 Session 1st June 1972.
192 Session 9th March 1976.
discourse post the event. \(^{193}\)

The change in discourse from the site to a new discourse also points to a reversal in the hysteric’s discourse with a disruption to the hystericization of artifice because it reverses \(S\) over \(a\) in the hysteric’s discourse to \(a\) over \(S\). This alludes to what I term the first suture in Lacan’s theory of the event. It sutures the Imaginary and Symbolic. \((\text{Lacan 1994 p. 5})^{194}\) There are two sutures in Lacan’s suppléance. The second involves nomination. When both occur simultaneously suppléance occurs. \((\text{Lacan 1994 p. 5})^{195}\)

As I stated in Chapter Seven, their simultaneous occurrence places Lacan’s nomination with subjectivization. I separate the two sutures only to highlight the fact that if a shift occurs which only contains the first suture it is merely a displacement of the trompe l’oeil. \((\text{Lacan 1979 pp. 109, 111, 112})\) The change of discourse with the first suture places the \(a\) over \(S\), hence after an evental rupture the new discourse commences to point back to the site with each point by point decision, that is, the site and the new discourse both have the object \(a\) in the Symbolic agent position. As with the other discourses, the new discourse connects what is in that position with the Imaginary on the right hand side of the diagram. When this occurs in the new discourse object \(a\) connects with the extra signifier on the right hand side above the bar. The nomination, as I also showed in Chapter Seven, in the Imaginary position provides a new understanding of the Imaginary. The reversal of \(a\) over \(S\) arrests the gaze and ruptures the hysteric’s fantasy about being captured by the gaze of the Other. \((\text{Harari 2001 pp. 255, 253})\) The event and the ensuing new discourse also disrupt the hystericization of artifice for viewers of painting. A viewer’s request of painting is to procure know-how,

\(^{193}\) Lacan’s theory in 1972 incorporated a combination of set and logical theory. Perhaps category theory introduced by Eilenberg and Mac Lane in the 1940s, informed Lacan. Given topos and category theory is intuitionist it is not surprising Lacan may have confused some people, including the eager Badiou who questioned whether Lacan was an intuitionist but decided he was not. \((\text{Badiou 2008 p. 215-6})\) Lacan declared mathematics gave up on the question of minus one because of a lack of theory to procure the Real’s locatable consequences within the logic of existence. This amounts to Lacan interpreting “set theory [as] the questioning of ‘yad l’un,’” and the logic of appearing as lacking theory about fidelity. A suture without certitude had to connect being and being-there. \((\text{Lacan 1972b p. 4})\)

\(^{194}\) Session 13\textsuperscript{th} January 1976.

\(^{195}\) Session 13\textsuperscript{th} January 1976.
although she approaches with an Imaginary identification. 196

Hysteric’s Discourse

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\$ & S1 \\
Symbolic & Imaginary \\
agent & work \\
\hline
\text{truth} & \text{production} \\
 & Real \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
a & S2 \\
\end{array}
\]

New Discourse of the Subject-Body

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
a & S1 \\
Symbolic & Imaginary \\
agent & work \\
\hline
\text{truth} & \text{production} \\
 & Real \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\$ & S2 \\
\end{array}
\]

She approaches swindling duplicity in the structured hystericization of artifice to find know-how. In different words, the site of an ‘Artistic Truth Procedure’ is with a hystericized discursive tie, and as I argue in coming chapters, she has envelope-value with the art. Lacan defines hystericization as the “structural introduction, under artificial conditions, of the hysteric’s discourse.” (Lacan 2007 pp. 33, 23) Old knowledge is confronted when an affect of anxiety connects with something that is

196 It is a hysterical identification involved with questioning S2. (Harari 2002 pp. 241, 263, 352)
unknowable for the object a gaze. In her quest for know-how, the hystericized viewer engages with the site. An evental rupture to the hystericized tie displaces knowledge and the void is questioned with affect, connected to disjunction and associated with the desire to know. (Lacan 2007 p. 19) Old knowledge cannot process the unrepresented in a perceived world. Thus the unpresented exposes and de-totalizes knowledge. (Verhaeghe 2001 p. 80) (Lacan 2007 p. 144) (Lacan 1979 p. 103) The fantasy of a total knowledge began with a swarm of S1s in the Other. (Lacan 2007 pp. 32, 33) The hysteric’s discourse has a swarm in the barred position and what represents it for her is S1 as the phallus above the bar. 198

The hystericized viewer is initially like a hysteric, she desires to know articulated knowledge. The difference is a hysteric can go beyond the S2, master’s jouissance, which bars “a” by using it as the non meaning signifier in the signified position (in the master’s discourse). If she chooses the object a semblant position she offers herself as the guise of object a, as does painting with its duplicity. The difference between the hysteric and the hystericized viewer is that the painting has, like an analyst or a woman, already taken up the position of the Not All in the site. However, the hystericized viewer, although she searches for what her fantasy keeps barred, is shocked to identify with a it in hystericized artifice. She recognises it in the swarm of S1s and has a symptomatic identification with it. Her desire for articulated knowledge is cut with recognition of lack she feels with affect. The lack or undesignated minus one is revealed within an errancy. “It is not that affect is suppressed, it is that it is displaced and unrecognisable.” (Lacan 2007 p. 144) It remains unrecognised unless it is designated. (Lacan 1979 pp. 227, 236) 199 Duplicity pretends to hide it but when it is seen it is captured. Lacan’s first suture is the shock when “something is given not so much to the gaze as to the eye, something that involves the abandonment, the laying down, of the gaze.” (Lacan 1979 pp. 101)

197 Lacan states it is “a representation of lack in jouissance.” (Lacan 2007 p. 19)

198 The master’s discourse is the usual situation for the hysteric outside of the artificially hystericized world.

199 As errancy it can overtake representation, as in a dream like “Father I am burning.” (Lacan 1979 p. 60)
9.2 The Viewer

The Gaze, the Symptom and the Site

The viewer’s eye encounters something new. According to early Lacan, an “uncontrollable occurrence,” a suppletion, can substitute for a specific deficiency. (Harari 2002 p. 162) As I discussed above, Laurent’s example of an isolated element is a symbol of colour on a fish, which has “personal signification” for Frank Ghery. Laurent places such personal signification with art and complains it is a symptom displayed for collective use. (Laurent 2008 p. 7) He describes Ghery’s architecture, the Bilbao Art Museum, as displaying such a symptom. He complains that it “is presented as if the void has been ‘externalized,’ … that [it] gazes at us and fascinates us and provokes our gaze.” An externalized void becomes an object-spot, like a sardine can. (Laurent 2008 pp. 7-8, 8) (Lacan 1979 p. 95) He decries the fact that art belongs to its own worlds. In his view, art objects are in “excess” because they expose the artist’s symptomatic “personal significations.” The painter’s symptom intrudes. He declares analysts don’t present themselves as artists do. Analysts present a “compact object, which they have designated,” whereas artists represent objects in “excess.” (Laurent 2008 pp. 8, 14, 15, 19) In short, Laurent discounts sites other than the site in the psychoanalytic setting and he chooses to ignore the forms a Not All strategy can present in different contexts of artifice. Lacan was more open minded. In an early text Lacan discussed the presentation of a symptom in art as well as in psychoanalytic artifice. He was referring to “the symptom’s formal envelope” across worlds. (Lacan 2007 p. 190) This awareness of the site across worlds can also be seen in his reference to a site with a woman, a mystic and a saint. Also it is notable in his discussion with the students of May 1968 in Paris. (Lacan 2007 p. 190) I discuss in Chapter Twelve Lacan’s theory of the site as it pertains to politics.

---

200 Although Laurent doesn’t refer to Lacan’s 1964 theory on the arrested moment he mentions the sardine can apologue from the same seminar.

201 Lacan writes in a 1936 article about his entry into psychoanalysis. This text makes reference to a psychotic patient’s poetry. The trace of the symptom in its formal envelope “swings back in creative effects.” It seems symptomatic effects in artistic creations are a reversal of those in the psychoanalytic clinic. (Lacan 2006a p. 52)

202 Sites in Badiou’s theory are in different worlds. Nonetheless, Badiou states, “it is obvious that not all thinkable situations necessarily contain evental sites.” (Badiou 2005 p. 177)
Lacan has a theory of the worldliness of the symptom, which, unlike Laurent’s criticisms of the object-spot in a painting, shows Lacan values the artistic site. Moreover, his analysis of the singular symptom across worlds specifically affords a focus on a viewer of a painting. He describes a deceptive painted skull in the foreground of Holbein’s painting, *The Ambassadors*, as a trap where the viewer is caught. He states that where vision is ordered with relations across visible worlds “everything is a trap,” and specifically in the world of a painting, where a viewer becomes part of the relations within the symptom’s worldliness. (Lacan 1979 pp. 93, 85, 86) He describes how her vision is integral. She is confronted with her gaze in a world or “domain of vision [that] has been *integrated* into the field of desire.” (Lacan 1979 p. 85) Although her gaze is part of vision, vision can be displaced, which then reveals her privileged contact with the Real. Displaced vision confronts her with something undesignated and outside of perception. The skull in *The Ambassadors* has inverted perspective, an anamorphosis. The stretching of appearance captures the viewer when deception is realized within the logic of appearing. The gaze is differentiated from sight, perception is disrupted and swindling duplicity related to vision across worlds is revealed. (Lacan 1979 p. 89) Duplicity reveals what is objectivated with the phenomena of sight. In Badiou’s words, what is objectivating “is the multiple support and referent of phenomenology.” (Badiou 2009a p. 360)

Lacan describes the gaze which overwhelms the voyeur with shame. “The gaze in question is certainly the presence of others.” Lacan asks if it is just the existence of others looking at us that causes us to apprehend the gaze. He concludes it is not. We are not merely correlative with objects in a world, representations or “imaged embodiments” within signifying structure. (Lacan 1979 p. 89) It’s as voided animals we participate in the capture of the gaze. “The gaze intervenes here only in as much as it is not the annihilating [divided subject], correlative of the world of objectivity, who feels [herself] surprised.” (Lacan 1979 p. 85) The gaze that captures her is not a gaze that sees but a gaze imagined by her in the field of the Other. (Lacan 1979 p. 84) The

---

203 My italics.

204 In Chapter Twelve, I discuss Lacan’s appeal to the May ’68 students and refer to jouissance with a hole of shame.
viewer, similar to a voyeur, is captured because she perceives she is sustaining herself in a function of desire. (Lacan 1979 pp. 84, 85) Despite Laurent’s qualms, linked with the framework of the fundamental drives, the viewer does perceive something in the artist’s “personal signification.” (Lacan 1979 p. 89) She sees in the gaze of generic others, a recognition of her own “personal signification,” which sustains her connection to a point. 205 Multiple support and a phenomenological referent hold with a phenomena of sight. What is at stake “is to make up for the absence of the sole part of the real that cannot manage to be formed from being.” (Lacan 1998 p. 48) A new discourse occurs in the tie after the event. She is a minimum as a function and counted with the generic gaze of others via a universalised relation. She is a singularity with collective authority. (Mellard 1998 p. 3)

The gaze is caught because duplicity has revealed it isn’t about lack in vision, just the Real in the hole of the Symbolic, because a desire related gaze is not about vision. A hole does not appear. Displaced vision confronts us with an unpresented element, a Symbolic in the hole of the Real which is outside of perception. “If one does not stress the dialectic of desire one does not understand why the gaze of others should disorganise the field of perception.” (Lacan 1979 p. 89) Two holes are involved with the dialectic of desire. The capture of the gaze initiates change to both ontological and non-ontological halting points in the Real and the Symbolic. Duplicitous strategies point to both. However, according to Lacan’s preferred R.S.I. nomination, if she sees herself via “the gaze of others,” that is, the Real in the hole of the Symbolic she is counted with the universal symptom. She perceives she has been sustaining herself in desire. This cut occurs with nomination. Laurent correctly states the skull in The Ambassadors or the Bilbao sardine can is an “externalized” void. It has to be designated. Lacan describes the skull as a realization in form, “a different eye – that which flies in the foreground of The Ambassadors.” The cut enables a realization in form, a subject-body in “topological relation with others.” (Lacan 1979 p. 89) It is an articulation between viewers about “a different eye.”

205 Affect indexes a supplement in vision, which forges intimate and extimate relations between two halting points: the singular intimate counted with an extimate universal.
9.3 The Viewer and the Site

Laurent’s lecture rejects the possibility of an evental change occurring for a viewer of art. He describes an artist’s symptom as an impingement upon the viewer. However, as Lacan pointed out, art has a different duplicity in artifice to psychoanalysis. Laurent implies clinical practice is singular because it is directed to an individual analysand and analysts should not turn their “personal signification … into an object of fascination.” (Laurent 2008 p. 15) As I said above, the analyst, mystic and a woman, choose to place themselves in the semblant position so as to create a gap between themselves as Not All and the not one. This is a subtractive strategy for an evental site. Also a painting takes up the Not All in the site. It uses an artist’s “personal signification” to present semblance in the site’s agent position. The exposure of the artist’s symptom in the hystericized artifice is its connection with multiple support in the gaze of the viewer precisely related to the presentation of the collective gaze, which disorganizes the field of perception. (Lacan 1979 p. 89) Contrary to Laurent’s complaints, the artist and the analyst both present a site.

Lacan states when Not All is “held in place” it can sustain a correspondence so something new “can act as a function of truth.” (Lacan 1972b p. 8) If nothing occurs it falls away. He aligns the analyst with the saint and states quantifiable progress is not important. (Lacan 1990 p. 16) If the event falls away or “if it only happens for some” the faithful can nevertheless hold strong. The saint or the artist does not take up the Not All position for caritas but rather “to embody what the structure entails,” which is to allow for undecidability and the convocation of the subject.
Part C

Pigmented Colour and the Viewer of Painting as Colour

Part C presents an analysis of colour as an artistic event with painting also how and a viewer operates with the artistic subject.

C.1 Colour and Viewer Materiality

Chapter Ten examines Badiou’s theories of art and how they relate to the artistic subject-body. Chapter Eleven analyzes the materiality of colour in worlds of the sensorium and how pigmented colour lends itself to subtraction. I present a colourist strategy, which exploits the juncture between colour and light, to emphasize how pigmented colour exists in its own right and within a concept of sight. I examine how a viewer is within a nil relation with that which inappears with the colour. I discuss colour and negation and provide an analysis of how the logic of the non sequitur (a form of the excluded middle), combined with subtractive strategies, facilitates viewer engagement with the site in the classical world of a painting. Chapters Twelve examines viewer transference and subtractive strategies, Lacan’s evental sutures, and a viewer’s envelope-value. Chapter Thirteen addresses Badiou’s theories on the logical completeness of worlds, localization, and how Lacan’s unconscious is a being-there site.
Chapter Ten

Badiou’s Artistic Subject

10.1 Badiou and the Gaze

This chapter follows previous discussions about the subject-body and the Not All subtractive strategy. Once again I predominately address my second and third questions about the viewer as part of the subject and whether Badiou’s philosophy is compossible with Lacan. The major focus of the chapter is Badiou’s artistic subject-body. I analyse some of Badiou’s texts on art and one in particular, Dance as a Metaphor for Thought and begin with the question of the Imaginary transference in Art and Philosophy, which I discussed in Chapter Eight. I then analyse how he deals with the spectator of dance and a specific gaze. The chapter concludes with an analysis of an impasse in Badiou’s philosophical theories of the artistic subject and how this impasse means his philosophy is not compossible with Lacan’s clinic as a condition.

In Art and Philosophy, Badiou defines three schemas of art: didactic, romantic, classical and pedagogical. According to these schemas Lacan’s theory of art remains Imaginary and classical because it arranges for Imaginary transference with a viewer but doesn’t cut this transference. Badiou’s schema, the pedagogical, is opposite to psychoanalysis. It has a cognitive and revelatory function, which addresses the thinker. He describes viewers as “thinkers” who need to have their thought attuned by art. (Badiou 2005a pp. 7, 9, 10, 1, 4, 9) His pedagogical schema presents new thought for its viewers (thinkers) rather than an arrangement for a viewer’s engagement with new thought. In other words, attunement and new thought is already presented in the art. Viewers/thinkers only have to think about it. (Badiou 2005a pp. 4, 9) The thinking viewer doesn’t become part of the subject-body. She is only attuned by the subject demonstrated in the art’s new thought. Similar to this in Logics of Worlds, he discusses a viewer’s thinking processes as a deciphering of truth. A subject is “implicated in the demonstrative procedure” but the subject-body is with the art, which “allows” a viewer to decipher it.
The attunement contains a cut to a viewer’s Imaginary transference. He doesn’t describe how the cut occurs except, in *Dance as a Metaphor for Thought*, he states a spectator must be rigorously impersonal to avoid being a voyeur.

Just as the dancer – who is an emblem – is never someone, so the spectator of dance must be rigorously impersonal. The spectator of dance cannot in any way be the singularity of the one who is watching. (Badiou 2005a p. 67)

He declares the spectator/viewer must renounce everything in her gaze that is singular or desiring, otherwise she turns into a voyer. “The gaze of the spectator must thereby cease to seek, upon the bodies of the dancers, the objects of its desire. … But such a gaze belongs to no one,” which means the spectator “cannot be in anyway the singularity of the one who is watching.” (Badiou 2005a p. 67) This is a long way from Lacan’s voyer whose gaze is cut when she is suddenly confronted with how she is sustaining herself in a function of desire. (Lacan 1979 pp. 89, 84, 85) Badiou merely requests the viewer intentionally renounce her desiring gaze. “Renunciation” suggests constituent intentionality. 207 Also the word “renunciation” does not convey the shock of a suture. A “cut” is a more apt word because it implies a cut to constituted knowledge. Badiou suggests a dance spectator employ a “fulgurant absolute gaze,” as a technique to attain an impersonal gaze. He also states this gaze is necessary because dance is ephemeral. The gaze allows what he calls a “genuine spectator” to glimpse in dance the strong “charge of eternity” which “watches over disappearance.” (Badiou 2005a p. 68) The fulgurant gaze “grasps” the disappearing and vanishing gesture of an event in the artifice of dance. He asserts when “seized by a genuine spectator [it] cannot be used up.” 208 Later he refers to “naming” what has been seized. (Badiou 2005a pp. 68, 70) The grasping and seizing could imply a viewer is pivotal to a site. However,

206 “The key point is that the truth underlining the infinity of prime numbers is not so much this infinity itself as what it allows one to decipher about the structure of numbers.” (Badiou 2009a p. 32) My italics.

207 However, in *Logics of Worlds* Badiou states “consciousness for multiple beings is constituted by a truth [which] depends on an ontological theory of situations of being.” (Badiou 2009a p. 174)

208 My italics.
there is no theoretical explanation about her engagement with a site apart from the “impersonal fulgurant absolute gaze” and that she must renounce the singularity of her desiring gaze. The renunciation is necessary because art is “a universal address.” It doesn’t “address itself to the singularity of desire. ... The gaze of the spectator must thereby cease to seek .. the objects of its own desire.” Badiou is concerned the spectator will “refer us back to an ornamental or fetishistic nakedness.” (Badiou 2005a p. 67) In other words, the viewer’s singular desire for the naked bodies of dancers only refers the universal back to the singular.

Badiou, like Plato, ignores the singular symptom in preference to a universal symptom. As I discuss in Chapters Five and Thirteen, this results in an Imaginary nomination. Plato’s *eidos* is a name “stuck onto the real.” The solution to this is the Real makes a hole in semblance because that is where the site discovers the Real. (Lacan 1973-1974 p. II, 6-7) Plato imagined the Real from the Symbolic with mathematics because he placed the hole in the Real. (Lacan 1973-1974 p. I, 10) The *eidos* for him is the Imaginary as it equates with the certain image of things in ultimate knowledge, not the uncertain image of image with secondary knowledge. As I said in Chapter Five, Badiou also does this when he ignores the integrality of the viewer within the envelope of a painting’s world. His focus is the being in-itself in the painting. Plato “saw that without the *eidos*, there was no chance that names would stick to things.” Thus his nominalism was Imaginary. (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 106) Badiou implies the viewer’s singular symptom will expunge the universal. Hence he doesn’t address the relevance of the singular symptom as an enquiry, and he does not theorise or recognise the relevance of the cut to the Imaginary transference. The relevance of an individual’s symptom relates to the cutting of the Imaginary transference and a Real nomination. As I discussed in Chapter Seven, what Lacan advocates apart from the Symbolic nomination in some circumstances, involves the R.S.I. nomination: realizing (Real) the Symbolic in the Imaginary. (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 108) The Real nomination emerges from the Real ring and is with a singular symptom. The only way it can “work is that one puts there exactly the same signifier in all these empty places” because after all it is a signifier of “common error.” (Lacan 2002k pp. I, 2, 8) “Its radical function is to give a name to things with all the consequences this involves, because it does not fail to have consequences.” (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 109) It is constructed from the flaw in the Real,
the common error expelled from discourse. (Lacan 1998 p. 22) (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 108) In short, if the singular desiring gaze is renounced no provision is created for a cut to the symptom, which incapacitates the evental site.

His requirement to suppress the singular symptom is so paramount he not only requests the spectator renounce the singularity of her desiring gaze, he also demands it of the artist. However, when he makes this demand he combines their singular symptoms and gives the impression the artist and the spectator/viewer are the same. “Just as the dancer – who is an emblem – is never someone, so the spectator of dance must be rigorously impersonal.” (Badiou 2005a p. 67) He doesn’t indicate they have separate and specific functions in the evental site. This lack of definition is heightened when he also aligns the artist’s renunciation with what appears to be a Not All subtractive strategy. It appears to align with the Not All of an analyst in the position of object a in the analyst’s discourse who represses what she knows. However, he doesn’t explicitly align it with the site. He places the strategy with the artist because he is following Mallarmé, “the dancer does not dance” and a poem is “set free of any scribe’s apparatus.” (Badiou 2005a p. 66) The artist/dancer is subtracted from the art. “The dancer must never appear to know the dance she dances. Her knowledge ... is traversed as null, by the pure emergence of her gesture.” (Badiou 2005a p. 66) All of the artist’s pre-existing knowledge is subtracted and becomes a “subtractive dimension of thought,” even though knowledge is, through and through, its matter or support. (Badiou 2005a p. 66) He defines this as the thought body in the guise of an event. Although Mallarmé claims the subtraction of the artist’s singularity offers the viewer the nakedness of her own concepts, it becomes increasingly obvious in Dance as a Metaphor for Thought that Badiou’s main concern is the artist is subtracted so she can’t be a part of the subject-body. She is sacrificed and must disappear. (Badiou 2004a p. 109) Thus, although there is a similarity here with Lacan’s Not All theory, Badiou is not interested in the viewer being offered “the nakedness of her concepts.”

209 This has interesting parallels with Laurent’s criticisms of the artist’s “personal significations” in art as an ‘object-spot.’ Lacanian analysts such as Laurent cannot accept an artistic event occurs for a viewer within what Lacan calls the formal envelope of the symptom. The unpalatable issue for them is the artist with the painting duplicitously presents Not All with subtractive strategies, which index the potentiality of a possible site.
He asserts the fulgurant gaze assists the viewer because the universality of the artifice of dance makes an impossible demand upon her.

[It] demands a gaze – relieved of every desiring inquiry into the object for which the ‘vulgar’ body (as Nietzsche would say) functions as support – reaches the innocent and primordial thought-body, the invented or disclosed body. (Badiou 2005a p. 67)

A fulgurant gaze meets the demand because it is relieved of the singular symptom and is “only a flash of the gaze.” This allows a viewer to think and “apprehend.” Dance presents “the permanent showing of the event in its flight.” (Badiou 2005a p. 68) This is different to a permanently closed duration of time because “eternity does not consist in ‘remaining as one is,’ or in duration.” Badiou states “the spectator of dance must apprehend the relation of being to disappearing” and this can occur because “a ‘fulgurant’ gaze grasps a vanishing gesture [and] it cannot but keep it pure, outside of any empirical memory.”

There is no other way of safeguarding what disappears than to watch over it eternally. Keeping watch over what does not disappear means exposing it to the erosion of the watch. But dance, when seized by a genuine spectator, cannot be used up, precisely because it is nothing but the ephemeral absolute of its encounter. (Badiou 2005a p. 68)

I propose the issue is not the speed of the spectator’s glancing but rather the event’s flash of being for envelope-value. I propose a fulgurant gaze retaining the ephemeral absolute of its encounter is as hopeless as and hopeless because of a mere renunciation of a singular gaze. “The permanent showing” in artifice alone is not an event in flight. It is only a permanent showing of the discourse of the site. The production of the event is a new truth that is a synthesis in the entire materiality of the envelope. Empirical memory isn’t a threat to truth’s eternal state of becoming.

Previously I analysed Art and Philosophy and showed Badiou’s theoretical reasoning for including Lacanian psychoanalysis in the classical schema is incorrect. I addressed his criticism about Lacan’s theories of a cut to a viewer’s gaze. In Dance as a Metaphor
for Thought he requests the dance spectator renounce her singular desiring gaze and use the technique of fulgurant sight. However, it is reasonable to assume such renunciation and such a technique for viewing is limited and will leave a viewer’s singular desire uncut. Thus Badiou’s lack of theory about a cut to the gaze and Imaginary transference amounts to the very thing he accuses Lacan of in *Art and Philosophy*. (Badiou 2005a p. 7) In fact, it is his theory of art that is Imaginary, not Lacan’s. Nevertheless, he joins fulgurant sight to absolute thought, which, although this highlights immanence, it by-passes how fulgurant sight might cut the desiring gaze. The chief difficulty with theorising how it might make the cut is that it deals rather with immediacy and the effects of truth in appearing. In other words, his linking it to absolute thought appears to save his theory from the didactic schema which he criticises for alignment with immediacy and external truth effects. If the fulgurant is understood as internal to artifice, not an external connection with immediacy, it links with immanence, which is coextensive with the truth that artifice generates. However, the “Absolute” with the fulgurant is more than fulgurant sight itself because the Absolute is thought that is an eternal acquisition. (Badiou 2005a p. 68)

I posit that fulgurant sight is basically forced upon a spectator because of the ephemerality of dance. She tries to capture a dancer’s movement with flashing fulgurant glimpses much as a still camera captures a horse’s gallop with a series of still photographs. The question the artifice presents with this forced abnormal sight, beyond the challenge to capture immediacy, is “Can an event be glimpsed in the artifice of a body in movement?” Ironically duplicity of the artifice forces the spectator to account for the physicality of her own body, her very “vulgar body,” in situ with the dancer’s body. Although untheorised by Badiou, the reason the artifice wants this account is because the spectator’s “vulgar” body and her “normal” sight is part of its envelope and, as I discuss below integral to a minimum or nil value. The physicality of her sight and body in space and time is initially understood as secondary to the movement of dance and then to the supposed totality of the dancer’s body. The spectator is forced by

---

210 I refer herewith to fulgurant sight rather than the fulgurant gaze so as to differentiate it from Lacan’s gaze which is beyond the perceptual field.

211 Badiou places immanence with such coextensivity in *Art and Philosophy*. (Badiou 2005a p. 9)
the dancer’s movement, in front of her own body, to watch with fulgurant sight, but she
glimpses with recognition something outside of sight. The artifice of dance
duplicitably manipulates her sight to shift attention from physicality with immediacy.

A nil value relation in the envelope is a correlation between a spectator’s “normal” sight
with her commonable body and a multiple with the artificed dancing body. The relation
inappears but supposedly the dancing body appears. However, what inappears with the
dancing body is the materiality of the dancer’s commonable body. The nil relation is
between what inappears with the commonable body, the body held in common between
the viewer and the dancer. Fulgurant sight cannot capture the immediacy of the dancing
movement and the spectator’s “normal” sight points to the inappearing with her
“vulgar” commonable body. Thus, the commonable body becomes the material used by
the artifice of dance and its duplicity induces a cut which makes a new signifier
possible with the nil relation. The dancer’s body is artificed and as such is once
removed from worlds in the sensorium. Its subtractive strategies such as the forcing of
fulgurant sight emphasise the non apparent commonable body, apparent in its difference
to itself. 212 Dance explores how being with the semblance of what is artificed differs
from a body in the semblance of the sensorium. Thus the body’s worldly value is its
inappearance as minimum within envelope-value.

Eight years after Dance as a Metaphor ..., Badiou theorizes nil value in Logics of
Worlds. He discusses how the being-there-noise of a motorcycle becomes a disjoined
part of a conjunction in a visual landscape. (Badiou 2009a p. 128) Furthermore, he
connects the nil value to the viewer’s vision, and places her gaze with her body, “gaze
(or body).” However, he doesn’t place the viewer in the art’s envelope or integral to the
nil value. His example of how a viewer conjoins with nil value is with envelopes in the
sensory worlds of the sensorium. (Badiou 2009a pp. 128, 129) When he states, “All this
can do without my gaze, without my consciousness,” he forgets there is a difference
between the sensorium and a world of artifice. Artifice requires a viewer’s concept of
sight. However, amidst his examples of sensory worlds, he discusses a world of artifice,
the world of opera, but does not mention the viewer’s inclusion in its envelope. He

212 The non apparent is not there. (Badiou 2009a p. 123)
explains opera presents a bound moment of semblance, which simply serves to establish the envelope in artistic semblance. Implicit with this establishment, along with his misrecognition of viewer inclusion, is a surreptitious supposition that artifice can do without the viewer’s gaze and certainly without her symptom. For example, he states the establishment of a bound moment of semblance simply guarantees artistic consistency. (Badiou 2009a p. 131) I discuss below this avoidance of the viewer in Badiou’s theories of art.

10.2 Badiou’s Viewer and Art

Here I explore ephemeral artifice per se because Badiou asserts dance as ephemeral artifice harbours the strongest charge of eternity. (Badiou 2005a p. 68) I suggest a glimpse of an event occurs when an artistic subject with any artifice identifies a trace of being in the site. 213

Subtractive strategies within installation, sculpture and performance art throughout the twentieth and early twenty first centuries explore ephemerality and “cutting edge” formalist endeavours related to the avant garde. I cite my own ephemeral art practice, which explored viewer engagement with unscripted spoken language. 214 In 1987, I presented Betwixt and Between And the Deep Blue Sea. Viewers in several venues engaged simultaneously with spontaneous conversations which were illegally broadcast over the airwaves of two cities. The broadcast involved a multi-layered twenty four track analogue recording. Conversations were recorded and broadcasted simultaneously, that is, broadcast simultaneously with previously recorded conversations in real time. 215 This artifice was a response to Baudrillard’s criticism of

213 However, an event doesn’t occur with every artistic situation although it may contain duplicitous strategies.

214 In 1979-1987, I explored viewer engagement in what is commonly called ‘live art events,’ and in 1993 with an artist’s book of large etchings, Letter Lace: An Artist’s Book, which was exhibited, 1993, in 200 Gertrude Street Galleries, Fitzroy, Victoria. I also focussed in 1998-2004, on viewer engagement with colour as painting and colour as installation. The live art events provoked unscripted spoken language between viewers. The artist’s book of etchings presented “a challenge to the reader/participant [because it supplied her with] an opportunity to lace under and over a hole in knowledge and produce a work.” (Kent 1993 pp. 1, 3)

215 The audio event, Betwixt and Between And the Deep Blue Sea, was part of Australian Regions Artists Exchange, and simultaneously broadcast in Sound West Studios (a 24 track recording studio), Curtain
the Paris uprising of May 1968. He proposes two dimensional art (student poster art in 1968) and the electronic media (radio and television) are similar because both prohibit viewer response. (Baudrillard 1985 p. 86-7) Transitive communication between viewers was the material used by the artifice and the nil value relation was between intransitive communication and viewers barred transitive communication. Duplicity within the real time format enticed viewer engagement however the transitive communication was constantly cut in the broadcast by previously recorded conversations. The cuts maximalised the intransitive and cut singular narratives.

The crucial issue for any artifice, whether it is static or non static, avant garde or otherwise, or even a political event such as the Paris May 1968 uprising, is that it present a possible evental site via strategies which engage the singular symptom. The site can then accommodate an aleatory event with any artifice. As I discuss in Chapter Thirteen, a viewer becomes part of artistic subject because she identifies the trace related to a symptom that is the site. However, despite Badiou’s assertion about ephemeral artifice and how the fulgurant with dance “safeguards” the event with a “permanent showing,” I suggest duplicity with ephemeral artifice simply highlights how an event can occur, despite chronological time in a world. Ephemeral art with “present-ness,” real time, or as Badiou mentions “local time” or “pure time,” in the end only presents different variations on duplicitous strategies for the site and different minimums within envelop-value. (Badiou 2005a pp. 82, 87) The issue of chronological time may be integral to specific evental sites however, there is a different time involved with the knotting of the finite with the infinite. 216 What is of consequence is artifice presents the site, engages its viewers and a subject-body is realised.

In Fifteen Theses on Contemporary Art Badiou asserts what is needed is an infinite subjective series and the precise means of summation on the side of finitude. Art must be pure and stay within defined art forms. He accuses cinema and multi-media art of

---

216 Despite Badiou’s assertions in Dance as a Metaphor for Thought he states elsewhere “the name is the present – the only present – of an event,” time is the gap between two events and the intervention of an event founds time. (Badiou 2009d p. 3) (Badiou 2005 pp. 210, 265)
appropriating other art forms and thus being impure. \(^{217}\) “We need to create new art, certainly new forms, but not with the dream of a totalisation of all the forms of sensibility.” (Badiou 2004a pp. 104, 107) Rancière states Badiou’s theory on art is undoubtedly modernist. One of the characteristic traits of modernism is “the affirmation of watertight separation between the arts.” (Rancière 2004 p. 222) \(^{218}\) Badiou does state art is not exactly pure form even if there is something like “progressive purification.” \(^{219}\) However, his modernist approach with a purification of form produces dead ends. “After Malevich, all correlation between shape and colour looks old, or impure.” “We cannot continue.” He ends up with “sequences of purification,” which he explains is much more than a rupture of pure creation. (Badiou 2004a p. 108) Despite his warning “not to be obsessed with formal novelty,” there is an emphasis in *Fifteen Theses on Contemporary Art* on modern formalist progression. He explains it is the forcing and fidelity with successive points which continue after the subject-form of the event. In *Logics of Worlds*, he describes this as a “subjective identity.” “Its materiality is constituted by the consequences drawn day after day from the event’s course.” (Badiou 2009a p. 51) The materiality of the subjective production for Badiou’s artistic subject is reorganised by the consequences of successive points and these points of art are works of art. They are new forms which follow the artistic event’s course for progressive purification. This progressive purification is far removed from the singular symptom.

In *Fifteen Theses on Contemporary Art* there is no analysis of viewer engagement. This is not surprising given Badiou doesn’t include a viewer with the artistic subject. (Badiou 2005a p. 12) “What shows are works of art, which are the real subjective existence of art in itself.” (Badiou 2004a p. 109) “The subject of an artistic process is

\(^{217}\) He also discusses the site and the viewer with cinema. Interestingly he takes on the viewer’s role in cinema and states he is “travelling in the company of an Idea, rather than being able to take possession of it.” Later he states “It is not so much what we know but what we can know. ... To indicate what there could be, beyond what there is.” (Badiou 2005a pp. 82, 85, 88)


\(^{219}\) His example is Malevich’s *White on White*. “Colour and form are eliminated and only a geographical illusion is retained. This illusion is the support for a minimal difference, ... above all, the null difference between white on white, the difference of the Same – what we would call the vanishing difference.” (Badiou 2007 p. 55)
not the artist ... The subject points of art are works of art.” (Badiou 2001 p. 44) However, in placing the artistic subject only with the art, Badiou is also inadvertently placing it with the artist. I argue the art on its own is just a potential site, which is an unrealized subject. And the artist is only part of such a site. As I discussed above, although Badiou asserts every pre-existent aspect of an artist’s knowledge is subtracted, which places the artist with the subtractive strategies of the site, he misses how an artist’s desire aligned with the site is part of such strategies. He proposes the artist forgets pre-existing knowledge so as to manifest undecidability in the site.

The dancer abolishes every known dance because she disposes of her body as if it were invented. So that the spectacle of dance is the body subtracted from every knowledge of a body, the body as disclosure. (Badiou 2005a p. 66)

Then as a “subtractive dimension of thought,” the “dancing body ... is a thought-body in the guise of the event.” This means, subtracted from her body, the dancer manifests the site, the dancing body, which gestures to a suspended decision. It suddenly becomes a thought-body. Badiou’s spectator encounters the thought-body and the pedagogical schema then educates the spectator to think through the thought-body. (Badiou 2005a pp. 66, 9, 77) He doesn’t theorize the encounter except to say a spectator can then think through and decipher new artistic configurations or developments with purified art forms. 220

In The Subject of Art, Badiou places the subject between the corporeality of the art work and the name. The body supports the subject as the reality of the subject. (Badiou 2005b p. 2) His nomination subsists in the body of the art. He avoids the viewer’s body except to denigrate it with body art, which he describes as a paradigm where a subject is identified with the body as an “exposition of itself.” He describes it as a subjectivity of enjoyment that is the Western paradigm of today. Moreover, he places jouissance with the denigrated body of the viewer and places it with the paradigm of body art. (Badiou

220 Dance as a Metaphor for Thought ends with Badiou deciding “dance is not an art but only a sign of the capacity of the body for art.” (Badiou 2005a p. 70)
Contrary to this, Lacan’s evental signifier has the substance of jouissance. Lacan’s subject-body “enjoys itself only by ‘corporizing’ the body in a signifying way.” (Lacan 1998 p. 23) It is the named enjoying substance between knowledge and jouissance. His subject is the name and the body. Post his event there is a new discourse. The name on one hand is with knowledge, and jouissance, which affects the subject-body, is on the other. He theorised this with the empty set of bones in *Radiophonie*. The signifier of the event assigns the enjoying substance as belonging to a situation, that is, the enjoying substance becomes a logical consistency. Badiou however, in his avoidance of the viewer, only places jouissance with the body’s Imaginary exposition of itself and only refers to the name within the body of art. (Badiou 2005b p. 2) (Badiou 2009a p. 51)

I argue the viewer’s body is discursively tied to the corporeality of the art work via her concept of sight. Thus the tie has envelope-value. The artistic subject-body is the synthesis of the envelope, which contains the materiality of both bodies. As I discuss in Chapter Thirteen, although Feltham avoids a definition of the artistic subject-body, he also places the viewer with the entire materiality of the artwork. He analyses Meyerhold’s theatre and places the viewer with the theatrical event, which he states “transforms not just the stage and its objects, but the entire material space of the auditorium including the audience members.” (Feltham 2006 p. 251)

### 10.3 Bestowal of the Gaze

Badiou’s theory of art reveals an impasse with the individual’s singular symptom, which impacts I argue upon what Badiou terms as a twentieth century renaissance for philosophy. “Lacan is a condition of the renaissance of philosophy. A philosophy is possible today, only if it is compossible with Lacan.” (Badiou 1992 p. 83-4) Badiou’s impasse creates a lack of compossibility with both Lacan’s theory of the philosophic pure act and psychoanalytic practice as a condition for philosophy. Much as *eidos* for Plato was not the uncertain or deceptive image of an image with what he called secondary knowledge, Badiou’s impasse with his pedagogical art schema avoids the Real of the singular symptom’s hole in the Symbolic. (Lichtenstein 1993 pp. 2, 1) (Plato 2007 pp. 344, 346) His theory places the artistic subject only within the art work,
hence truth, as fait accompli, is only presented to a viewer for her attunement to new artistic configurations, that is, her intellectual development about new thought in art. His impasse thus restricts “subjective identity” to the purification of art, which is circumvented by modernism. Although he can recognise his artistic event and subject-body within old as well as new art, his schema, along with its operations of subjective identity, are bound to the progression of formalism. For example, such formalist subjective strategies, aimed only at new artistic configurations, result in formalism for the sake of formalism. The crux of the matter is, Badiou’s theory of art and truth doesn’t estimate immanence (internal to art) and singularity (singular to art) can include a viewer (singular symptom) in its envelope. (Badiou 2005a p. 9) However, I argue that art is rigorously coextensive with the truths that it generates and truths have a locatable instance with individual viewers internal to the artistic effect of the works of art. Furthermore, these truths are singular to art, that is, the truth testified by art absolutely belongs to the materiality of its envelope. Despite himself Plato pointed to this with his analogy about functionalism with the carpenter. As I stated in Chapter Three, the aim of the artist’s product, if the artist has an “eye on form,” is to meet the true function of the product equivalent to the knowledge of its form, which is its logos. The user of painting is the viewer who has a true knowledge about a concept of sight and can see the production is for her use because the true function of a painting is produced for knowledge of the form. Hence the true function for a painting involves making reference to “what is” as a remove from the truth of being in its physical form, so as to create a truth of being in knowledge for a viewer within a sentient logos. In short, the event occurs with the concept of the sense of sight in an envelope of a painting because painting aims at human sentience. In addition, as I discussed above, if the singular desiring gaze is renounced, no provision is created for a cut to the Imaginary with the singular symptom and this lack of a cut incapacitates the efficacy of the evental site.

It is pertinent here to mention how Feltham analyses a split in Badiou’s theories, which I propose correlates with Badiou’s artistic subject.

The problem is not that Badiou sometimes says that the party itself is the political subject and not the support. The problem is rather [a] split between the subject as agent of change and as support of change. In
Being and Event there is a ... split in the definition of the subject: between the subject as certain types of action – forcing, disqualifying the unequal – and the subject as the body of change – a series of revolutionary works, a ground breaking theorem. (Feltham 2008 p. 79)

In relation to the political subject, Feltham asserts it is the subject as agent of change, which cause a political transformation to occur throughout an entire society. (Feltham 2008 p. 79) He explains the split occurs because Badiou wants both “praxis” and “poiesis” and he suggests that if Badiou is to avoid such a split with discrete agents and products, he will need to show how the process of change is not only ongoing but identical to the new structure it gradually establishes. (Feltham 2008 p. 80) Further to this I propose the split between the subject as agent and as support of change occurs with Badiou’s impasse, his lack of focus upon the singular symptom in his art theory.

Badiou’s dancer in Dance as a Metaphor for Thought presents a site via a Not All strategy. Thus dance is presented as supposedly incomplete for, as Mallarmé proposes, the viewer’s sake. (Badiou 2005a p. 66) In Theses on Theatre, Badiou states that the theatre-idea is incomplete because it is stuck in eternity unless there is a bestowal of the collective’s gaze. The emphasis first and foremost is upon the theatre being completed. Also, although the public are relevant for theatre’s completion, the focus is a collective gaze not a singular desiring gaze. Desire as well as what Badiou calls the “theatrical act,” is not a concern for a singular spectator. Desire is taken in hand by theatre, because desire is its subject matter. (Badiou 2005a pp. 73, 75) It is addressed on stage for viewers, that is, desire is presented as all worked out for its viewers. He declares it is the duty of theatre to “recompose upon the stage” living situations and to “embody” intelligence, force, desire and mastery via “the effect of the theatre-idea.” (Badiou 2005a p. 76) Thus viewer’s minds can be educated and attuned. Furthermore, it is not a singular spectator but the public who are relevant as they participate in the order of the similar. They participate in the prevailing idea (eidos) of theatre to complete it. Badiou explains the public is required because theatre needs to go from “eternity to time.” Nonetheless, there is a risk involved for theatre. A generic public that comes together by chance, without any particularity such as being a defined community (an audience who are all women or all teenagers etc.), must be constituted as a “complement” to the
theatre. (Badiou 2005a pp. 72, 73, 74)

The public represents humanity in its very inconsistency, in its infinite variety. The more it is unified (socially, nationally, civically ...), the less useful it is for the complementation of the idea, the less it supports, in time, the eternity, and universality of the idea. Only a generic public, a chance public, is worth anything at all. (Badiou 2005a p. 74)

This seems to be a reference to how Badiou’s generic multiple in Being and Event counts all enquiries as a collective totality. However, this totality is different or becomes clearer in Theses on Theatre, which is written seven years after Being and Event.

Who can ignore the fact that, depending on which public one is playing to, the theatrical act does or does not deliver the theatre-idea, does or does not complement it? (Badiou 2005a p. 74)

His point is if the public is a defined community, it is less useful as a complement to “the universality” of the theatre-idea. Moreover, the chance involved relates not to the singular or typical member of the object but rather to what is the best kind of public to judge theatre’s universal address. The theatrical act is restricted by whether its public can make a universal judgement. “Theatre falls under the category of restricted action, and every confrontation with the ratings will prove fatal.” The public, he states, comes to be “struck” by theatre’s ideas. Nevertheless, the risk involved is about how will theatre’s universal address rate if its public isn’t of an infinite variety and therefore doesn’t complement its universal address. Theatre’s subject-body must avoid the

---

221 The multiple has “all the common traits of the collective in question: in this sense it is the truth of the collective’s being.” (Badiou 2005 p. 17) What was indiscernible and inconsistent emerges as a consistent truth of the collective because the negated property is defined at the same time as contrary property.

singular symptom if it is to fulfil its universal address because its appeal is to a collective totality.

According to Lacan, as I discussed in Chapters Two and Five, focusing on the collective and the universal symptom is a downfall for a philosophy because it doesn’t remain faithful to its pure act. (Lacan 1998 p. 30-1) The collective world view represents the fantasy of equivalence within the sexual relation, which is based upon an Imaginary illusion, a fantasy embedded in discourse. As I show in Chapter Thirteen, the generic multiple is universally exposed in the localization process. Badiou states it has all the common traits of the collective in question. However, it may be common to all but the singular trait is precisely where the truth of being must be localized, because the illusion of equivalence with the sexual relation is materialized in the universal. In other words, the sexual relation is only in discord because it can’t be founded in the universal. (Lacan 1971-1972c pp. 57, 65) As I stated in Chapter Two, the relation of two with equivalence is founded in universals. The question ‘how does universal man relate to universal woman?’ is imposed upon us with the initial reciprocity between S1 and S2 in discourse. In fact, the imposition is founded upon this question. If there were no discourse or this question of man and woman “we would not have to bring the universal into play.” (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 57-8) Badiou’s impasse requires the collective gaze to complete theatre. He misses the relevance of the singular symptom and that the question of collective identification relates to Imaginary nomination. It appears from his theories on the Artistic Truth Procedure that it isn’t the singular spectator/viewer but the artist he is referring to in Being and Event, when he states “in mixed situations, … the means are individual but the transmission and effects concern the collective.” (Badiou 2005 p. 340) However, a transmission rather than a teaching about the event is with the subject-body, not the art work, that is, not the artist with the site prior to the event. There is a difference between the artist with the Not All strategy in the site, “subtractive dimension of thought,” and transmission after the event. It is not the singular symptom of the artist, the personal signification that Laurent dreaded, the site in the body of the art, that is conveyed in transmission because, as I showed in Chapter Nine with Lacan’s insight about the analyst’s discourse, that is only the site that never arrives. Nevertheless, Badiou hangs onto undecidability, the suspended decision in the site. A permanent showing and undecidability in any artistic site only indexes Real blockage in
the Symbolic. What is required is not an Imaginary but a Real evental nomination, which realises the subject. If he is to avoid Imaginary nomination, Badiou needs to realise transmission and effects depend upon a subject point locatable as exposed by a relation of nil value in the envelope, which involves a cut to the Imaginary with a singular symptom. In other words, the transmission is with the viewer who is part of the artistic subject, internal to the artistic effects of the works of art and belonging to its envelope. The emergence of such transmission and effects concerns the individual, not the collective, for the sake of all. As I discuss in Chapter Twelve, the secret of new knowledge is conveyed to the collective but as I also discussed in Chapter Five, it is not transmitted via S1 in the master’s discourse.

It is the singular symptom that discloses the full material body, which convokes a new point. Badiou doesn’t want the singular desiring gaze of the viewer to be exposed and subvert the universal address. However, Lacan’s theory and clinical artifice is about such exposure and use of the symptom. A viewer’s gaze, supposedly with sight, is cut and she is confronted with something outside of perception, yet realized within the logic of appearing. (Lacan 1979 pp. 85, 86, 85, 89) Something of her gaze correlates with what inappears, which indexes an undesignated and indiscernible multiple. (Lacan 1979 p. 89) The something that is outside of perception, seeks, from within the enveloped site, a nil value relation. The dance spectator’s displaced normal sight and commonable body, which inappears, seeks a minimum for this relation. “The gaze in question is certainly the presence of others” but the cut isn’t caused by others looking at her, by a gaze that sees, but by what is imagined as personified in the presence of others, the collective. It is caused with a sudden knowledge of the inadequacy between One and the Other. (Lacan 1998 p. 49) She is thrown upon what sustains her in desire. (Lacan 1979 pp. 89, 84, 85) It is the Real, which makes realisation in a hole in semblance possible. This cut to the singular intimate is what allows the generic multiple to count all the enquiries of collective totality, an extimate universal. It reveals the gaze is not about what appears to lack in her concept of sight but an acknowledgement, naming, of what is inadequate, incomplete in the art’s universal address.
Chapter Eleven

Subtraction and Colour’s Materiality

11.1 Colour’s Materiality and Apartness

Following on from Badiou’s theories on art this chapter continues to analyse the nil value relation and materiality within an art work’s envelope. It focuses on painting and how the viewer’s sentience is integral to colour in painting. The first section explores many of the issues about colour raised in the first four chapters. It examines how formalist subtractive strategies facilitate an evental site in painting as colour with colour’s materiality and apartness from light. I cite theorists and various artists who belong to only a few who have discussed colour over the centuries. Their comments deal with the negativization of colour and colour’s capacity to be a threat. The focus of this section is on the relationship between the materiality of colour in the sensorium and pigmented colour in painting. Also in this chapter I examine how this connects to negation and the excluded middle, and I continue to place emphasis on a viewer’s integrality.

As I discussed in Chapter One, colour is considered unstable, unrestrained, endlessly displaced, deceptive, and even dangerous. (Brancquemond 1885 p. 46-7) (Hardin 2013 p. 8) (Hyman 2006 p. 45) (Taussig 2006 p. 42) (Batchelor 2000 p. 31) These characteristics relate in part to colour’s materiality. Take for instance its supposed deceptiveness. Gage declares colours are often involved in visual deception with physical properties because colour is rarely perceived as it is physically. (Gage 2006 p. 7) This deceptiveness is due to its being seen as ephemeral and optic, as superficial reflectance dependent upon invisible wavelengths, rather than form and the haptic. Colour’s physicality is simply variable types of higher or lower energy dependent upon molecular processes. The variations occur between different colours. (Gage 2006 p. 78)

---

223 For the most part the artists are modernists from the twentieth century.

224 Objects reflect some wavelengths of light and absorb others.
Even its reception into the physical body is not all that physical as the retina’s cones simply convert the physical into electrochemical energy. Once it reaches the brain, the recognition of colour depends on inference and memory. (Gage 2006 p. 7-8) In addition, a viewer’s knowledge of colour’s physicality is always incomplete. We can’t apprehend it without adequate phenomenological and empirical proof? (Lacan 2007 p. 47) 

Also as I have discussed, Western art has considered tone in painting to be primary and colour secondary. Tonalist painting has been most dominant. (Gage 2006 p. 17-8) Its principle concern is the definition of form and shape. It employs shading (lightening and darkening) and the density of represented light to delineate and portray the volume of form and shape. This involves the admixture of white or black pigment to coloured pigment. However, colourist painting is contrary to this. Its principal concern is the exploitation of the juncture between colour and light. It relies on portraying the atonality of colour so as to separate colour from tonalist shading and light. It achieves this with the use of pure or saturated colour and colour’s inherent tone. (Gage 2006 pp. 38, 216) It emphasises colour’s apartness from light because its inherent tonality doesn’t reference the density of light. For example, yellow’s inherent tone is lighter than blue. Colourist painting subtracts it from light to makes it distinctly different. The strategy is a specific formalist approach. Formalism stresses self-referentiality, art for art’s sake, art that exists in its own right. (Gage 2006 p. 216) Colorists have a strategy of “colour for colour’s sake.” Given its principle concern is the juncture between colour and light, the strategy stresses colour’s disjunction from light by accentuating how colour exists in its own right. The colourist Sonia Delaunay states, “Colour [needs to be] liberated from descriptive, literary use; colour grasped in all the richness of its own life.” (Delaunay 1978 p. 213-4) 

The subtractive strategy accentuates what is usually

---

225 A viewer only has an Imaginary meconnaissance of the non-seen spectrum in white light. Savoir (scientific knowledge) is Symbolic knowledge and meconnaissance (or connaissance) is a misunderstanding which occurs with a viewer. (Lacan 2008 p. 4)

226 Gage describes Sonia Delaunay as colourist. Her “sense of vivid colour was stronger than that of her husband, Robert. She came from Fauvism, while he came from Neo-Impressionism, and [he] was always more concerned with the creation of light and movement through colour, than with colour for its own sake.” His “particular interests were with light and transparency rather than colour as hue.” (Gage 2006 p. 38)
subordinated to the density of light, that is, colour’s inherent tonality or apartness is usually what inappears. The strategy emphasises not all is presented in the supposed unity of white light or light’s prominence. Moreover, colourist painting subtracts colour from light in the sentient tie to provide a site for colour as an event with pigmented colour and the concept of sight. This facilitates a cut to a viewer’s scopic drive and Imaginary transference.

Tonalist painting reduces colour to tinted shades of chiaroscuro. Colour’s inherent tone is usually ignored and hidden from the viewer.

The colourfulness of painting since the Renaissance [has] been greatly reduced. Colours might have been used with a certain amount of brilliance to portray specific local material, but they always had to participate in the general greyness of tonality. (Rothko 2004 p. 40)

Stokes disparagingly describes colour’s inherent tone as different from the accepted notion of tonal differences, which maintain the dominance of form and volume.

Colour is a glorified form of tone, but one so glorified, bringing with its two further dimensions, hue and intensity, such a host of relationships foreign to the purely linear progression of tone from lightness to darkness, that no misapprehension about the meaning of colours to the fantasy could be further from the mark than to conceive of colour as a bright yet convenient fancy-dress facilitating the perception of tonal difference. (Stokes 1937 p. 62)

Colour’s inherent tonality or apartness from light has long been disparaged and considered secondary. For example Gage’s research shows despite the fact colour’s materiality is intricately linked to light as energy, there was and still is a belief in Western culture that “light and colour are distinct entities.” (Gage 2006 p. 15) Nevertheless, colour’s inherent tone was distrusted and treated as inferior in comparison
with the tonal binaries of light and dark. Also “accidental” colours, such as the evanescent colours of rainbows, were not considered separate to light until after the late Middle Ages. (Gage 2006 p. 15) However, the “accidental” colours or colour linked with glass or gems were more highly valued than colour in other materials because “accidental” colour appeared to generate light itself. (Gage 2006 p. 20) Also colour and light were seen as distinctly different entities because light or lux was considered to be the source, and colour with luxem a mere reflection off surfaces.

Colour’s inherent tone usually is inconspicuous unless it is emphasised in colourist painting. When a viewer does perceive it, she sees it as colour having its own light and as a sign of colour’s apartness from light. It inappears and thus has nil value. Oiticica points to an invisible atomistic materiality with this inappearing. “The meaning of the signal does not matter here, since coloured structures function organically, in a fusion of elements, and are a separate organism from the physical world.” (Oiticica 1992 p. 35) Sensed in the discursive tie, a sign of colour’s apartness as inappearing can become a material inscription of what is not. Subtraction accentuates this potential with colour, rather than emphasizing how colour depends on or represents light. Oiticica relates the sign to colour’s separation from the optical.

Yellow, contrary to white, is the least synthetic. [It] detaches itself from the material structure, and expands itself. Its tendency is towards the sign, in a deeper sense, and towards the optical signal, in a superficial sense. ... The meaning of the signal, here, is one of internal direction … the sign being [colour’s] profound, non-optical, temporal expression. … The important thing here, (with pigment-based colour) is the temporal light sense of colour; otherwise it would still be a representation of light. (Oiticica 1992 p. 35)

---

227 There was “a premium on the contrast of light and shade, [which] continued to be a major – if not the major – preoccupation of painters until modern times.” (Gage 2006 p. 17-8)

228 My series of paintings, Night Rainbows, point to ‘accidental’ colours, as they portray the spectrum in rainbows but they are placed in a night sky. Thus an inappearing with coloured pigment comes to the fore.
Colourist painting emphasises colour’s inappearing and thus its potentiality as an event. However, it’s difficult to determine colour’s material apartness from light. In fact, most of the time colour is barely differentiated from light. Perhaps this is because colour is ephemeral and optic. Wavelengths in general belong to light’s physicality but colour’s distinct physicality is the spectral specificity of variations of energy in wavelengths. It is simply easier to consider colour as integral to the structure of light and thus seemingly dependent upon it. Gass points affirmatively to colour’s integrality with the structure of light and how colour surpasses line.

Line should be matched against colour, not colour against line. The unity of the line is derivative anyway, borrowed from the object it presumably limns, and that unity may be quite imaginary. ... A colour’s unity is inherent, however, since it is continuously, insistently, indivisibly present in what it is. Furthermore, every colour is a completed presence in the world, a recognizable being apart from any object. (Gass 1976 pp. 73, 76)

What Gass is describing here is not colour’s apartness from light but rather its constant presence with light, and when he states colour is recognizably separate from any object, this fact is only because colour is structurally part of light. His comments don’t address the problem of colour’s integrality with light or how colour is different to tone and line with light. These two problems can be summed up as follows. Firstly, as I discussed in Chapter Six, light was valorised and colour made secondary because light was understood to be a constant presence, a guide that knows where the viewer needs to look, and basically to be the master of the viewer’s house. (Kusnierek 2008 p. 31-2) (Merleau-Ponty 1962 p. 361) If colour is only integral with light it has this power, along with tone and line. Secondly, colour is different from line and tone because they report on form. If colour only reports on form it is forced to serve a different approach to its pertinence to a sense of sight. When colour appears apart from light its central role with the sense of sight, specifically within the sentient tie in painting, is acknowledged.

229 As I discussed in Chapter Three, as lemons have a taste and pertain to a sense of taste, colour has and pertains to visibility, a sense of sight. (Hyman 2006 p. 17)
However, a colourist subtractive strategy takes advantage of colour’s structured integrality with light. It juxtaposes the integrality against colour’s apartness from light to emphasise colour’s central role with the concept of sight and the artifice of painting. The viewer has to choose between the two positions. Colour’s central role is incontrovertible despite the fact it relates to colour’s inappearing. Thus line and tone in painting accentuate colour’s role in comparison to their priority which is haptic, that is, the main concern of line and tone is to elucidate light’s definition of form for the sake of guiding our sight. However, line and tone are not specifically about the sense of sight. Colour can help report on form, for example with coloured traffic lights, but it is more about the “how” of seeing than the “what” is seen. Light makes form visible for our sight but the visibility also supports a concept of the sense of touch. Colour is only about the sense of sight in its own right. This is why colour has a central role with painting. As I discussed in Chapter Three and the previous chapter, the enveloped sentient tie is painting’s salient concern. If a painting’s aim is to be seen and to create a difference by being seen, the tie with a viewer’s sight is required, hence colour’s central role in painting is to address the painting’s aim and create a difference in a viewer’s concept of a sense of sight. Immanent and singular to painting, it is colour which addresses how sight is construed upon a negated third term, how an unpresented element in the disjunction between light and colour is relayed within the discursive sentient tie. Thus painting as colour facilitates colour as an event which is immanent and singular to painting and specifically with human sight. Such an event can only occur with colour because colour is about a concept of sight, which is sight for sight’s sake, sight in its own right.

Although colour correlates with a viewer’s Imaginarization, Gass does have a point when he states the unity of the line, which is derivative anyway, may be quite Imaginary. (Gass 1976 pp. 73, 76) Colour is not as Imaginary as line because line gains its “unity” in the Imaginary of the image. There are similarities here between Gass and Kristeva. Kristeva writes about how colour escapes narrative representation. She describes the signified of colour as freed from the signified of a ruling representation. “The unfolding narrative must be broken in order for what is both extra and anti-narrative to appear.” (Kristeva 1980 p. 214) She declares Giotto’s colour appears to be independent from the signified narrative.
[Giotto’s colour] constantly *pits itself* against the ever present norm. It tears itself from the norm, bypasses it, turns away from it, absorbs it, goes beyond it, does something else – always in relation to it. (Kristeva 1980 p. 215)

However, as Kristeva states the signified of a ruling representation still rules. Line is not considered as secondary and subordinate to light. As I showed in Chapter One, line and tone have been prominent for a long time in Western art. They were employed to constrain colour. Ruskin and Blanc were disparagingly aware of colour’s ability to surpass line. Ruskin asserted, “While form is absolute, so that you can say at the moment that you draw any line that it is right or wrong, colour is wholly *relative*.“ (Ruskin 1857 p. 194-6) And Blanc, “The predominance of colour at the expense of drawing is a usurpation of the relative over the absolute, of fleeting appearance over permanent form.” (Blanc 1874 p. 169) It’s not surprising after centuries of this kind of prejudice, a viewer still expects colour in the sensorium to merely report upon form as line and tone do, and hence colour is expected to play the same role in painting. Lichtenstein asserts line or drawing’s prominence is misplaced with painting. “The rules of sculpture are obviously those of drawing [and] drawing is nothing other than the grammar of painting whose true practice begins only with the art of *coloris.*” (Lichtenstein 1993 p. 160)

A key factor for colour’s inappearing is secondariness, which is why it has been negativised for centuries. In fact, it has been the object of extreme prejudice, systematically marginalized, reviled, diminished, and degraded. (Batchelor 2000 p. 22) I refer to secondariness within colour’s invisible and visible physicality.

1. The Invisible Physicality of Colour.

There are two relevant categories here. Firstly, the spectrum is known to be part of and yet generally hidden in the structure of white light. It is only visible via refractions when light passes through one medium to another with a

---

230 She cites Roger de Piles who states drawing only makes visible contours of form. (Piles 1677 p. 102-3)
different velocity. Prismatic colours are revealed in rainbows because the sun’s rays are doubly refracted, reflected, and dispersed through mist. Secondly, colour’s invisible physicality at either end of the spectrum with infra red and ultra violet is known but not readily visible to the eye. What is essential about both of these categories is colour invisibly “appears” or is known to not appear. The physical inexistence implies an invisible atomistic materiality. However, colour’s possible invisibility is due in the first category to its need for light to create refraction, that is, it is not seen in the being-there of appearing apart from light’s active role with refraction. In the second, light doesn’t make colour appear at either end of the spectrum. Colour exists as infra red and ultra violet but the viewer can’t see these colours. What inappears within sighted sentience is the issue here for a viewer, not what inappears beyond sight. After all, colour is transparent along with light, thus it is not considered to exist in the dark. However, whether it is seen or not, colour is considered to be is dependent on light for its existence. Both categories show colour’s dependence on light, which only reinforces the collective prejudice that colour’s dependence on light makes it secondary, that is, anything dependent is subordinate. Thus colour was negativized because light was considered a far more important structural concept. (Gage 1993 p. 70)

2. **The Visible Physicality of Colour.**

   The old term “lux” designates light and “luxem” colour. In the Middle Ages, luxem was understood as flowing from the whiteness of lux. Colour was considered to be an attribute of light. Lux was “the primary creative source” and controlled the flow of colour. Medieval thinking saw light in two ways, “Lux, the light source, and luxem, light reflected from surfaces.” (Gage 2006 pp. 70, 20) Lux these days measures the area over which light spreads and luxem measures light falling on something. Lux measures the intensity of light. Hence, tone, as the quantity of light, is more related to lux. Lux measures radiance. It emits, sends forth, disseminates and issues. Luxem however, measures illumination. It adorns, decorates, depicts, lightens and clarifies. Radiance appears powerful, active and masculine, whereas illumination, passive and feminine. Illumination results from the use of light. It occurs when
you light something up. Male is light as source and female light with colour, aligned with surface and materiality. Lux transmits and luxem receives. Lux controls luxem. Luxem along with colour and the feminine is seen as secondary.

Colour’s invisible materiality makes it appear to inappear and its visible materiality is considered subordinate to light, which also makes colour inappear. In both categories colour is negativized and negativization connects with the minimality of inappearing. Moreover, negativization inscribes inconsistent multiplicity. Both categories of inappearing can be further categorized. The first, referring to concealment with refraction and colour beyond visible spectral variations, is about colour’s existence in relation to the parameters of human sight. The second, concerning lux and luxem, is about worlds of the sensorium connected to collective prejudice toward dependence per se. Such prejudices are in discursive social bonds, that is, within the sentient tie.

As I mentioned above and in Chapter Four, colour is about the “how” of seeing, how sight is construed upon a negated third term which is concealed within an existential interdependence between a viewer and colour in the tie. Colour exists in the sensorium apart from sensory knowledge but if it is to be known to exist it exists as a concept of the sense sight in discourse. Thus colour is dependent on human sentience to be known. Dependence also occurs for the viewer who cannot know of the existence of visible colour unless it is sensed in the tie. The viewer has a power of knowing the sense of sight, a power of the eyes as Plato called it. However, if a viewer is kept ignorant of such power, and cloistered from any inscription of inconsistency, then discursive structure can remain stable. Cruz-Díez discusses such stability and explains colour “has been and remains anecdotal to form” because it is unstable.

Perhaps this is because traditionally colour has been thought of as an ‘accident’ (due to its changing nature, when what the individual usually wants is stability). This is why there have been attempts to subordinate colour to the stability of the individual, represented in painting by drawing (form). (Cruz-Diez 1989)
As I have shown in Chapters Two and Five, colour is a threat because it can undermine and change discursive structure. Colour has an errant and peripatetic way of threatening to break out of its constraints. Berenson thinks some kind of forbidden joy might escape if colour in artifice surpasses line and tone.

In ... visual representation ... colour must necessarily be the servant. ... Colour cannot range free but must serve rapid recognition and identification. ... In the figure arts, you cannot sacrifice any of these in order to attain the unadulterated enjoyment of colour. (Berenson 1948 p. 74)

Colour is constrained because “more than drawing,” it “liberates” the viewer from old conventions. (Matisse 1945 p. 100)

### 11.2 Negation of Colour

I continue here to focus on the apartness of colour as well as the viewer’s integrality. If a viewer has the power of knowing with the eyes she can perceive an inscription of inconsistency. How does inconsistent multiplicity referenced to existent colour come to consist within the being-there of the sentient tie? Badiou theorizes being-there with a transcendental operation, which provides identity or difference. The operation with phenomenology determines the minimum. It co-joins in synthesis any finite number of multiples with a measurement of more or less for consistency. “Operational phenomenology identifies the condition of possibility for the worldliness of a world, or the logic of the localisation for the being-there of any being whatsoever.” (Badiou 2009a p. 103) Although Badiou skirts the issue, I am placing the discursive structure of human sentience with his theory of the transcendental. Firstly, the being-there of existent colour is bound to degrees from the being of colour. As I discussed in Chapters Three and Four, there is a pure multiple of existent colour. And there is a separate being

---

231 Yves Klein describes the viewer and colour as both trapped by line. Colour is enslaved by line because line depicts the exterior world and colour is expected to do the same. However, he asserts colour presents signs to free both colour and a viewer. (Klein 1995)

232 Matisse points to how “all Renaissance painters constructed with drawing first then added colour.” (Matisse 1945 p. 99)
of colour with existent colour’s sense of sight in the tie. Just as a lemon has a sense of
taste colour has a sense of sight. The logic of localization for the being-there with a
concept of a sense of sight is in the synthesis of an envelope of painting. Badiou insists
what is of concern with operational phenomenology is not that the operations lend
consistency to appearing but that they are a synthesis for consistent appearing. (Badiou
2009a p. 103) The first transcendental operation involves a minimum, that is, colour as
inappearing is a non-apparent in a determinate world and a nil value relation also
involves the being of a multiple of colour or its ontological component, which is
negated in appearance.

Once it has been ontologically identified, thanks to the order of
transcendental degrees, we can think the non-appearance of this multiple
in such and such a world. … But the non-apparent is not the apparent
negation of the apparent. What we are concerned with here is the
difficulty … of making negation appear. (Badiou 2009a p. 105)

The operation that determines the non-apparent apartness of existent colour in the
copula of colour and light is the first transcendental operation. In discursive sentience,
the apartness inscribes the negated third term which is, as I discussed in Chapter Two,
the absent term in the relation of two in equivalence. A symbol as semblance for this
being of apartness, in the reciprocity of S1 and S2, is represented as a mirage (S2). The
symbol conceals the third term or being of colour’s apartness. When the mirage fails,
the third term is symptomatic for the being-there singular viewer, that is, when she
identifies something specific to her in what underpins (third term) the inappearing of an
apartness of colour. It is identified in the disjunctive relation of an evental site. As a
symptom it repeats and colour’s endless peripatetic displacement in unconstrained.
(Lacan 2002k p. VI, 5) If an event emerges, an extra signifier stops the repetition and
substitutes for the third term.

Badiou discusses light as an example of a negation of appearance. Kant, he says,
unconvincingly declares dark is the negative of light. Dark or night is the negative of
light or day. Dark or night is not negated. Negativized colour which is secondary to
light is not negated. This goes to the heart of the transcendental structure of consistency
or visible being-there. “This question has haunted philosophy from its very origins. [It involves] the impossibility of negation to come into the light of appearing.” (Badiou 2009a p. 105) Existent colour’s secondariness and negativization, which becomes part of a minimum relation, can be the minimum degree of existence. What is negated is a pure multiple related to colour’s apartness, not colour’s minimum degree in existence. Negativization touches on a negation of a Real. “The negation of being-there rests on the affirmative identification of being qua being.” (Badiou 2009a p. 105) The viewer of painting has clung to a collective apprehension of colour’s secondariness for centuries because such power differentials are the same as they are in society. I discussed this old collective knowledge in Chapters One and Two in relation to the fundamental fantasy and what is emptied of being. In the discursive structure of the sentient tie, the second in the relation of two, is what is secondary. The so called second sex is woman emptied of qua being for the sake of signifying relations. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 55) It is where colour is emptied qua being for the sake of signifying relations in visual representation for a viewer. In Chapter Two, I explained there is something of colour which is emptied in this relation because it offers the negated absence, in its relation to the minimum, the “emptied as being,” to the effects of the inscription in sentience. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 3) The first transcendental operation is the minimum that “appears” to inappear, an inappearing of the apartness of colour. It indexes a negated Real or unknown about colour’s apartness.

A minimal relation is within an envelope with the sentient tie in a world of the sensorium or in a world of artifice. 233 The following are minimal degrees of existence related to colour’s secondariness for possible minimal relations in different worlds.

- Colour’s secondariness to light as source in visual worlds of the sensorium.
- Colour’s secondariness to light (rationality and certitude) in visual worlds of social orders.
- Colour’s secondariness to light and tone (tonalist painting) and line (drawing) in

---

233 An envelope is a part of a world “where a differential value of appearance is the synthetic value adequate to that part.” (Badiou 2009a p. 130) Badiou theorizes the minimum relation in an envelope sets the scene of the other envelopes “beneath” it. “There exists an envelope of B .. if the set of the elements greater than or equal to all the elements of B admits of a minimum.” (Badiou 2009a p. 584)
worlds of Western art history and art institutions.

- Colour’s secondariness to light with tone and line in the artifice of painting.

Obviously the first point affects the other three points. The second and third both impact upon colour’s possible minimal relation within the artifice of painting, that is, a negativization of colour in society and art worlds are convictions and prejudices in collective knowledge embedded in a viewer’s sentient tie.

11.3 Pigmented Colour and the Excluded Middle

Pigmented Materiality and the Sensorium

Colourist’s subtractive strategies emphasise colour’s apartness from light, which subsequently accentuates the materiality of coloured pigment. The viewer of painting as colour is confronted by two aspects: the make believe of colour in the artifice and the material presence of colour as pigment. She prefers the make believe of semblants. Subtractive strategies enhance both aspects and lead to a decisive occurrence with an excluded middle. Colour is forced to play a make believe role for the viewer in the artifice of painting. Nevertheless as pigmented colour, it has material presence. This presence is completely different from the unity of constant presence colour has with light, which I discussed above with Gass. (Gass 1976 p. 76) Berenson points to the material presence of pigmented colour, although he thinks colour should be subordinated to form.

Where the work of art is envisaged as existing in a realm of ideated sensations [artifice] and not of sensations of those experienced in the workaday world [sensorium], colour is a difficult subject to treat. For colour belongs to the world of immediately present and not merely imagined sensations, and is only less material than tasting, smelling or touching, because it is perceived by one of the two signalling, reporting, informing senses, and not by the three more cannibal ones. (Berenson 1948 p. 74)

Pigmented colour has material presence in painting and this is sensed literally by the viewer even as painting represents colour which is supposedly in the sensorium. Blue
pigment for example is sensed as blue. It is not merely perceived as the imagined blue of sky depicted in a figurative painting. Blue pigment even in monochrome painting is within a two dimensional artifice of “ideated sensation.” Although, monochrome painting and much of twentieth century Western art aimed to convey “truth to materials,” to enhance the actuality of the materials used, the materials, in this case pigmented colour in painting, nevertheless remains within the bounds of artificed representation. As Berenson asserts, the ideated sensations of pigmented colour are difficult “to treat” in comparison to the sensations of colour with the “workaday” world. Likewise the viewer is disturbed as she compares pigmented colour to colour in the sensorium. As I have discussed above, she expects colour in painting to be the same as line and tone and merely report and inform her about visibility. Colourist subtraction undoes the expectation because it emphasises colour’s apartness and pigmented materiality.

Subtraction causes colour to shift within expected ideated sensations and the constraints of artifice. \(^{234}\) It uses colour within semblance along with the immediacy of pigmented materiality to ensnare the viewer.

 Colour in colour is born of any and every place of the pictorial organization, in its immediacy – its particularity. .. What is of importance in painting is paint. … Colour is of inherent significance in painting. (Olitski 1967 p. 20)

Colour maintains a fidelity to the world of painting as painting’s inherent significance. Its only definition is as paint. It is colour in colour, that is, sensorial colour within pigmented artifice. Its immediate gesture, undefined by drawing, appears integral to the surface of the painting and separate from colour in the sensorium. Buren declares the problem of line with its delineated shapes and contours is dissolved when colour, previously considered as subordinate, is seen to be of great importance. (Buren 1973 p. 234)

---

\(^{234}\) Wilkes refers to such instability. Colour can deflect its enslavement by line and change the “direction of a light beam as it crosses a boundary between two media with different refractive indexes.” (Wilkes 1979 p. 389) This causes an aberration because it deflects and distracts a viewer from line’s containment.
15) Coloured pigment is then understood to be painted as the image of itself, and subtraction in painting then explores the significance of pigment as colour, or painting as colour.

Merleau-Ponty describes a presence of nothing that shifts a viewer’s concept of sight.

Colours seem to have been born slowly upon the canvas, to have emanated from some primordial ground [like an] ‘inarticulate cry.’ ... Once it is present, it awakens powers dormant in ordinary vision.
(Merleau-Ponty 1964 p. 182)

A viewer attributes a preliminary existence to colour. However, painting as colour is a subtractive strategy which entices the viewer to engage with a multiple of nothing in a site of evental colour. It separates her concept of sight from what Merleau-Ponty defines as ordinary vision. When the duplicity of subtraction is revealed the viewer’s gaze is caught.

Kelley writes about colour’s materiality in art and cites a psychoanalyst, Janine Chasseguet-Smirgel, who links colour with sham, counterfeit, deceit and trickery. She describes colour as misrepresentation. Kelley connects her analysis with what occurred in the 1970s with some painted sculptures in Beverley Hills.

A rich Saudi Arabian sheik ... decorated his house in a thoroughly garish manner; including for example, a row of copies of classical statuary painted naturalistically – right down to pubic hair. These works initiated an ongoing battle ... that ended only when the house was burnt down by an arsonist. Even though we now know that Greek statues were painted when they were made, their present function as a popular sign of taste and order will not allow this fact to be recognized. The timeless order of the neo-classical conception is an appropriate symbol for the upper

235 “Colours are primordial ideas, children of the aboriginal colourless light and its counterpart, colourless darkness.” (Itten 1970 p. 8)
classes. … What was most dangerous about [the] painted statuary was that it hinted at presentness, a here and now that always entertains the possibility of a loss of position and power. The sheik’s sculptures were symbolically unsuitable objects for the decoration of a Beverly Hills mansion. No wonder, then, that aesthetic arguments can shift into violence when the politics of the sign are so loaded. (Kelley 2003 p.30-1)

Kelley refers to a presentness, here and now. Colour is seen as literality with presentness. The trompe l’oeil shifts and colour as semblant is revealed to resemble itself in another context, hence Kelley’s reference to Chasseguet-Smirgel who described colour as deceptive. If colour in painting resembles what it imitates then what it imitates is true and the semblance is a lie. 236 Colour is at the same time in the world and in artifice. As a semblant in artifice, it has to comply with a two-dimensional demand and only supposed to represent the “true” situation of colour in the sensorium. However, if duplicitous subtraction enhances the materiality of coloured pigment, a viewer is confronted with falsity and a shift of the trompe l’oeil occurs. Pigmented colour is seen as misrepresenting the “true” of the sensorium and is seen as a sham. Kelly hints at this when he links the literality with colour to the logic of the non-sequitur.

Historically, literalness has been considered the enemy of art. Along with material itself, colour is one of the most loaded signs of the quotidian. The literal use of material is a non-sequitur in art. No one would seriously consider the idea of sculpting a body out of actual flesh, or carving a rock out of stone. What would be the purpose of such a redundant exercise? Colour is thus set at a different conjunction between sign and signified, a problem that is negated in painting because it operates in two-dimensional space – which is why painting has been king of western art history, with sculpture relegated to the role of its idiot cousin. (Kelley 2003 p. 29) 237

236 “A semblant resembles what it imitates.” (Grigg 2010 p. 1)
237 My italics.
He points out two aspects related to negativization. The sheik’s sculptures were symbolically unsuitable for Beverley Hills because the taste and order of the Beverley Hills world wouldn’t allow an ancient Greek context to be recognized. Both aspects relate to prejudice within a social order. He incorrectly defines this negativization as “negation” when he states painting negates the literal materiality of pigmented colour, that is, when colour is required to appear separate from the sensorium. However, the artifice of painting effectively veils semblance in both worlds to maintain negation. What is negated is the multiple of nothing, which errs in the second count. The negativization of colour veils the negation. Moreover, prior to her engagement a viewer knows coloured pigments represent colour in the sensorium. She “both believes and doesn’t believe in semblants but in any case opts for them over the real thing because paradoxically they are a source of satisfaction.” She is happy to make do with them. (Grigg 2010 p.1)

**Colour and the Non-Sequitur**

Following on from Kelley’s statements about the non-sequitur in painting, I examine its logic. It is syllogistic and defined as a subset of the excluded middle. Its fallacy involves failure to distribute the middle term over at least one of the other terms, for example, all collies are animals, all dogs are animals, and therefore all dogs are collies. The middle term is in the predicate of both universal affirmative premises and therefore is undistributed. It has the logical form: all C are A, all D are A, therefore, all D are C. In this instance, it occurs when pigmented colour is used to represent colour in the sensorium.

- All colour in the sensorium is sensorial colour.
- All pigmented colour in the artifice of painting is sensorial colour.
- Therefore, all pigmented colour in painting is the same as sensorial colour in the sensorium.

The conclusion doesn’t follow the premise because pigmented colour in painting is not entirely the same as sensorial colour in the sensorium. However, the logic shows painting relies upon an interconnection between worlds and that pigmented colour is sensorial colour. As I discussed in Chapter Ten, when viewer engagement occurs within
an envelope of artifice, an artistic event can emerge and produce truths immanent and singular to art. She is encompassed with the envelope’s synthesis and after the localization process she is part of the truth-body and principally because of her sentient tie, which is with an inter-worldly grasp. There is a difference between artifice and a world of the sensorium: the envelope of the sensorium does not require a viewer’s vision. Nevertheless, as I have shown, her Imaginarization with an adjacent world of the sensorium impacts upon her engagement in an artificed world with a shift of the trompe l’oeil and the relinquishment of her gaze. The logic of non-sequitur disconnects the premise (all colour across worlds is sensorial) from the middle term (colour is sensorial in the artificed world) and disconnects the middle term from its extension (colour in the artificed world is the same as that of the worlds of the visible sensorium). The conclusion is incorrect because it does not distinguish the difference or separation between the worlds. The viewer sees this falsity and is forced to face her misrecognition because something is missing. She is, via her vision, the logical connecting link between both worlds therefore something becomes a logical deficit for her. Duplicitous subtraction has led her to this deprivation in appearing. It makes her aware pigmented colour is separate from colour in the sensorium. She can verify this because, as a logical power, she is included in inter-worldly transcendental operations. She also knows the sensorium can exist without her inclusion. However, if she is part of an envelope in the sensorium, as Badiou states, and she is co-joined with its inappearing relation, she knows there is a logically instituted worldly connection, which exists because of her conscious sight. (Badiou 2009a pp. 114, 128) In addition, she knows a multiple of sensorial colour can co-belong in different worlds.

The sets of the non-sequitur are established but the conclusion is incorrect: not all worlds that contain sensorial colour are the same or not all sensorial colour is the same. Nevertheless, the fallacy of the non-sequitur over the centuries has related to pigmented colour’s inaccurate representation of colour in the sensorium. Colour in painting must pretend it is not colour in its own right because it must represent the sensorium. Its pretence or make believe is seen as false and secondary, and thus negativized. It already exists as sensorial colour thus logically it does not follow that it needs to pretend to be what it is. Two facts are clear. Pigmented colour is a re-presentation of an existing sensorial representation. And, the artificed world requires viewer engagement.
Subtraction and a shift of the trompe l’oeil can facilitate a realization that the materiality of the pigment is a different phenomena with its own objectivating multiple supports. The distinction is made in her sight, not her gaze. The concept of sight informs her the distinction is based upon the difference in matter: the materiality of pigment is different to the materiality of colour in the sensorium. Pigmented materiality is reflected colour. It is a representation of wavelengths or optical signals received in human sight. We can follow the argument of the non-sequitur to a point. Colour in the reflected light of pigment can be measured and shown to contain all visible wavelengths.

Colour can be measured … by optical wavelength. Reflected colour, however, coming from paint and pigment … is much more difficult to define. When analysed with an electrical spectrograph reflected colour shows that it contains all visible wavelengths. Therefore, any reflected colour – not just white – consists of all other colours. (Albers 1963 p. 39)

In fact, everything a viewer sees is reflected colour, and all the rest of colour and light is absorbed.

We perceive colour when light strikes an object and is partially refracted. The band, or colour, that we perceive is that which is reflected from the object while the rest of the light is absorbed. Thus, a leaf appears to be green because the green part of the spectrum is reflected. We might therefore more correctly say that a leaf is anti-green. (Durham 2008 p. 234)

There is more to painting than this reflected congruence. Coloured pigment is not as vibrant as colour in the sensorium. 238 There is a richer reflectance in the greens of leaves than in green pigment. However, the most notable difference is coloured pigment is used for “artificial” purposes. The artifice is a creation and a different world to a

---

238 “Spectrometers … measure the light reflected from coloured bodies [thus] it has been possible to verify ... there is a great difference in the spectral composition of the green colours of vegetation and the pigmentary greens used by painters to reproduce the colours of nature.” (Grandis 1986 p. 55)
Kelley refers to a literality of pigmented material. (Kelley 2003 p. 29) This involves a negativization of colour’s resemblance to itself in another context, which conceals the negation of its multiple support. The fact the literality of coloured pigment is negativized connects with Lacan’s theory of the Imaginary phallus, which is, as Santiago explains, always artificial. In the second count it veils the semblant of being, which is the error’s semblant in the Symbolic, the episodic substance of the object a gaze. Negativization veils the semblant which in turn veils the negation of the inconsistent multiple. The viewer’s relation with negativized colour is a conjunction in the artificed envelope. The two have material minimality in common, which is a minimal existent above an inexistent. The minimality is an empty category in the logic of appearing.  

Subtraction leads the viewer to the nil value relation the two have in common and it ensnares her via her Imaginary identification to what is negated behind the negativization of coloured pigment. She identifies with the literality and then realizes, as a result of a cut to the Imaginarization, pigmented colour is no longer mere resemblance.

The logic of the non-sequitur is involved with the shift of the trompe l’oeil. As its etymology in Latin implies, it does not follow through, yet supposedly supplies proof of a correct deduction. In fact, the logic presents the verisimilitude of the trompe l’oeil which cannot follow through with an evental shift. There is a middle term, which is not distributed in at least one of its terms. Its logic is a syllogism that deduces a specific truth from general truths. A general set and a subset are established, and then a member of that subset is identified. It considers only two extremes. As a false dichotomy it negativizes the “other side” to make it appear worse than it really is.  

The point of the non-sequitur in any context is its fallacies are derived from a deficit in logic and erroneous logic is generally conceived as concealing a truth, better to say an errancy. Its deficit displays “there is no discourse which would not be of the semblant.” (Brusa

---

239 It is an objectless category in the terminology of category theory. (Badiou 2013 pp. 7, 2)


241 [http://www.atheism-analyzed.net/Logic.pdf](http://www.atheism-analyzed.net/Logic.pdf)
In Lacan’s theories an evental shift, which contains two simultaneous sutures, both a shift of the trompe l’oeil and a second suture, exposes semblance with discourse in artifice and in the viewer’s sentient tie. Just as the error in logic is declared to be an error in the logic of appearing, the error the non-sequitur hides contains errancy. The verisimilitude of the trompe l’oeil, or double meaning of artifice declares there is an error in discourse that relates to the second count, a deprivation in the logic of appearing. The extra signifier that emerges with the immanence and singularity of art supplies the truth, that the non-classical world of the sensorium is not all. However, a mere shift of the trompe l’oeil does not reverse the minimum. Subtraction can assist but if the shift is not intense an event will not happen and the shift will only be a mere acknowledgement of an interesting anomaly with the verisimilitude. However, if an event with nomination occurs the gaze is captured and simultaneously the event sutures being to being-there. This changes a viewer’s concept of the sight of colour in painting and also in the sensorium. A new signifier with the literality of pigmented colour threatens all sensorial visibility because what underpins the error of the count is revealed.

There is a further complexity here between non-classical and classical worlds. Badiou defines landscapes in the sensorium as non-classical. Thus an observation he makes visually is not true or false because the sensorium does not satisfy the principle of the excluded middle and does not validate the law of double negation. (Badiou 2009a p. 184) Colour as an event alters the logic of a world because it breaks from what regulates its appearance and summons its being in the appearing of its own multiple composition. And it alters a viewer’s concept of a sense of sight in painting and the sensorium, that is, colour as an event alters the logic of her sight in the sentient tie in relation to both worlds, firstly the classical world of a painting and secondly the non-classical worlds of the sensorium. The logic of the non-sequitur can thus be stated.

- All visibility is semblance
- Artifice is semblance

Badiou discusses an overturning of the law of appearing with other events. (Badiou 2009a pp. 363, 365)
Therefore artifice is the same semblance as the semblance of the sensorium.

What is concealed is the difference between the semblance with artifice, which is a classical world and semblance with worlds in the sensorium, which are non-classical. The difference is visible semblance is only part of the logic of appearing in a non-classical world because its visibility is only known in a concept of a sense of sight. As I have stated previously, visibility can only be known if it is seen within the sentient tie. Furthermore, visibility in the sensorium that exists as a sense of sight can only be ruptured with colour as an event, and only firstly with the specificity of its site in a classical world of artifice. Thus the logic of the non-sequitur in painting amounts to the following. Sensorial pigmented colour in the artifice of painting exists as a sense of sight in the viewer’s sentient tie. Subtractive strategies in paintings show pigmented colour resembles sensorial colour in worlds of the sensorium so it can with an enveloped viewer eventually rupture semblance per se within the visual discourse of the tie. The result is, colour as an event achieves a new truth with a concept of a sense of sight, which is for a viewer an entirely new transcendental evaluation of colour’s visual materiality in painting and all visible worlds.
Chapter Twelve

Site Specific

12.1 Colour as an Event and an Artistic Subject

This chapter primarily addresses my argument that a viewer is part of the artistic subject. It attends to my third question about compossibility between Badiou’s philosophy and Lacan because it presents the case for the singular symptom as the pivotal imperative for the site, why the individual viewer is specific to the site and how this impacts upon subjectivization and the subject. Following on from Chapter Eleven, I begin with subtraction in painting as colour which points to what is not and what precisely demarcates the evental site’s specificity. In Chapter Six I began to examine how the site’s specificity relates to the individual. In this chapter I analyse this more closely and areas which are crucial for philosophy because the site is its condition and its act, and that the seizure of truth is contingent upon the subject as act. Lacan asserts transmission occurs precisely from the specificity of the site. (Lacan 2002k pp. VI, 3, 5, 12) Also he declares there is a potential problem for philosophy with the site’s specificity and also this specificity with transmission when the extra signifier is conveyed as truth across worlds. As I discussed in Chapter Five, the signifier conveys the truth of being within universal logic because it is “constructed from” what is a “common error.” (Lacan 2002k pp. I, 12, 2, 8) In Chapter Six, I discussed a true doxa which is an individual’s supposition about her own error specific to the site. This is important because, although it is common to all, the error is specific to each individual separately, and it can’t be normed as conventional doxa in the master’s discourse. (Lacan 1971-1972c p. 47) This specificity with an individual’s symptom subverts the master’s discourse and any philosophy which completes the discourse.

A formalist strategy of colour for colour’s sake in painting subtracts colour from light, which suggests a nil value relation. The minimal non-apparent with colour becomes tied to a viewer’s sight in the relation. The pure multiple with colour is concealed by the minimality to constrain colour’s capacity for errancy which could otherwise cause a change of discourses. Subtractive strategies seduce the viewer with such things as
colour’s allusiveness and her penchant to question colour’s existence. The strategies aim to create a space for undecidability. They accentuate colour’s apartness from light to facilitate colour as an event specific to a viewer’s sense of sight. The specificity is within the second count precisely where the error occurred. As I stated in Chapter Four, the singularity of her concept of the sense of sight is influenced by her error. Her knowledge of “reality” is attributed to the representation she sees. (Harari 2004 pp. 123, 125) Her engagement is crucial because the site’s specificity with her count facilitates an event. Imaginarization is the key to subtraction, the specificity of the site and to how an event occurs in sighted sentience. Subtraction confronts her conceptualization of sight and the encounter cuts her Imaginary transference. However, although it is a key factor, in 1951 and increasingly across his oeuvre, Lacan consistently placed his focus on Symbolic rather than Imaginary transference. 243 Symbolic transference is useful for subtraction with the artifice of psychoanalysis and painting because it involves repetition and the attribution of knowledge to someone who is supposed to know all the answers. (Lacan 1979 p. 232) (Evans 1996 p. 212) The viewer approaches a painting with Imaginary knowledge and also the revealing repetitious signifiers of her history. She seeks the void because of an Imaginary relevance she places upon the Real. This means a symbol falls back into the Imaginary and semblance with colour only creates a mirage with the Imaginary. 244 Thus she seeks the void via a connection to her history’s Imaginary relevance to the Real. 245

Universality as semblance is obtained because a negated absence is repressed. It is a “constituting necessity,” an error in the second count. The divided subject identifies

243 Symbolic transference with repetition assists Lacan’s clinical artifice by revealing the signifiers of the analysand’s history. Imaginary transference with love and hate acts as a resistance. (Evans 1996 p. 212)

244 The Imaginary demonstrates homogeneity with the Real as binary. “The sack … should be given the connation of the ambiguity of 1 and 0, the only adequate supports of what is confined by the empty set. … S index 1 … does not constitute one, but it indexes it as an empty sack.” The one of S index 1 (Real S1) is with the void but it inconsist there. “There is no bridge between the first set and the rest. This is why the symbol falling back into the imaginary has the index 2.” (Lacan 1994 p. 5) Seminar 18th November 1975.

245 Mellard places relevance with the repressed dyadic first object. “In set theory, that dyadic object is the set formed of 0+1. … The set is normatively comprised of child and mother or other primary nurturer.” (Mellard 1991 p. 109) It “is not yet born as a number.” (Miller 2000 p. 20)
Furthermore, it becomes repetitive. There is an endless retroactive effect of the second counting of the first. It occurs because the void becomes part of all structured presentation. Imaginary knowledge contains a supposition made in the second count. The viewer supposes an element belongs to the void. (Chiesa 2006 p. 172) Subtractive strategies in artifice that appeal to a viewer's Symbolic transference, that is, the repetitive connection to this supposition, can lead to a cut in her search for Imaginary relevance to the Real. The cut creates a shift in the logic of appearing with her sentient tie. A shift, for example, could be when light suddenly appears transparent. A viewer suddenly apprehends light is “dominant” only for the sake of visibility. The shift reveals colour’s apartness because light is no longer seen as primary except for the sake of visibility. This shift is Lacan’s arrested moment and the first of his two evental sutures.

In Badiou’s terminology a viewer can notice the worlding of a specific being has not been guaranteed locally. He explains the voided human animal moves constantly across the infinity and transcendental organisation of worlds. She can notice the same multiple ontologically can be guaranteed across worlds. And she can do this because she is capable of including herself in the move from a plurality of worlds back towards a pure multiple of being. (Badiou 2009a pp. 513, 116, 114) Lacan is more specific in his theory. When a being, associated with the error in her discourse, has not been guaranteed locally, she identifies with it. She notices with her gaze, not her sight that a

---

246 Lacan and Chiesa discuss identification. (Lacan 2002b pp. XII, 5, 7, 14-15) Lesson 7th March 1962. (Chiesa 2006 p. 170) Identification proper in the second count is where the divided subject retroactively counts herself. “The second count concomitantly brings about in a retroactive way [her] primal repression of [herself] as the un-conscious unpresented -1, that is, the “enunciation of the nothing,” the void-set. (Strictly speaking what precedes the second count is not unconscious: the unconscious, just like consciousness, is a retroactive effect of the second count or structure qua count of the unary trait).” (Chiesa 2006 p. 171)


248 It is not the return as a sameness of a cycle. Each circuit is unique because of the impossibility of repeating the signifying uniquity of the unary trait, “the unpresentation of the part-object.” (Chiesa 2006 p. 171)

249 In Chapter Six, I discussed Kusnierek’s and Merleau-Ponty’s theories on light’s transparency. Kusnierek describes a given-to-be-seen function, where light is transparent and permits visibility, that is, to make form visible.
constructive invariance is made absent. However, when she notices it with her sight her Imaginarization is cut. (Lacan 1979 p. 89) As I said in Chapter Ten, something within the site in artifice seeks a nil value relation with what inappears. Badiou states, a voided human animal has “logical power,” which allows her to desire the worldly ubiquity of the void. (Badiou 2009a p. 114) She moves across the transcendental organisation of worlds and attests to the void.

Without the void there is no world, if by ‘world’ we understand the closed space of an operation. Conversely where something operates – that is, where there is a world – the void can be attested. (Badiou 2009a p. 114)

If there is no void, there is no starting point in being for a logical operation in a world. Thus she attests the void to perhaps locate the thinkability of a being.

A being is only exposed to the thinkable to the extent that – invisibly, in the guise of an operation that localizes it – it names, within a world, a new point. In so doing it appears in that world. (Badiou 2009a p. 113)

She desires ensnarement in the world of a painting for want of a logical operation with subjectivization such that what is a constructive invariance, specific to her count, can be localised with her being-there. Although Badiou doesn’t state as such, the site’s specificity directly relates to where the error occurs in her second count. The worldly ubiquity of the void appears in non-appearing as a consequence of the error, the gap of non belonging. It is rare that Badiou admits to this individuated desire to attest to the void. However, he states some can have “the luck of welcoming the event.” (Badiou 2009a p. 512)

Since it is capable of entering into a subject of truth, the human animal can even contribute to the appearance of a (generic) being for such and such a world. (Badiou 2009a p. 114)

He asserts every individual can shift with “objectal ubiquity” across innumerable worlds with logical grace. It is the grace of living for an Idea. (Badiou 2009a p. 513-4)
However, prior to such grace, Imaginarization with her “logical power” also moves across worlds. The worlding of a being is a logical operation and the identity of being is inscribed on the basis of other beings because it has to be guaranteed locally. As I stated, the viewer supposes an element belongs to the void. However, it is not enough to assume or presuppose with the Imaginary that the identity exists. Although Badiou doesn’t link this with the Imaginary or discuss a cut to Imaginarization he states briefly it cannot be presupposed that a genealogical invariance authorises the thinking of the same. (Badiou 2009a p. 116) Furthermore, as I stated in Chapter Ten, the viewer can differ from what she is in an envelope of artifice. The consistency of the artifice of painting with its site makes the viewer aware of this difference because she has been assigned a role in the artifice, which is a point for a relation in the envelope. Her being-there is required in the envelope locally to guarantee an identity of a being as a logical operation. The being in question is colour’s pure multiple tied with a human sense of sight. Prior to the event she co-joins disjunctively with the nil value of appearing which occurs in her vision. (Badiou 2009a pp. 114, 128-9) However, although Badiou doesn’t recognise her being-there is required in artifice, the requirement nevertheless involves a cut to her Imaginary. Subtraction confronts her conceptualization with sight which cuts the alternations of Imaginarization. Lacan is clear about these alternations. In an article on psychosis, early Lacan describes the alternations of the perceiver with Imaginarization. This occurs in both psychotic and neurotic structures.

Even if the alternations of the perciens [viewer] are admitted, its function in the constitution of the unity of perceptum [what is seen] is not discussed [by psychiatrists]. The diversity of the structure of the perceptum affects in the perciens only a diversity of register, in the final analysis, that of the sensoriums. In law, this diversity is always surmountable if the perciens is capable of apprehending reality. (Lacan 1977 p. 180)

As I stated, a cut to a viewer’s Imaginary relevance to the Real creates a shift in the

Badiou’s theory on art is less precise on Imaginarization, so much so it seems he is avoiding it. As I have discussed, although he refers to the transference in Art and Philosophy, he barely theorizes it.
logic of appearing with her discursive sentience. Thus when the signifier of the event emerges she can become a point, a being-there site, in the logical operation. Lacan’s R.S.I. nomination means her discursive sight with subjectivization and nomination is part of a trans-logical appearance of being between disparate worlds. 251 Guaranteed being is with an event because something has to be guaranteed to appear specifically where it inexists.

12.2 Lacan’s Evental Theories and Site Specificity

Lacan’s theories relate to the site’s specificity being individuated. He theorizes a hole is a site: a disjunctive attempt to bring being into appearing. The attempt fails which is Lacan’s theory of no sexual rapport. The site is, for example, The woman. (Lacan 1994 pp. 5, 3) 252 His Not All strategy, which is a woman, only constitutes a set and nothing else. “One can arrive at the hole because of the set.” (Lacan 1994 p. 1) 253 It avails itself for the site and allows for an individual’s error in the second count. It makes the error a main feature as it pinpoints the failure. (Chiesa 2006 p. 170)

Although Lacan’s theory of the event was developed throughout the 1960s and 1970s, his theory on the sutures of suppléance is in Seminar XXIII. The sutures involve naming with the extra signifier, which as an “infinite line … makes the false hole into a true hole, in other words something representable in a diagram.” (Lacan 1994 p. 2) 254 Truth with the true hole is representable and emerges after the event of the sutures. Prior to these theories he used his Formula of Sexuation.

The displacement of the negation from the ‘stops not being written’ to

(Badiou 2005a pp. 4, 5,7) In statements such as the following it is as though Imaginarization doesn’t play any pivotal role. “Art makes an event of what lies at the edge of what is given to perceptual experience, that is, at the edge of the indistinctly sensory … In art, the Idea is imposed through the transformation of what can be perceived into an improbable imperative. To force to see something, as if it was practically impossible, something that is anyhow clearly visible, is precisely what painting does, for example.” (Badiou 2011 p. 144)

251 Badiou discusses the trans-logical although, as I have stated, he only sees the painting as the artistic subject. (Badiou 2009a p. 513)

252 Session 13th January 1976.

253 Session 9th March 1976.

254 Session 10th February 1976.
the ‘doesn’t stop being written,’ in other words, from contingency to necessity – there lies the point of suspension to which all love is attached. … All love, subsisting on the basis of the ‘stops not being written,’ tends to make the negation shift to the ‘doesn’t stop being written,’ doesn’t stop, won’t stop. (Lacan 1998 p. 145)

The “suspension” to which all love is attached is the gap of undecidability. The gap of undecidability or suspended correspondence of certitude, which I have referred to previously, is between the Contingency (where Lacan places the Not All strategy) and the Impossible position. It provides a movement to the Necessary position where an extra signifier substitutes for the error of the count. (Lacan 1972b p. 16) Negation has to be displaced “from contingency to necessity.” In other words, the negation associated with the error indexed in the site, has to be shifted with a decision outside signifying certainty via the extra signifier in the Necessary position.

Lacan’s infinite line pierces the false hole. The line is his evental signifier which works with a relation.

It is not because the finite has limits that a line which has what is called an infinite point i.e., which forms a circle, is enough to provide a metaphor of the infinite. (Lacan 1994 p. 4) 256

As I discussed in Chapter Seven, Lacan’s second Real is where the evental signifier emerges from, a point in the circle, the ring of the Real. It isn’t the Real object a, although the signifier supports the Real object. (Lacan 1994 p. 57) 257 It is distinct from it and exists alongside it as appearing. (Lacan 1998 p. 45) It’s a truth that emerges into consistency because it supplements consistency. The new Real, which has emerged

255 In the 1970s Badiou criticized Lacan’s Not All strategy as only making a hole in the phallic function. (Badiou 2008 p. 214-7) However, as Grigg points out, in the 1970s Badiou misunderstood that Lacan wanted to maintain the indeterminacy and essential incompleteness related to the Not All strategy with the gap. (Grigg 2008 p. 85)

256 Session 13th April 1976.

257 Session 11th May 1976.
from the ring of the Real, pierces the Real ring and makes it representable as the truth of being. (Lacan 1994 p. 2) In Lacan’s R.S.I. nomination, the new Real supplements the Symbolic with consistence in the Imaginary. It does this as a meaning effect which is Real, not Imaginary. Moreover, the extra signifier puts the error right precisely where it occurred and because it substitutes for the error, it makes a new Imaginary. (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 77, 74, 77, 83, 74, 77) (Lacan 1994 p. 3) However, as I discussed in Chapter Seven, Badiou concludes the consistency of Lacan’s new Real is the same as the old Imaginary. Lacan’s extra signifier results from the self belonging of “an element ... which ... sets in motion substitution.” (Lacan 1994 p. 177) The extra signifier belongs to, but is an extra signifier for, the negated element, that is, it stands in for the element in a relation between being and being-there. Initially the relation was a nil value relation between semblance concealing the element and representation. Lacan’s extra signifier, infinite line, or letter names between two points. “There is none other than what is termed the shortest path from one point to another.” The shortest route is “known,” between the Symbolic and the Imaginary. (Lacan 1994 p. 4) The infinite line or letter proceeds from a point to make known the multiple a. The letter, letter a, then becomes a representable. “The letter a ... is nothing less than a testimony to the intrusion of a writing as other – as ‘other’ with precisely a small a.” (Lacan 1994 p. 177) The infinite line, name or letter a, is formed by the suturing of the Symbolic object a (which conceals the multiple a) to the Imaginary phallus (representation or the viewer’s second count in being-there). It is the cut to her gaze. Simultaneously it pierces a hole in the “state” of a situation.

[The] artifice of representation ... is only a perspective. ... We must supplement this supposed continuity at the moment when the infinite line is thought to emerge from the hole. We must give a body to the circle [Real ring], in other words give it consistence, it must be imagined as

---

258 Session 10th February 1976.
259 Session 9th March 1976.
260 Session 11th May 1976.
261 Session 13th April 1976.
262 Session 11th May 1976.
having some kind of physical support, for it to become thinkable.

Effectively, nothing thinks but the body. (Lacan 1994 p. 3) 263

As I discussed in Chapter Seven, Lacan’s extra signifier embodies as it supplements within a logical operation, that is, as a new consistency. It is a meaning effect. The symptom is sutured with the Real and the Symbolic to render jouissance possible, to write as J’ouïs sens and to hear a meaning. (Lacan 1994 p. 4) 264 It is not Imaginary but Real, that is, it’s a new Imaginary. Lacan states “The Real is something common to them in their consistency.” (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 77, 74, 77) 265 In *The Theory of the Subject*, Badiou doesn’t comprehend that there is a new signifier, which arises from the false hole formed by the Symbolic object a and the Imaginary phallus. The Real of this hole is the Real blockage in the Symbolic. Badiou decides Lacan has only “re-ascribed to the Imaginary” and “the consistent homogeneity of the Symbolic.” (Badiou 2009b pp. 245, 231)

Lacan’s second suture, simultaneous with the first, is between being and being-there. 266

“In making this splice, at the same time, we make another between what constitutes the symbolic and the real.” (Lacan 1994 p. 4) 267 This is Lacan’s theory of localization. The infinite line works with a relation between two elements. It arises from the Real in the false hole of the Symbolic and simultaneously, with Lacan’s R.S.I. nomination, it becomes a name in subjectivization for the Symbolic in the hole of the Real. 268 The subjection is convoked by the subject, that is, the subject to be, which is the envelope-value. As I show in the next chapter, localization is convoked from the being-there site.

The unconscious is tied to the a in the Real. In fact it is due to the error. (Lacan 1994 p. 182)

263 Session 10th February 1976.
265 Session 11th February 1975.
266 Session 9th March 1976.
268 “When there is a suture between the real and the symbolic there is one between the imaginary and the symbolic.” (Lacan 1994 p. 4) Session 11th May 1976.
In-tension-al truth ... can, from time to time, touch on something of the real; but if it does, it is by chance. One can never over estimate the frequency of errors in writing. (Lacan 1994 p. 181)  

The errancy of “the error aims, if there is an unconscious, to express something.” (Lacan 1994 p. 178) However, “in question is the following: the consequences of an error are not entirely caused by chance. For psychoanalysis teaches us that an error is never the result of chance.” (Lacan 1994 p. 178) The error is not aleatory but it keeps expressing its specificity in the site with errancy. The expression is about a chance occurrence but its repetition isn’t. The error in the second count marks the multiple a, which exists as negated. The error is a consequence of falsehood. The void is universally included in presentation, but nothing belongs to it. Badiou calls it the unpresentable point of being. No multiple in existence can prevent the void from placing itself within it as inclusion. It is “remarkable that it appears as a consequence, or rather as a particular case, of the logical principle ‘ex falso sequitur quodlibet’,” which means “from falsehood follows anything.” (Badiou 2005 p. 86) It can be read as, “If one claims something is both true and not true, one can logically derive any conclusion.”  

If it is falsely supposed that a multiple belongs to the void – one necessarily infers anything, and in particular, that this multiple, supposedly capable of belonging to the void, is certainly capable of belonging to any other set. (Badiou 2005 p. 87)  

This relates to my discussion about the non-sequitur with pigmented colour, which is a deliberate attempt to eliminate the middle ground because the role of resemblance with pigmented colour can conceal or inversely with subtraction reveal the error of the
second count retroactively. 273 The void appears because of falsehood. It is a consequence of the gap of no belonging. 274 Artifice points to the false hole via a Not All subtractive strategy. The falsity with errancy presents absurdity or as Badiou states, an “idea without being.” (Badiou 2005 p. 87) The multiple that would belong to the void is radically non-presented in the second count and would, if it were presented, be an element of any set. 275 An individual viewer bears the error of the second count and the consequences of its falsity.

The real, that is, impossible Other of the Other, is our idea of artifice, in that it is an activity that escapes us. ... There is no fact without artifice

---

273 A law of classical logic is involved. “Anything follows from a contradiction, that is, once a contradiction has been asserted, any proposition (or its negation) can be inferred from it.” [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principle_of_explosion](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principle_of_explosion) The logic of the non-sequitur is a performative contradiction. It involves circular reasoning, “begging the question.” [www.philosophicalsociety.com](http://www.philosophicalsociety.com)

274 The logic of set theory is classical because it admits the principle of the excluded middle and reasoning by the absurd, which amounts to being deduced from what non-being must be. Being is determined by the gap between being and nothingness. (Badiou 2013 p. 15) The second negation masquerades as true. Behind its falsity, because of the gap of no belonging, the void appears as a consequence. It is of course minimal and non-appearing. Category theory and the logic of appearing negate non-being and deny or at least have a position of reticence towards the infinite and reasoning by the absurd. With category theory, to show such a world, such an object “exists,” we must somehow show it. “There is therefore in this kind of thought no indirect (or oblique) proof of existence or truth. We are bound to believe what we see (or construct). Hence [there is] an empiricist bent.” (Badiou 2013 p. 15) Set theory on the other hand is about what exists for thought beyond what surrounds us, namely that experience is a condition of presentation.

275 Badiou theorises the falsity is built upon an error. “A multiple which would belong to the void would be that ultra-nothing, that ultra-void with regard to which no existence-multiple could compose it being presented by itself. ... Then it follows that anything ... is true.” (Badiou 2005 p. 87) If, on the basis of the negation of the unpresented element not belonging, the void is denied in turn, that is, it is falsely supposed a multiple belongs to it, then that multiple, supposedly capable of belonging to the void, is certainly capable of belonging to any other set. (Badiou 2005 p. 86-7) This implies the multiple, if it were presented, could be an element of any set whatsoever, and no existence-multiple could oppose its presenting itself. It’s being presented by itself could thus mean it is extended to every multiple. “If a statement A is false (if I have non-A) and if I affirm the latter (if I posit A), then it follows that anything (any statement B whatsoever) is true.” (Badiou 2005 p. 87) The said multiples “being-inside” seems to have, by this inclusion, “filled” the void with something. In other words, the void is firstly negated, as not belonging but remarkably, it appears, as consequence of a second negation that occurs when it is denied falsely by a multiple that gets in its place, as belonging. The void’s inclusion universally in presentation, infers it has an element, written \{Ø\}. If it is its sole element, it means the void is both subset and element, included and belonging. However, the void does not have any elements. It is the proper name alone, which presents being in its lack. The void does not belong to \{Ø\}, but the proper name belongs to it, which constitutes the suture to being. (Badiou 2005 p. 89)
and it is a fact that [a divided subject] lies, in other words [she] accords recognition to false facts. (Lacan 1994 pp. 1, 2)  

Errancy touches the error, which aims, if there is an unconscious, to express something. (Lacan 1994 p. 178)  

Moreover, it aims to express the error’s specificity to a singular divided subject in a discursive tie.  

However, misunderstandings about errancy reveal a distinction between the error and errancy, for example, Badiou has expressed dissension with Lacan which relates to this distinction. In Chapter Seven, along with Bosteels, I criticised Žižek for his misleading term, the Truth-Event. (Bosteels 2006 pp. 154, 153) He also labelled a symptom as truth. (Žižek 1999 pp. 130-1) However, the symptom is where the knot slips. Žižek is defining a Real blockage in the Symbolic or a false hole as truth. The symptom with this hole is not a truth. However, one can see this same misunderstanding in Badiou’s criticism of Lacan in the last pages of Being and Event. He criticises Lacan in the same mistaken way, that is, the symptom is truth, “truth as cause,” that truth is the cause of neurotic suffering. (Badiou 2005 p. 433) He states if one was to identify a cause of the subject it would be the event, that is, truth doesn’t cause a subject, an event does. There are two things wrong in Badiou’s criticism. Lacan’s suffering neurotic is a divided subject. She is not Lacan’s subject caused by suppléance, an event. This is the same misguided criticism Badiou makes in the last pages of Logics of Worlds, which I discussed previously. (Badiou 2009a p 477-82) Badiou does this because, as he states briefly, he refuses to be persuaded Lacan has a theory of the event. (Badiou 2009a p. 481) The suffering divided subject suffers from the errancy of the error which repeats with Symbolic transference. Unnamed, errancy erupts because the unconscious is built upon a falsehood. 

Lacan’s truth occurs after an extra signifier has enabled being-there to confer a new

---

276 Session 13th January 1976.  
277 Session 11th May 1976.  
278 I described Badiou’s dissension as spurious because he dealt with Lacan’s divided subject rather than Lacan’s subject with suppléance. He placed Lacan’s divided subject up against his (Badiou’s) theory of the subject with the extra signifier.
consistency upon being. The truth is sense that an event confers upon the falsity and the absurdity of errancy. The sense is mental, j’ouis sens, between the Imaginary and the Symbolic. (Lacan 1994 p. 3) 279 It is incorrect to define the insistence and expression of an errancy as truth simply because it points to the error. The distinction between the error and errancy relates to the event and chance. The event is aleatory because it is aligned with aleatory errancy. However, post evental truth is specific to the error and its specificity is in the site, which is not caused by chance. The specificity of the error in the site also relates after the event, to nomination, localization and transmission. As I showed with Lacan’s apologue on the prisoners in Chapter Seven, errancy is not “truth as cause” and although Lacan’s extra signifier is a re-presentation of the multiple a, it is not caused by it. It is cause by the convocation (subjectivization and nomination). The event’s alignment with errancy is a separate issue to the fact that the event is convoked by a decision made without the certainty of signifying structure, that is, it is convoked by a subject because the decision is beyond any viewer’s concept. (Badiou 2005 p. 429) This means it has come from the Real in the false hole with the convocation and it supplants the Symbolic and the Imaginary. The convocation doesn’t involve truth as cause but truth as a future anterior. Paradoxically the truth forces decision or in different words the subject forces the event to decide the true of the situation. (Badiou 2005 pp. 401, 430)

Lacan’s theory about the specificity of the error in the site relates to his theory about no sexual rapport. “The Two as a couple [is the] set with a single element.” (Lacan 1994a p. 2) 280 When there is equivalence between the Two as a couple, “there is no relation.” There is an error. (Lacan 1994a p. 3) 281 A reflexive set with transitivity and anti-symmetry is required for the event. Lacan aligns the latter with the Not All strategy in the site and a woman. “To specify that woman is Not All implies dissymmetry.” (Lacan 1994 p. 2) 282 “If the error is put right at the place where it occurred, [then anti-symmetry will be available and] the two sexes are no longer equivalent.” (Lacan 1994 p.

279 Session 10th February 1976.
280 Session 9th March 1976.
281 Session 9th March 1976.
282 Session 9th March 1976.
Retroactivity is implied with the past tense of the word “occurred.” Lacan links time with the different movements and directional orientation of the two rings of the false hole. They appear the same accept they rotate in different directions. Although Symbolic repetition is implicated with retroactivity, he is referring to the instant of the event. A cessation of movement is the instant when the evental signifier pierces the site. (Lacan 1994 p. 6) An extra signifier stands in for a nonexistent relation. The coupling, two sexes, finds rapport with the suturing of being to being-there. In addition, it supports a woman. (Lacan 1994a p. 3) The infinite line or extra signifier emerges at the place where the error occurred, “at a single point but its consequences can be seen at two other points.” (Lacan 1994 p. 3) It is at the place of “original sin.” (Lacan 1994 p. 2) The two points of the error’s consequences are critical for the first suture. They are the Symbolic object a, that covers the error, and semblant or Imaginary phallus. The suture of these points permit the second suture, which pierces as it names the unpresented element.

12.3 The Site’s Specificity and the Artistic Subject

Lacan’s 1964 arrested moment in painting, taming of the gaze and shift of the trompe l’oeil, are theories on the first suture. (Lacan 1979 p. 118) The cut must have

---

284 Time and space are both implied as being connected to being-there. Tendlarz’s research on the three dimensional world with autistic children specifically points to how time and space are part of the Symbolic and the logic of appearing. (Tendlarz 2003 p. 97)
285 Session 9th March 1976.
286 Session 9th March 1976.
287 Session 17th February 1976.
288 Session 18th November 1975.
289 Santiago describes the semblant of the Imaginary phallus, a postiche object, which is “always artificial.” It veils the lack or error and is separate to the Symbolic object a. “An image of lack does not exist. … Marked by lack, this image orientates desire, which rises up in a veiled manner and is above all, associated with absence. This absence thus consists of the possibility of a presence – that of object a.” (Santiago 2010 p. 3) However, when the first suture makes the Imaginary phallus equivalent to object a they cancel each other out and movement can occur beyond signifying structure. A “signifiermess” is created and the master signifier is separated from knowledge. (Lacan 2007 p. 130)
290 The theory of the arrested moment remained prominent with Lacan for many years and there are earlier references to it as well. Lacan expands upon the 1964 theories in later seminars. In Seminar XX 1973, he indicates the viewer approaches the painting in the feminine position of ‘being it.’(Lacan 1998 p. 100) He defines the arrested moment and “jealousissance” as what springs forth from the image. The eye’s power to separate is likened to when a child gazes enviously at a sibling on the
a sign of an unpresented element to be a strong intensity for evental rupture. Even birds require an attraction to a sign of something before they are fooled by painted grapes. The shift must involve something like the trompe l’oeil but it is beyond a mere recognition of verisimilitude. Lacan explains the duplicity of subtractive strategies can deceive a viewer if she is presented with the painting of a veil, that is to say, a lure that incites her to ask what is behind it. (Lacan 1979 pp. 112, 111) This shift or moment connects with Lacan’s three logical moments of time in the apologue on the prisoners. 

There is an arrest of the gestural movement between pseudo-identification in its dialectic with identificatory haste. The arrest terminates or freezes a painter’s gestural movement. (Schneider Adams 1993 p. 215) Identification with the gesture is sutured terminally with identificatory haste. “The moment of seeing can only intervene here as a suture, a conjunction of the imaginary and the symbolic.” (Lacan 1979 pp. 117, 114-6, 118) Identification in the Imaginary is sutured with the Symbolic in the identificatory action of haste. 292 The concluding third moment involves an understanding of the act. The laying down of the gaze is an efficacious act that passes into something that is materialized.

The first act in the laying down of the gaze [is] a sovereign act, no doubt, since it passes into something that is materialized, and which, from this sovereignty, will render obsolete, excluded, inoperant, whatever coming from elsewhere, will be presented before this product. (Lacan 1979 p. 114) 293

In short, it renders obsolete the errancy of the error. As I stated in Chapter Eleven, it materializes as a transcendental operation with a viewer’s discursive sight in the synthesis of an envelope with a painting. “The terminal time of the gaze completes the

mother’s breast. “Jealouissance” is a jealousy of the other gaining the jouissance of the Other at the mother’s breast. “The child who is gazed at has it.” (Lacan 1998 p. 100) The viewer, from the place of “being” it, gazes at the semblant, Imaginary phallus.


The two moments overlap. (Lacan 1979 p. 117)

My italics.
gesture” because the act completes it. Lacan links this to subtraction and hints at its motive being the capture of the Imaginary with viewer engagement.

The painter’s brushstroke is something in which a movement is terminated. [It] is a new and different meaning to the term regression – we are faced with the element of motive in the sense of response, in so far as it produces, behind it, its own stimulus. (Lacan 1979 p. 114)

Subtraction enables the viewer to distinguish between the gesture and the act. (Lacan 1979 pp. 115, 114)

He places the relation to the other and a revelation of the Other’s desire at the cessation of movement. The Symbolic object a operates in desire but the eye has a power across several registers. It has, within the identificatory haste of the second moment, a power to separate the a in its relation between the other and the Other. The a is separated from the fascinatory effect of the conjunction between Imaginary with the Symbolic. In this first suture, the viewer’s engagement is determined by the break of the a. (Lacan 1979 p. 115-8) The eye’s “power to separate” operates across both registers, the Imaginary and the Symbolic. The “break” of the a is the uncovering of the Symbolic object a gaze and what is uncovered is the Real multiple a. Lacan asserts that whilst the viewer is in the second logical moment the effect of the arresting movement is literally a killing of life. What is killed or cut is the viewer’s old Imaginary knowledge. If an event with the materialisation of the extra signifier occurs it is because the “arrest ... creates its signification behind it, with the distinction between the gesture and the act.” (Lacan 1979 p. 116) The event with Lacan’s sutures occurs in the discursive tie with human sight because the first is evident with the eye’s power to separate the concealed multiple from the conjunction of the Symbolic and Imaginary registers.

Artistic semblance or the trompe l’oeil in a classical world is revealed when the viewer compares the painting to worlds in the sensorium. This kind of trans-worldly comparison also occurs with for a viewer of non-classical worlds in the sensorium but it only amounts to regional stability. Badiou writes about a shift with regional stability when a viewer in a world of the sensorium shifts her vision.

224
If I turn around it is not because I imagine, between the world and the incongruous noise [of a motorcycle] that disjoins itself from the [world of the sensorium], a sort of abyss between two worlds. No, I simply situate my attention, until then polarised by the [said world], in a wider correlation. (Badiou 2009a p. 129)

The viewer shifts her vision and she, along with the regionalization of adjacent worlds of the sensorium, is stabilized. A minimal relation occurs between the viewer and the incongruent noise of the motorcycle, which Badiou defines as a nil value of conjunction. Ultimately, however, the value of the world of the sensorium is superior to the disjunctive ingredients. Badiou asserts the envelope “in which the nil conjunction is signalled, prevents this nullity from amounting to ... a decomposition of the world’s logic.” Notably a non-classical world of the sensorium does without a viewer’s vision. (Badiou 2009a pp. 129, 128, 129) However, the artificed classical world of a painting requires it. Moreover, an event requires her vision because it requires the transcendental operation with discursive sight, which involves her eye’s power to separate the concealed multiple from the conjunction of the Symbolic and the Imaginary, such that an old consistency is ruptured with the act. If the singularity of the site is strong and subtraction enhances the consequences of falsity with the logic of the non-sequitur, subjectivization with her act convokes an event to decompose the logic of the artificed classical world.

Plato’s protestation against the illusion of painting, Lacan states, is not because “painting gives an illusionary equivalent to the object.” 294

The point is that the *trompe l’oeil* of painting pretends to be something other than what it is. ... At the moment when by a mere shift of my gaze, we are able to realise that the representation does not move with the gaze, we are able to realise that the representation is merely a *trompe l’oeil*. (Lacan 1979 p. 112)

---

294 This is contrary to the didactic and classical schemas Badiou proposes. (Badiou 2005a pp. 2, 5)
Suddenly the representation is about something else.

The picture does not compete with appearance, it competes with what Plato designates for us beyond appearance as being the Idea. It is because the picture is the appearance that says that it is that which gives the appearance that Plato attacks painting, as if it were an activity competing with his own. The other thing is the petit a, around which there resolves a combat of which trompe l’oeil is the soul. (Lacan 1979 p. 112)

Two points here need explanation. Firstly, the soul is a hole, it presents the false hole in the artificed world, and secondly, when Lacan states “it is that which gives the appearance” he is referring to uncovering of concealed multiplicity, specifically the multiple support and referent for a phenomenality, which he terms petit a. The multiple support or the petit a is what is veiled behind the make-believe semblance of the trompe l’oeil. The artificed classical world sets up a situation, “of something that may pass into the real” between the petit a and the viewer. (Lacan 1979 p. 112)

What occurs with the viewer’s vision when there is a shift of her attention to the visibility of the adjacent world, her gaze (Symbolic object a as semblance) implicates representation (Imaginary phallus). In fact, it brings representation into question. (Klein 2007 pp. 181, 180) An event erupts with a shift of the trompe l’oeil and an act. As I mentioned previously and discuss in the next chapter, there is a materiality with pigmented colour in painting. Its literality in painting as colour comes into play with a viewer’s sighted efficacious act and colour as an event. It erupts locally in the being-there site with the sighted act, that is, it materialises with a transcendental operation

\[295\] There is “a classic Platonic problem. The universal part of a sensible object is its participation in the Idea. I translate this as follows: the ontological part of an object is the pure, mathematically thinkable, multiplicity that underlies it.” (Badiou 2009a p. 301)

\[296\] I place the word “implication” within this phrase because what is implicated relates to immanent logic and the name “implication” is given to the operation of the transcendental functor. It interprets the implication with a correspondence. (Badiou 2013 pp. 114, 119) The functor transfers the implication of the reflexive and transitive sub-objects of the immanent logic of appearing to a third object of anti-symmetry.
within a viewer’s sighted synthesis in the envelope with the painting. As Lacan states, “something is materialised” (with both sutures), which makes the act distinct from the concealed multiple support. (Lacan 1979 pp. 114, 116, 112) The implication is with the materiality in an enveloped synthesis. The sighted literality of pigmented colour transitively connects to other objects, when the relation in the process of localization is exposed and grasped with inter-worldliness.

Feltham defines the individual as an operator of fidelity who figures within the material situation to be transformed. The operator “has to be transmissible and [she] has to judge the connection or non-connection of distant multiples to the event.” She “alone determines the consistency of the truth procedure.” (Feltham 2006 p. 250) I place the viewer within the envelope and implicated in a minimal relation with a point because

---

297 Badiou explains theory about this site of being-there comes from mathematical theories in the 1950s and 1960s, the Grothendieck topos. (Badiou 2009a p. 295)

298 As I said, the function of “implication” is given to the operation of the transcendental functor. A viewer’s involvement with the implications of the functor relates to sub-objects, which from 1 to centration can multiply exponentially without totalization because the logical structure is holding together with the Central Object. (Badiou 2013 p. 117) As interconnected as it may become, it will remain logically consistent, which implicates an interconnection of truth. To each element ‘q’ in the envelope there is an existential (appearing) stratum. The functor associates a collection of parts of the object to existence, that is, makes each member of the collection “homogenous in terms of its degree of appearing (or existence).” Badiou states, “We wish to pass analytically from this collection of parts [sub-sets] of A to a collection of elements of A, in such a way that a part [sub-set] of the object is associated to the territory [of an envelope]. … As q traverses the territory [of an envelope], the collection of xq’s thereby selected would be a part of A ‘representative’ of the territory in terms of existential analysis, since all the xq’s have different degrees of existence.” (Badiou 2009a p. 291)

299 The transcendental functor “harbours the possibility of synthesis of existential analysis. It enacts what, following topologists, we would call a recollement (or sticking back together) of transcendental analysis.” (Badiou 2009a p. 290) It analyses the strata of existence, such as all the maximums and minimums, and correlates an element of the transcendental toward a sub-set of an object. (Badiou 2009a p. 289) “This thinking localizes the object (the appearing of the pure multiple) on the basis of, or within, the transcendental.” (Badiou 2009a p. 290) The single element, the typical representative, is the individual viewer. The analytic projection of the territory, or the synthesis of the envelope is what is required for completion and the functor brings together all the elements, which then are associated to a single element. She is not only the typical representative transcendentally, she is within the projection in the territory, a representative of the very being of the object, that is, the collective of viewers each of whom are a degree of existence. Every projective representation is synthesized in the pure multiple that underlies the appearance of the object whose degree of existence is equal to the transcendental. (Badiou 2009a pp. 291, 294, 295) “The being of the object is internally organized, on the basis of the existential analysis, by synthesis that corresponds to the transcendental envelopes.” (Badiou 2009a p. 295)
her engagement and site’s specificity pinpoints the error’s occurrence in her second count. In a different text, Feltham also refers to a specificity and an eruption of the Real.

The particular form of chance at stake in the event is ... captured in Aristotle’s category of tuche as reworked by Lacan in Seminar XI: the missed encounter, or irruption of dysfunction. (Feltham 2008 p. 101) (Lacan 1979 p. 52-63)

As I stated above, Lacan declares the error aims to express itself to a singular divided subject. Feltham alludes to this and links the error’s specificity to the event. “The event implies an original theatricality.” He refers to Mallarmé’s A Cast of Dice. It is about Aeneas who comes across a bronze frieze which represents him in the Trojan War and the sack of Troy. He sees a disaster in the frieze which caused his current predicament and attitude and that his current situation is a direct extension and continuation of that original disaster. (Feltham 2008 p. 102) The continued errancy or the consequences of falsity built upon the error caused his signifying history. Feltham defines errancy as the event’s repetitive insistence to be assimilated. Aeneas, a viewer of the frieze, was confronted by an eruption from its disjunctive site. Feltham states the event stages and announces itself within its site. Badiou’s “state,” or what I posit is the signifying structure connected with the logic of appearing, is built upon the consequences of falsity, with the multiple a erring with the sub-sets of inclusion. The errancy is with a multiple of the site. It exists in appearing although it doesn’t belong to the situation. 300

As I have shown the viewer approaches a painting with identification related to the Imaginary as well as with signifying history. Although she identifies with an Imaginary relevance to the Real, it is Symbolic transference that leads to the first suture. The error and errancy relate to repetition with Symbolic transference. The erring error in the site returns via errancy to be named. This occurs with an individual and a collective of individuals. In Lacan’s theory a symptom is individuated with each member of a collective. A member is typical of the group and integral to the universal but the site or

---

300 Badiou states a site is therefore a minimal effect of structure. (Badiou 2005 pp. 174, 175)
symptom is individuated. This means that not only is the event’s localisation individuated but the site’s specificity is also. I discuss in the next chapter how Lacan’s theory on the political subject and the individuated symptom differs from Badiou’s “social symptom” with emancipatory politics. (Badiou 2009a p. 365) This is most pronounced in Lacan’s theory related to the Paris uprising in May 1968. He links the uprising to the master signifier’s function with knowledge and production in his university discourse and states the function bears upon how action can change culture. (Lacan 2007 pp. 183, 184, 185) This function with knowledge aligns with his formula, “the subject supposed to know,” which is the main spring of Symbolic transference. It relates to an individual and the collective, thus to the artistic and political being-there sites. It is crucial for the success of emancipatory politics and that the emergence of truth is not supposed knowledge. Truth emerges from where knowledge is considered false. “Knowledge gets added to the real, indeed it is for this reason that it can bring the false into being, and even into being-there a bit.” Truth is a shock to ambivalent old knowledge. “All knowledge that is not false couldn’t give a dam about it. In becoming known, only [truth’s] form is a surprise.” (Lacan 2007 pp. 187, 186) Old knowledge falls to the rank of symptom. “The effect of truth is only a collapse of knowledge. It is a collapse that creates a production, soon to be taken up again.” (Lacan 2007 p. 186) A pivotal identification, in this case related to political protest, can become “Being, marked one.” Being becomes truth and the master signifier arises as a promotion of being because of its characteristic relationship with knowledge. (Lacan 2007 pp. 154, 155) Lacan appeals to the May ’68 students.

This is only an appeal to locate yourselves to what one can call radical functions, in the mathematical sense of the term. ... A function is something that entered the real, that had never entered it beforehand. (Lacan 2007 p. 188)

He tells them it’s worth investigating how the master signifier functions as “addition” and “multiplication.”

It is a matter of applying one of these relations to the other. You invent the logarithm. It starts to run wild in the world. ... Something [has to] be
produced that functions in knowledge as a master signifier. (Lacan 2007 p. 188)

Shame is the hole from which it arises and it makes a shift occur with the existing master signifier and multiplicity of “quilting points.” The points are how it hooks on and makes a discourse. Its function is transposition which Lacan links to subversion. He explains it was intimated that the students could live with domination and the shame of being dominated, which is “the nature of the progression of knowledge.” The relation between “addition” and “multiplication” emerges from this hole of shame. The truth that emerges as an extra signifier is “shamelessness” because that is what is inexistent in shame’s hole. The shame involves identification with something about law and the love of the father. (Skelton 2006 p. 134) In Freudian theory, it aligns with a positive conscience, which inspires “pro-social behaviour and ethical integrity and provokes shame when we fall short of its lofty precepts.” (Skelton 2006 p. 134) Symbolic introjections of the identification involve taking inside the self aspects of another or what is external: “a process that Lacan takes to be characteristic of the Symbolic.” It “generates the conditions for the suffering of symptoms ... and for human bondage.” (Skelton 2006 p. 253) Furthermore, a need for punishment with guilt and shame impels an individual to seek humiliation or painful situations, which paradoxically produces enjoyment. The singular symptom is exposed and universalised with extimacy. The relation between being and being-there that becomes an evental change to shamelessness is specific to the individuated symptom.

The class struggle perhaps contains this little source of error at the start, that it absolutely doesn’t take place at the level of the true dialectic of the master’s discourse – it is located on the level of identification. (Lacan 2007 p. 190)

---

301 “The logarithm of a number is the exponent by which another fixed value, the base, has to be raised to produce that number.” The logarithm is connected to the exponential function. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logarithm](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logarithm) and [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exponent](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exponent)

302 It is linked in Lacan to the symptom of the obsessional neurotic and an attempt to mystify and defend against anxiety. As an intra-psychic factor it is aligned with the affect of anxiety. (Skelton 2006 pp. 212, 253)
The master signifier (knowledge) originates from the One. “Whether it knows or not, [knowledge] initially stems from the unary trait.” (Lacan 2007 pp. 46, 50)

Shamelessness and impudence confronts the production of the system. The master signifier always relates to production. The function of the master signifier within old knowledge has to be questioned and addressed from within the place that shelters it, such as the University. However, Lacan specifies it is not a matter of making someone important who intended such a venture, whatever result might come from the confrontation, or to make something of an artist’s or author’s art into something that must be seen or read, but rather that it captures the engagement of viewers or the gaze of others, readers, political activists etc. 303 What is of value “comes through its master signifiers” and is valuable because it engages singular protagonists. (Lacan 2007 p. 192)

He also asserts a singular student can find a way of being justified with the universal “lumpen-proletariat.” Shame can be the means, as Laurence Simmons states, “to lift oneself (to ‘evade’) the self.” He discusses a “mirrored shame ashamed of itself, a sort of mise en abyme of shame.” Humans discover “a reflective self return,” and a “necessary relatedness mediated by shame.” (Simmons pp. 34, 38, 39) Lacan is declaring that emancipatory politics can be successful if the emergence of truth is from the false hole (of shame) with a singular symptom. Moreover his theory declares artistic evental change is not brought about because of the intention of an artist or the value of the intention in the art. Likewise political evental change and a political subject-body aren’t produced by the intentions of a leading activist, the intentions of a political party, a political manifesto, or I might add emancipatory philosophy. The reason for this is an intention is based on knowledge already in existence, where a master signifier is already functioning. As I stated above, truth emerges from where knowledge is considered false. New knowledge isn’t transmitted via old knowledge. (Lacan 2007 p. 198) The success of politics depends on a lack of supposed knowledge. A Not All strategy works with Symbolic transference so when there is a cut a new truth emerges from an Imaginary supposition related to the error in the second count and the Symbolic and the Imaginary are sutured in the Real hole in the Symbolic. (Lacan 2002b pp. XII, 5, 7, 14- 303 He cites unnamed writings in the journal Scilicet as an example.
In short, evental change with emancipatory politics can successfully occur with a R.S.I. nomination that arises with a singular symptom.

As I show with localization in the next chapter, the viewer is, along with the art work, an artistic subject. She is a required for the site’s specificity in the materiality of the envelope and is thus part of the consistency of the subject-body. She is a subject by chance because she hasn’t calculated for its occurrence. However, her specificity with the site is not by chance. The event in its association with errancy is by chance, but it is along with the subject linked to the specificity of the error because it emerges precisely at the place where the error occurred. Thus the event and the subject-body are linked to the singular symptom via the specificity, which is not by chance. Although Badiou can admit an individual is “personally marked” by the event, he ignores the event’s specificity with her error and only focuses upon the event’s link to erring and the fact she cannot calculate or account for its irruption. (Badiou 2001 pp. 124, 125) As a subject there is a lack of conscious intentionality with her sudden efficacious sighted act but the event is nevertheless convoked. In addition, although she is a singular member of an object (a group of viewers), and as such is ‘absolutely’ at most one element because she is identical to the other viewers, nevertheless she is a designation for a collectivized concept. (Badiou 2009a p. 214) In fact, as I discuss in the next chapter, she is localized by all the other elements (viewers). As a globally typical element, she has synthetic value in an envelope of painting. She plays the role of the envelope and as a subject, the undoing of the Real synthesis and alternation of appearing.

304 Lesson 7th March 1962
305 As I stated in Chapter Ten, Badiou doesn’t place the viewer with the artistic subject. (Badiou 2004a p. 109) (Badiou 2001 p. 44)
Chapter Thirteen

Localization: A Viewer and Colour

13.1 Badiou: Artificed Envelope and Viewer

This chapter examines the localization between being and being-there. The viewer is in a site of being-there. A sudden awareness of the literality of coloured pigment implicates her in a minimal relation with a point. She singularly designates a collectivized concept when the relation is exposed. I discussed in Chapter Four, how the singularity of her sight is also influenced by shared reality, which can be predicted according to a certain command of prevailing codes characteristic of the Imaginary and typical of the Symbolic. (Harari 2004 pp. 124-5, 97) However, an individual’s major change away from old knowledge can “demonstrate” a privileged reference of contact with the Real. (Harari 2004 pp. 125, 97) As a member of an object of viewers she represents the privileged reference with the common sonority of a site’s specificity, which influences a sense of sight. Badiou refers to the singular member of a group as a representative who identifies as an atomic phenomenal component of a function of being-there in a world on the transcendental of that world. (Badiou 2009a pp. 218, 213)

The individual is … an element of the pure multiple that this group is. The reciprocal will be the following: given any atomic component of the group … it will be identified by an individual of the group. (Badiou 2009a p. 218-9)

An individual viewer is atomically counted as one in appearing and is already counted as one in being. She is a member of a viewer-object and integral to the couple formed by a multiple and the transcendental indexing of this multiple. (Badiou 2009a pp. 220, 245, 243) She is a member guaranteed by transcendental collective indices and

---

306 He refers to an individual anarchist with a group of anarchists at a political demonstration.
identifies every atomic component of the object. The atomic component is prescribed by a transcendental identity to this individual. (Badiou 2009a p. 220) She is part of localization when she co-joined in a minimal relation with coloured pigment brought to bear by subtraction in painting as colour. This localization occurs because of colour as an event. She is involved with a change to the logic of a painting’s world in which the multiple of colour appears. In the retroaction of this logic there is a relational grasp of being-quas-being. Being-there with the relational form gives consistency to the multiple which has solidarity between the ontological count as one of a given multiplicity and a logical synthesis of it in its region. (Badiou 2009a p. 225-6)

Badiou refers to the One, the atom, as Lacan’s “quilting point of appearing within being.” (Badiou 2009a p. 218)

At the point of the One, under the concept of atom of appearing, and assuming the postulate of materialism, we can see that the smallest component of being-there is prescribed by a real element of the multiple that appears. This is an analytical quilting point between being as such and being-there, or the appearing of any being whatever. (Badiou 2009a p. 226)

There is retroaction on the multiple with the logic of appearing. The relation allows a conceptualization of a multiple’s synthetic unity, which depends on being and appearing at the same time. It is an ontico-transcendental synthesis realizable as a relation, the transcendental functor. A transcendental degree evaluates an atomic element of an object and it has the power to localize. A new atom is obtained with the localization of the real atom. “Given two real elements of the appearing-world, we can localize the one on the existence of the other” and with common materiality held in a conjunction “the result of the two operations is exactly the same atom.” 307 The transcendental synthesis occurs with the envelope. With the retroaction of appearing on being, the multiple composition of being is unified within the synthesis, such that its relational consistency is affirmed. (Badiou 2009a pp. 226, 227, 228, 230)

307 The functor operates with a conjunctive and disjunctive correspondence.
The functor associates every transcendental to sub-sets (singular viewers) of the viewer-object.\textsuperscript{308} The existence of sub-sets are measured with degrees then organized into envelopes for the sake of synthesis. One typical element of the object corresponds to each degree. An element of an object is globally typical if the object has an envelope-value, with regard to the objective of the multiple’s appearing in the world. As a globally typical element of the object with synthetic-value, a singular viewer decides on the destiny of the object.\textsuperscript{309} Such decisions subsequently modify the object up to its terminal minimalization. (Badiou 2009a p. 286) Key to the destiny of such modifications is her fidelity to the truth of new altered logic. She plays “the role of the envelope” such that when there is an event there is an “undoing of the real synthesis [and] the alteration of the whole appearing.” (Badiou 2009a pp. 278, 279, 286, 288)

13.2 Logical Completeness of a World

The new logic entails a distribution of intensities around its disappeared point. (Badiou 2009a pp. 371, 372, 371) Thus an event must make its consequences, not just itself, exist maximally. The maximality of a new existent is a subsisting mark of the event. A “consequence” is the logical interpretation of a relation. (Badiou 2009a pp. 378, 369-70) The logic opens up consequences which compose the body of truth. (Badiou 2009a pp. 371, 386) The ramifications for painting as colour, for pigmented colour as a site, is the transcendental of colour specific to painting can be suddenly ruptured because an extra signifier undoes an existing transcendental with the logic in appearing. What is required for this occurrence is synthesis and localisation with a multiple that is realised as literality, that is, pigmented colour is realised as literally sensorial colour in its own right specific to painting and apart from colour with light in the sensorium. The site requires the colour appear in its own referential field. Badiou terms the field a retroactive jurisdiction of its own objectivation. (Badiou 2009a p. 391) A viewer who identifies it realises its self referentiality. Previously pigmented colour was merely a resemblance, pretence to be colour in the sensorium, cloistered within artifice about the artifice of the sensorium. However, a consequence subsequent to the new logic is

\begin{itemize}
  \item The viewer is a sub-set of the object localized by all the other elements.
  \item Badiou states such an element of the object subordinates all the others to itself in terms of the destiny of the object within the world. (Badiou 2009a p. 286)
\end{itemize}
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literality with pigmented colour realised nevertheless as an extra signifier still specific to painting but also to the rupture of sensorial semblance per se. The new logical interpretation or a maximal true consequence is in a relation with a concept of sight which makes the new signifier thinkable.

Underlying every object in a world is an element of a multiple with nil value and “every relation between objects links together the inexistent of the one to the inexistent of the other.” Change happens to a world at the point of the inexistent. The logical completeness of appearing, which means every relation is universally exposed within it, makes multiple beings, not objects, infinitely inaccessible. This is a consequence of a world’s ontological closure. (Badiou 2009a pp. 302, 309, 320) Badiou discusses an example of relations between apparent objects in a world to illustrate a logical completeness of a world. 310 His example, dubbed the Oka Incident, is the violent revolt of the Mohawk Indians for sacred land. They are protesting against the Quebecois Administration of a golf course and against the police. He describes the Mohawk people as object one, an element-object, and the Quebecois Administration as object two. There is a relation to the relation which is both a relation to the objects and a relation to the Mohawks’ connection with object three, who is an individual representative of progressive citizens who takes sides with the Mohawk Indians. The relation between the Mohawks and the Quebecois Administration is universally exposed if there are two distinct expositions of the same relation. (Badiou 2009a pp. 312, 316) I am arguing a viewer and her sighted sentient tie is object three, a universal exponent of the exposed relation. She embodies in her sight the exposed relation between object one (the evental site with pigmented colour) and two (colour in the sensorium). As the initial exponent (object three) she has genuine local relations (she is far enough away to see the totality of the relation). However, object four, which I am designating as Western art institutions, is also an exponent but they have a global dimension. (Badiou 2009a p. 319) See the diagrams below for the objects and their relations. The viewer, object three, has a unique relationship with object four because object three and four together provide the universal exposition of the exposed relationship between pigmented colour

310 However, he is careful to point out that his example doesn’t involve an event. (Badiou 2009a p. 311)
and colour in the sensorium. Thus far every relation is universally exposed and commutative as the logical completeness of the painting world. However, the logic of its appearing becomes a ruptured trompe l’oeil when the signifier of the event changes the exposed relation between object one and object two. Pigmented colour comes to be understood as a literality of sensorial colour, that is, pigmented colour is literally artificed colour, which ruptures semblance in the continuum of the non-classical world of the sensorium. Object four sees the new concept of sight caused by the new signifier of the literality in the relation such as it is exposed to the visible by the viewer. “There exists at least one point internal to the world, from which it is known.” The initial exponent, the viewer, is captured by the global seeing. (Badiou 2009a pp. 317-9)

I am proposing it is relevant that Badiou’s theory, about a universal exposed relation with two distinct expositions of the same relation, connects to Lacan’s theory of the gaze of others and his trans-individual. Furthermore, as I stated in Chapter Four, the extra signifier, produced reflexively from a pure multiple of pigmented colour becomes localized in the tie with a singular viewer. Its transmission is from the place where the signifier was missing in colour, to where it is missing in the tie, the lack of knowledge about what the concept of sight has produced. Although Badiou avoids this level of detail related to the specificity of the site, he asserts, as I cited above, “every relation between objects links together the inexistent of the one to the inexistent of the other.” (Badiou 2009a p. 302)

13.3 Localization: Colour and a Viewer

The localizing of a multiple that brings forth multiplicity is an event. (Badiou 2009a p. 311) It involves a quilting point or suture between the logic of appearing and the multiple. There are two different ways to consider an element of a multiple: either as “itself” that belongs (in the ontological sense) to an initial multiple or as the element that defines a real atom of appearing. With the latter, the element is related not only to the multiple but to a dimension of an object with transcendental indexing. The element that relates to the transcendental of an object in appearing is an object-element. Its being becomes localized in a world. Atomic logic apprehends the thinkability of it being thought. The localization involves a retroaction of appearing on being. (Badiou 2009a p. 221)
Badiou asks ‘What occurs for an individual or maximal figure of a group as an intrinsic multiple-determination when an event locally re-arranges the transcendental world?’ He is referring to individual anarchists in a political demonstration. I ask the same question about a viewer who is a maximal figure of a viewer-object.

We already know that becoming-subject is precisely such a retroaction – namely concerning particular human animals – of the evental modifications of objectivity. The precondition for becoming a subject in a determinate world is that the logic of the object be unsettled. (Badiou 2009a p. 222)

He implies the effects of worldly objectivation on multiple-being need to be identified with the retroactive becoming-subject, which concerns “human animals.” These effects also need to be identified with the artistic subject. I part company from his theory with my theory of the viewer who has envelope-value in the world of a painting and is hence integral to localization. I place her in a co-joined relation with the object-element because she is a validated identity in a world of painting and along with the painting an artistic subject. My proposal is contrary to Badiou’s because he places localisation in the world of a painting only with pictorial elements upon the canvas of the painting. (Badiou 2009a p. 222-5) He describes the localization within these elements as pictorial logic which feeds back on the neutrality of what is there. (Badiou 2009a p. 225) I propose that if an element of pigmented colour is localised on the degree of intensity assigned to a viewer, it is transcendentally linked to every element of the painting world that possesses this degree. This is a relation immanent to the world of the painting. Given that Badiou states existence has the power to localize, if the viewer exists in this world, she has the power to localize because her existence means she has a transcendental degree. (Badiou 2009a p. 227) I posit, she is integral to commutative relations with other objects involved with universal exposition and thus she is what forces the subject-body. Without her the painting is just a potential site.

I have argued throughout that the viewer is within the materiality of the envelope. As I mentioned previously, Feltham also refers to the spectator/viewer as part of materiality within artificed envelopes. Whilst analysing Meyerhold’s theatrical event, he places the
spectator within the work. “What the Meyerhold-event does is transform not just the stage and its objects, but the entire material space of the auditorium including the audience members into the work.” He calls this “a transindividual act.” It encompasses “the potential creativity of the audience and the emergence of a collective which is included in it.” Spectator inclusion in the full scope of the art work’s materiality, profoundly undoes “the sovereign singularity of the art work.” (Feltham 2006 p. 251)

However, he does not discuss spectator involvement with a minimal relation or mention a cut to her Imaginary transference. In addition, although Feltham seems to be criticizing Badiou’s proximity to modernism, when he places Meyerhold’s event beyond a Greenbergian teleological sequence of radical breaks, he nevertheless traces Meyerhold’s theatre as a transformational break within theatre. As I discussed in Chapter Ten, contrary to this, I propose it isn’t subtractive “avant garde” formalism (Meyerhold’s or his follower’s subtractive strategies or the inclusion of spectators/viewers within his theatre), which is forced with the subjective. Subtractive formalism, no matter how “cutting edge,” is only a form of subtraction conceived for the sake of a site. What is relevant is spectator/viewer inclusion with synthetic-value and also that the event emerges from its Real synthesis. This is counter to Badiou’s theory as he avoids the viewer’s inclusion with the envelope. As such it is irrelevant if the art belongs to a “sophisticated” subtractive formalism of the twentieth century or colour in Giotto’s painting. The subject-body is thus freed from modernism’s sequence of increasingly radical breaks. 311

Meyerhold’s audience participation may be a radical break in artistic configurations but it doesn’t necessarily facilitate an event. In Chapters Five and Six, I referred to Plato and the commonality of the error. Lacan states the “something of the One,” Yad’lun, the Real One, begins at the level of lacking, not at the level of sameness. “The One of the set is distinct from the One of the element.” The element is perfectly acceptable in the empty set and the empty set in the One of a set. Common sonority with the error is a

311 It is not a matter of whether subtractive formalism is in the twentieth century or in any age. Badiou points to this when he refers to horesness in the Chauvert cave paintings and Picasso’s paintings. There is a difference of 30,000 years between both forms of painting. (Badiou 2009a p. 20) However, as I discussed previously, Badiou does insist that no matter in what age it occurs formalist radical breaks are the subjective form. (Badiou 2004a p. 108)
way of expressing oneself in harmony with the theory of the set. Thus a class of all the sets which have a single element highlight equivalence. In other words, the One of the element of a viewer is distinct from an “affinity” of all such One’s in the viewer-object. Between the individual and the Yad’lun, elements play a role in the transition of the One as Real, which is not about an individual’s corporal existence. (Lacan 2002k pp. VIII, 10, 1, 2, 10, 6) A commonality between individual’s errors is most likely the same with Meyerhold’s spectator/viewer inclusion as with Plato’s dialogues, Badiou’s social symptom and my participatory performance art. However, the inclusion of an individuated spectator/viewer with envelope-value is distinct from the Ones of the element with individuals who are all considered the same. As I discussed previously, an event requires a site with the consistency of a false hole because it requires a transcendental operation for localization, that is, human discursive sentience separate the concealed multiple (Yad’lun) from an old consistency (Symbolic and Imaginary), such that the consequence of the separation is decomposition of a world’s logic. Furthermore, the event specifically requires a singular symptom because the site’s One of the element, distinct from the One of the set, can, as a reflexive set, comply with a subject’s convocation.

As I mentioned above, “every relation between objects links together the inexistent of the one to the inexistent of the other.” It is at this point of the inexistent where change can happen to a world. An element of a multiple identifies a logical atom of appearing. (Badiou 2009a pp. 302, 218) The change occurs at the level of atomic composition with both elements. The element with a multiple of pigmented colour defines an atom of appearing within the transcendental indexing of the viewer-object. It becomes localized because appearing with the viewer retroactively bestows appearing upon the element. It gains consistency because of the count-as-one of a given multiplicity and the local synthesis of its region. Both beings operate in conjunction with an existential kinship of materiality. The conjunction is a new atom. Localization is upon a maximal degree such that the result is a conjunction (atom) with a maximal degree. The element that is

312 The errors, marked with the unary trait, mark the Ones of the element.
localised thus possesses the maximal value which validates its being. (Badiou 2009a pp. 225-6, 277, 224-5)

13.4 Real Point and Localization

The event cuts the formless continuity of sensory experience for a viewer, that is, her old discursive structure in the tie specific to the evental site. And it is a cut in relations thinkable between elements. Artifice provides the potentiality for the cut because it emphasises a site, which contains a Real point for the cut. The new atom of the event emerges with the cut which alters the logic of a concept of sight in the world of a painting for a viewer. Artistic semblance provides a classical world with an excluded middle and a clear distinction from the non-classical worlds of the sensorium. As I discussed previously, the classical world of the painting embraces the logic of the non-sequitur, which, with subtraction, confronts logic.

- All visibility is semblance
- Artifice is semblance
- Therefore artifice is the same semblance as the semblance of the sensorium.

What is concealed in the appearing of artifice that alters the logic is that artistic semblance is different from that of the sensorium because artifice signifies a different kind of world. As a classical world it provides contingency, for example, the fundamental premise of the non-sequitur alludes to a middle term which can provide the potential for a cut to the logic of appearing. A viewer endlessly analyses logic. She goes through a sequence of circuits but there is one where she has made a mistake in the count. (2002b pp. 14, 15) The logic of appearing in a non-classical world is indifferent to the second count but the classical world requires the error in her second count. When the logic of the non-sequitur doesn’t follow through the deficiency of logic is suddenly revealed. She is confronted with the Real point of the cut, a strong intensity of the site. The evental suture creates unsettling effects for her with logical alterations and the retroaction of “becoming-subject.” She identifies the effects with objectivation.

---

313 Badiou mentions “a clear cut in the formless continuity of sensory experience.” (Badiou 2009a p. 19)
314 Session 7th March 1962. Lacan discusses the full and empty circles of the torus.
Badiou thinks it is hard to know the degree of transformation the effects have on a human animal’s “very being.” Not only is a world rearranged but becoming part of a subject also has effects because an entirely new transcendental evaluation is invoked “by force.” (Badiou 2009a pp. 222, 366) It affects her because the sighting of a Real point in the site confers specificity upon her. The value of the site is revealed in the location of the new atom, that is, where its specificity is revealed as locatable consequence. The element of the multiple of pigmented colour, is, as far as sensory synthesis is concerned, an invisible underpinning, which depends upon visibility. It is a Real point in the site that confers specificity relative to the situation for the one element missing with a sentient tie. Badiou describes two operations that connect the gap between the pure presentation of being and the logic of identity. The first, within the concept of appearing involves the Real point. An atom in appearing identifies it, assigns existence to it. The second connection is the relations immanent to any being in a world, which are retroactively related with transcendental logic on a multiple that appears. The relations reveal an appearing multiple correlates with synthetic unity, which is dependent on the multiple’s being and on the transcendental. \[315\] She is local \textit{in situ} for an element of pigmented colour, the point of the One as Badiou calls it. She prescribes it with her sight in appearing as the Real point. The two elements prescribe the same new atom that is formed. “The result of the two operations is exactly the same atom.” (Badiou 2009a pp. 226, 176, 227, 228) The element of a multiple of pigmented colour identifies an atom of appearing within the same world and the logic of the world correlates between the two elements. Localization is mediated through the transcendental with the viewer. The element of the multiple of colour becomes part of being-there. It belongs to a concept of sight with the viewer-object. \[316\] Its being thought is the retroactive feedback-effect of its appearing.

The decision for the event with the point connects to the question ‘Does the multiple support, referent of phenomenology, exist or not?’

\[315\] This is the ontico-transcendental synthesis realised in a relation, the transcendental functor. It has to be realised in a relation because the transcendental always relies on relational differences.

\[316\] It “belongs” to the viewer-object on a particular transcendental degree. “For a localized atom, the greatest possible value of belonging is localization.” (Badiou 2009a pp. 224, 227)
A point as the reduction of the infinite multiplicity of the Two [the transitive], localizes the action of that truth to which an event has given the chance to appear in a world. (Badiou 2009a p. 401)

A point is a testing ground with a decision that spaces out and co-joins the subjective (truth procedure) and the objective (multiplicities that appear). It makes appear the infinities of a world before the instances of a Two, the “yes” or “no.” As a test, with the infinite reduced to the Two, it localizes the action of a truth. The Two is a transitive set and its elements, Ø and {Ø}, are also transitive. (Badiou 2005 p. 132) Thus a pure multiple and all its elements are transitive. However, a site is a reflexive set. As a multiple, the site is an element of itself. It presents itself to itself, in transcendental appearing. (Badiou 2009a p. 366) The transitive allows for comparison hence the decision for the event with the point. In an order structure sub-objects can be compared if they are connected as commutable. They have to be reflexive, that is, have a relation to themselves. Thus in a minimum order there are two sub-objects, the transitive and the reflexive. The transitive supplies the third because it makes the two comparable, that is, for example, to ascertain what is inferior in size. (Badiou 2013 p. 117) 317 The viewer recognises the element of colour as belonging when the ordinal (the viewer) identifies it therefore it is included in the viewer ordinal. This synthesis that is realizable in a global relation is possible because of the transcendent functor. The three axioms of a partial order relation incorporated in the operation of the transcendent functor are reflexive, transitive and anti-symmetry. It is an operation of regional ontological consistency, which involves two structures.

The synthesis is ultimately realizable in the form of a relation, which is itself global, between the structure of the transcendental and the structure that is retroactively assignable to the multiple in so far as the later appears in such and such a world. (Badiou 2009a p. 226)

317 Every element of an ordinal is transitive and ordinals are intrinsic or structural. If an ordinal is smaller than another ordinal it means it either belongs to or is included in the larger. (Badiou 2005 pp. 133, 134) The disproportion in size relates to compatibility with the anti-symmetrical axiom.
The first structure is of the transcendental, which is a scale of evaluation that measures degrees of identity between two appearances of multiplicities. The structure authorizes the setting of the degrees. 318 If its third axiom of order arising from the transitive is anti-symmetry it avails a comparable relation. (Badiou 2009a p. 158-9) In the ontological situation there is Ø, the empty set, which is the proper name of being-quas-being. The transcendental with appearing cannot accommodate the empty set. It can only evaluate a minimal intensity, zero. The anti-symmetry in the order structure means the minimum is unique, that is, singular. As inferior to every other element two minimums are thus the same. What is involved with objectivation is the localization of an element (atom) on a transcendental degree. Thus there is a relation of worldly compatibility between two elements of a multiple: an order relation is directly defined on the elements of a being that appears, which is not conveyed by its pure ontological composition. “This relation amounts to the projection onto being of the fundamental feature of the transcendental (the partial order-structure).” The transcendental functor is the complex form of the synthesis, that is, an ontico-transcendental synthesis, which constitutes a supernumerary argument. (Badiou 2009a pp. 196, 226, 197

13.5 Real Point and the Symptom

In the mid 1970s Lacan defines the Real point as a point in the hole of the Real ring in the Borromean knot. He discusses the relation of localization as a line between two points and its purpose with substitution is to make known an inexistent. (Lacan 1994 p. 4) 319 (Lacan 1998 p. 139) (Lacan 1994 p. 177) 320 He states the unconscious touches by chance upon an error with a frequency. The errancy of “the error aims, if there is an unconscious, to express something.” (Lacan 1994 pp. 181, 178) 321 The unconscious is a hypothesis because it is “supported” by the element that underpins the error. (Lacan 1998 p. 139) In fact it is a hypothetical “take” on the relation required for localization. It

318 Every transcendental is a partially ordered set. It is partial because it does not link together all the elements of a base set.
319 Session 13th April 1976.
320 Session 11th May 1976.
321 Session 11th May 1976.
postulates upon an extra signifier. (Lacan 1994 p. 179) A swarm copulated with knowledge because of the second count and signifier One is the signifying order instituted upon the basis of the envelopment by which the whole chain subsists. (Lacan 1998 p. 143) The partial order structure continues on regardless unless an extra signifier is instated.

Whether that relation is symmetrical, anti-symmetrical, transitive, or other, whether the [divided subject] is transferred to S2 to S3 and so on and so forth, these questions must be taken up on the basis of the schema that I am once again providing here. (Lacan 1998 p. 143)

He was providing a presentation on knotting and the fourth ring or extra signifier. The unconscious without the extra signifier can only logically provide a “minimal formulation,” that is, a signifier that represents a signifier for another signifier.

The signifier in itself is nothing but what can be defined as different from another signifier. It is the introduction of difference as such into the field, which allows one to extract from la langue the nature of the signifier. (Lacan 1998 p. 142)

The extra signifier is a form of excess extra to, and extracted from, what is there. The introduction of difference is with the emergence of an extra signifier. It is different to the missing signifier of la langue (the point of One as Badiou calls it) although it is extracted from it. The site requires the extracted signifier only emerge from the object-element’s own referential field. A viewer who identifies it realises its self referentiality. Lacan’s understanding of such referentiality and his declaration, “The signifier in itself is nothing but what can be defined as different from another signifier,” demonstrates a knowledge of the differences between being and appearing, and such formulation

322 Session 11th May 1976.
323 My italics.
between set theory and category theory. The introduction of difference meant the extra signifier could be extracted from la langue. An extra signifier stands apart ontologically from the lack of difference in set theory or the ambiguity of difference with category theory. As Lacan states, difference “allows” or enables an extraction from being onto being-there. Also the overtone in his text relates to complexities with exponentiation. Badiou refers to the complexities.

It is practically impossible to think the categorical definition of exponentiation without passing through its hidden set-theoretical model. Certainly we can give this definition, but then it would still remain a pure real, an obstacle in our way of understanding. Which is why I hold that exponentiation is like the categorical passage where the demands of set-theoretic ontology operate, if not declared, like a forcing. (Badiou 2013 p. 45)

Lacan took decades to develop his theory about the site’s specificity with a singular human. The hypothesis of an individual’s unconscious is demonstrated “on whom it is based” because the extra signifier constitutes a subject’s sign. In the early 1960s he stated “The neurotic wants to retransform the signifier into what it is the sign of.” (2002b p. XIII 5) Over a decade later he states “it is because there is the unconscious” specific to a divided subject that “the signifier can be called upon to constitute a sign” (faire signe), a “subject’s sign.” She is the site’s specificity because she can be “made into a subject of the signifier, or at least which passes for such.” (Lacan 1998 p. 142) Lacan’s 1970s theory of localization (with a relation and a sign) is

---

324 Set theory and category theory define the relationship between the signifier and the letter differently. “In set theory the identification of a presented multiple (therefore of a being) is clear: a set is defined by its elements and two sets which have the same elements are identical (are the ‘same’ set). ... There is therefore in category theory an essential ambiguity to identity. Caught up in a network of and similar external actions, ‘two’ objects are indiscernible – except as pure empty letters. This is inevitable as identity is not an immanent mark, but rather the effect of actions, or arrows, which operate in a categorical universe.” (Badiou 2013 p. 14) In Logics of Worlds, Badiou states “Ontologically a multiple cannot differ ‘more or less’ from another. A multiple is only identical to itself and its laws of being-qua-being ... that the slightest local difference – for example one which concerns a single element amid an infinity of others – entails an absolute global difference.” (Badiou 2009a p. 155)

325 Session 14th March 1962.
a signifier he describes as a verb, which determines disjunction, and “becomes a sign.” (Lacan 2002k p. I, 1)

The verb is defined as a signifier that is not as stupid, ... notastupid as the others, no doubt, providing as it does the movement of a subject to [her] own division in jouissance, and it is all the less stupid when the verb determines this division as disjunction, and it becomes a sign. (Lacan 1998 p. 25)

The singular human within a relation that becomes conjunctive identifies the Real point in the site. She identifies it as a sign, which is a trace of the event. Lacan’s theory insists upon the singular human because the Real point in the site is specific to her, that is, being as an extra signifier from the point is a site’s element of itself which is conferred upon her and supports her. The viewer identifies what has been conferred as a symbol of a symptom. The symbol designates what inexists. (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 5) She identifies with it because of its repetitive errancy in the Symbolic. Subtraction with artistic semblance aims to undo the symptom as it points to duplicity in the false hole between the symbol and the symptom. (Lacan 1975-1976 pp. 16, 17, 34, 50)

There are significant differences between Lacan’s symptom and identification, and Badiou’s “social symptom.” Badiou places a symptom with a collective in a political situation. Although he doesn’t place a viewer within art’s localization process, he does place individuals in a political collective with localization. He examines the beginning of the political site and presents an example of a political insurrection at the end of the Franco-Prussian war in 1871. He asserts the beginning is a “social symptom.” The collective identifies it, which contributes to the site’s existence, such that the site becomes evental. Furthermore, it becomes a support-being for the activist workers. He states the disarming of the Parisian workers turns a day (an object), 18th March, into a

---

326 Session 8th December 1971.
327 As I stated in Chapter Six, there are two signs, one with the gaze, the division with the second count, and the second with the extra signifier.
328 Sessions 18th November, 9th December, 16th December 1975.
site (object-element). Previously the possibility of the Paris workers gaining governmental power was non-existent. Thought as object is with political appearing, which occurs because the support-being of the site makes the impossible inexistent of worker-being into an existent. The workers thus constituted a political authority with the support-being. (Badiou 2009a pp. 366, 365, 364, 366) I propose a symptom is also with the object-element for a viewer-object with artistic semblance. She identifies it and with it and thus contributes to the site’s existence and the site in turn imposes itself upon her, that is, it confers being upon her. She identifies what is conferred upon her as a symbol of her symptom. The site implicates an element of itself, which as Lacan states is extra to and from what is there. Moreover, the new atom or signifier emerges from the point. It becomes a trace, a symbol, and a subject’s sign. (Lacan 2008 p. 40) (Lacan 1998 p. 142) The site’s support-being makes the inexistent of viewer-being into an existent. The site’s imposition and forcing is a demand impelled by being, that an unknown capacity appear as an unprecedented power. In Lacan’s theories the extra signifier is ‘called’ upon by the singular human who has cohabited with the error of the second count. A viewer possesses the new atom, which specifically supplements her and she happens also to be a typical member of a viewer-object. The individual in a relation of localization turns an object-element of a multiple of pigmented colour, into a site. As a representative of an expedient viewer-object she decides a relation is universally exposed. The viewers of the viewer-object are expedient because her concept of sight is part of the gaze of others.

As I discussed previously, according to Lacan even a singular representative in a political situation is the pivotal figure with identification that turns an object-element in a world into a site. He theorizes this in a seminar on exponentiation and the Paris May 1968 protests. (Lacan 2007 p. 180-93) 329 Individuals are typical members of the political collective-object, but only one by one. Lacan declares the singular is pivotal even if the subjective only happens for some. This may mean evental change doesn’t constitute immediate progress for the political collective-object. (Lacan 1990 p. 16) Two things are relevant here. Firstly, such immediate progress with emancipatory

---

329 Session 17th June 1970.
politics requires a quantity of adherents because as many people as possible are required to overthrow political conditions. Secondly, the overthrow usually requires an instant change or a short time frame. The artistic event with a singular viewer occurs in an instant but the overall change for a collective viewer-object doesn’t constitute immediate progress. It occurs with viewers one by one and each occurrence is separated by different durations of chronological time. The subjective pertaining to one viewer remains commutative with localization and is communal despite chronological time variations with different viewers. However, although a collective political subject may occur at the same chronological time for a collective of individuals, Lacan’s theory insists the requisite is nevertheless the element, or singular symptom with a typical member of the collective-object. (Lacan 2007 p. 190) Badiou emphasises the singular with the universal, the singular summons a universal thought-subject. He places singularity with truth procedures, for example, singularity is singular to art. (Badiou 2005a p. 9) However, he does not place this degree of focus on a singular member with a “social symptom.” (Badiou 2009c p. 29) He states that truth as singular is declared by a subject without identity. “It is offered to all, or addressed to everyone.” (Badiou 2003 pp. 11, 5, 14) Packaged within this, as Burchill points out, is his avoidance of difference with his trans-particularity, that truth is indifferent to difference and to sexual difference. In relation to the singular symptom however, as I discussed in Chapter Ten, he wants the viewer to give up on the singularity of her desire because he thinks the singular symptom expunges the universal. (Badiou 2005a p. 67)

In Part A I explored how protestation and transgression only leads to a change of positions within the master’s discourse. (Lacan 2002k p. VI, 9-10) The above mentioned Oka Incident was a protestation, which involved Mohawk Indians as the object-element. An event didn’t occur with the incident because it didn’t change transcendental arrangements and bring forth multiplicity as such. (Badiou 2009a p. 311) The object-element (Mohawks) was in a triangular set of relations with object two (Quebecois Administration) and an object three, a singular citizen representative of

330 She suggests that since 2011 Badiou has been considering “an essential ‘egalitarianism’ of the universal.” (Burchill 2014 pp. 1, 6)

331 Protestation plays upon the roles of the master as semblant and the slave in the signified position.
progressive citizens who took sides with the Mohawks. Badiou asserts the citizen’s relation to the relation was both a relation to the objects and a relation to their connection, that is, the citizen establishes a relation with the Mohawks and a relation to their relation with the Quebecois Administration. (Badiou 2009a p. 313)

I place the viewer where Badiou has the citizen, pigmented colour with the Mohawks, and colour in the sensorium with the Quebecois Administration. A new atom, literality with pigmented colour emerges as exposed and within a viewer’s sentient tie. Badiou’s progressive citizen and a viewer both have relations with the objects and constitute a relation to the relation because they are commutative and co-appear with the two initial objects. Badiou describes this triangle as a “subjective intensity,” in fact, the citizen or viewer is an “expression of the subjective implication” in a conjunctural relation. 332

332 The object-element (pigmented colour prescribed by a Real element) designates a being of a painting world which is not really in the world, a transcendental minimality for the viewer-object. (Badiou 2009a pp. 314, 316, 323) “The inexistent of an object is suspended between (ontological) being and a certain form of (logical) non-being.” The inexistent of colour testifies logically in appearing for the contingency of being-there. Its being has non-being as its being-there. (Badiou 2009a p. 324) It is a being whose being is attested, but whose existence is not. If there is “a tipping-over of a nil intensity into a maximal intensity” an event has occurred. (Badiou 2009a p. 343)
Why didn’t a political event happen with the Oka Incident? Badiou doesn’t explain why. His discussion about a “social symptom” with the Parisian workers of 1871, shows that group identification is involved. He asserts the disarming of the Parisian workers turned a day, 18\textsuperscript{th} March 1871, into a site. Many if not all within the Parisian workers’ organizations identified the site and an event occurred. (Badiou 2009a p. 364) This group identification didn’t happen with the progressive citizens in the Oka Incident. Obviously many if not all of the citizens didn’t identify the Mohawks as a group site, a social symptom; otherwise their identification would have contributed to the site’s existence and thus made an event possible. Furthermore, I presume from his many political examples, it would not have been a political event for Badiou if only one person, the singular symptom of an individual citizen, was involved with the identification.

Lacan’s theory of different types of nomination is pertinent to any evental occurrence including such an incident. The three different nominations relate to Lacan’s three registers. Any of the three forms of suppletion could have occurred with the incident. Imaginary nomination is associated with identification. Previously I stated Imaginarization is the key to subtraction and the specificity of the site with sighted sentience. It is also a key to Lacan’s Imaginary nomination of the event. Something of a close attachment stands in as a substitute. “The support derived from identification with
the other is sufficient to compensate for the absence of the signifier.” (Grigg 2008 p. 16) It doesn’t have to be with a group, it can be identification with a friend. Such suppletion concurs with common sonority. As I stated in Chapter Five and Six, a true doxa, along with Imaginary identification, contains the unnamed element or Real object a behind the deceptive Symbolic object. It has the error common to all and common sonority with the one that is not. Along with Lacan, I stated Plato’s nomination is Imaginary. His theory about participation in an idea sustains the idea and circumscribes the Real as a gap. (Lacan 2002k pp. VIII, 5, VII, 9, 8) 333 The gap and an Imaginary nomination appear to promise that one can arrive at something with dialogue or protestation. (Lacan 2002k p. VII, 7) 334 The inadequacy of the nomination relates to the similar (semblable). True doxes with Imaginary identification seem numerically self evident because they are associated with individuals. (Lacan 2002k pp. VIII, 12, 4) 335 However, it is not the individual that is the problem but rather the idea of the individual that sustains the individual, that is, the idea in S1, the pure multiple in the master. The only thing we arrive at with dialogue or protestation is the Real as a gap and the common sonority of the true doxa. This only supplies the ontological distinction between the pure multiple and existence. As I stated above, the Ones with individuals in a collective-object amount to the One they have in “affinity” with the others of the all. (Lacan 2002k p. VIII, 6) However, what is Real for an individual is what makes a hole in semblance. (Lacan 1973-1974 p. II, 6-7) This hole relates to the image of the image. 336 As I showed in Chapter Four, Plato analysed how light can’t see without sight, but he didn’t note that sensory knowledge is known by the knowledge it causes, that is, by what the concept of sight with colour produces in discourse. Sensory knowledge’s

334 Participating in the idea is participating with the unary trait. This involves the failure of the sexual relationship, which is the mark of the master signifier on the divided subject. There is identification with the trait. (Lacan 2002k pp. VII, 2, 3)
335 Session 19th April 1972.
336 It is not that the semblant with the site hides anything. It is simply a sign of itself that is hidden. (Lacan 1971 pp. I, 12, 11, 15) Session 13th January 1971. The site only discovers the Real because of the function of semblance.
dependence upon the concept is the inscription that indexes the error, the inconsistency of sensory knowledge in the tie. Inconsistencies on both sides become a relation of nil value.

As I stated in Chapter Five, Badiou ignores the individual’s Real with the hole in semblance and camouflages it with the similar in a political event. He also ignores it within the synthetic-value of the painting. Thus, as Lacan states about Plato, Badiou’s nomination with art and politics is Imaginary, that is, he tries to make up for the no sexual relation. (Lacan 1998 p. 82) Also Lacan asserts Plato pays homage to the effect of the name of the Real but his nomination isn’t Real. (Lacan 1974-1975 pp. 106, 108) His nomination occurs when a philosopher straddles both the site and master’s discourses. All it achieves is a change of places in the master’s discourse, which at least limits general doxa. The One of the element (not the One of the set) that is a singular viewer, gains knowledge of jouissance, independent from others in the collective-object, which provides access to the Symbolic in the site. A Real nomination can then realize the Symbolic in the Imaginary. I alluded to this in Chapters Ten and Nine when I discussed how both Laurent and Badiou misrecognise the relevance of a singular symptom for an artistic enquiry. Their misrecognition is about a supposed impingement - Laurent’s with an artist’s symptom and Badiou’s with a singular symptom. Laurent is concerned that the artist’s “externalized” symptom is displayed for everyone like the sardine can in Lacan’s story, and Badiou proposes art should address the universal, not the singularity of desire. (Badiou 2005a p. 67) However, the sardine can doesn’t see the viewer in the logic of appearing. It looked at Lacan and saw nothing. As I stated in Chapter Three, the true function of painting is to create a truth of being in knowledge integral to its user. Thus, unlike the sardine can in a non-classical world it aims at the concept of sight. Any inconsistency displayed in the art can become an object-spot in artifice. (Laurent 2008 p. 8) (Lacan 1979 p. 95)

As I discussed in Chapter Nine, a viewer may for instance, despite Laurent’s qualms, perceive something in the artist’s “personal signification.” Like the skull in Holbein’s painting The Ambassadors, it is a trap where the viewer is caught. The viewer becomes part of the relations within its world. She is confronted with what is specific to her, the privilege of the gaze, which is integrated into the field of desire within a world. If her
vision is displaced in the trap, the displacement confronts her with something outside of perception. The displacement is a realization within the logic of appearing. (Lacan 1979 pp. 89, 85, 86, 85, 89) What is objectivated with the phenomena of sight is revealed. The gaze relates to the presence of others but others looking at us don’t trap the gaze. What is displaced isn’t a gaze that sees but a gaze imagined by her in the field of the Other. The displacement occurs because a viewer, similar to a voyeur, perceives she is sustaining herself in a function of desire. (Lacan 1979 pp. 89, 84, 85) She sees in the gaze of generic others, what is Real for an individual. It is the Real in a hole in semblance, a recognition of her own “personal signification,” which sustains her connection to a point. However, she is also confronted with the logical completeness of a world which holds with the phenomena of sight. What is at stake “is to make up for the absence of the sole part of the real that cannot manage to be formed from being.” (Lacan 1998 p. 48) The gaze is caught because duplicity reveals that what appears to lack in vision is just a hole in the Symbolic and it is a hole precisely because the desire related gaze doesn’t appear. The displacement confronts her with an unrepresented element, a Symbolic hole in the Real. Two holes are involved with the dialectic of desire. It is not just that the viewer is One of a set with a viewer-object or that she represents others or as with a voyeur others are looking at her. “The gaze of others ... disorganise the field of perception.” (Lacan 1979 p. 89) The capture of her gaze initiates a Real nomination with both the Symbolic and the Real holes. Subtractive duplicity in artifice points to both. Lacan’s theory of localization with his Real nomination involves a designation of the ontological referent because it is counted with the universal symptom, “the gaze of others.” However, the viewer’s gaze has to be cut to enable a relation with the gaze of others. The viewer is in this sense both the One of the element and One of the set. The cut to an old consistency, rather than a re-ascribing to the Imaginary as Badiou thought in *The Theory of the Subject*, allows a realization in form, a subject-body in “topological relation with others.” (Lacan 1979 p. 89)

I stated in Chapter Seven that Lacan proposes a Real nomination which provides a new consistency with the extra signifier as it realises the Symbolic in the Imaginary. It

337 In different words, affect indexes a supplement in vision, which allows the singular intimate to be counted with an extimate universal.
supersedes the old consistency. The Real in the hole of the Symbolic is why and how subtractive strategies with Symbolic transference facilitate an event’s emergence. The evental signifier arises from it and names both holes. Symbolic suppletion only names the hole in the Symbolic. Plato only imaginarized the Symbolic in the Real hole. Lacan explains mathematics can imagine the Real from the Symbolic. (Lacan 1973-1974 p. I, 10) Plato’s *eidos* is the Imaginary as it equates with the certain image in ultimate knowledge, not the uncertain image of image with secondary knowledge. Badiou also does this when he places next to no emphasis on the singular symptom, for example, within a painting’s world. He imaginarizes like Plato that the Symbolic in the Real, that is, the Real from the stand point of the Symbolic. If his trans-human is with Imaginary suppletion and a philosophy of emancipation then the other is still a symptom for the individual and the singular is not counted with the universal. The singular symptom is ignored in his theory of emancipation with the artistic event. His artistic truth about the sensible is a new universality, a “new Idea in the sensible.” It is “universality against the abstraction of money and power. ... The question of art today is a question of political emancipation.” (Badiou 2004a p. 107) In short, the singular symptom is a threat because it provides the means with a being-there site to subvert the master’s discourse. In fact, the event can only advance with the singular because “there is no collective unconscious, only particular unconsciouses.” (Lacan 1994 pp. 4, 3)

Such a being-there site inexists as nil value. It is the unconscious in later Lacanian theory. As a being-there site, a viewer inexists with the minimum of every transcendental, that is, her degree of existence is nil, non-being. In the early 1960s Lacan discussed the sequence of circuits with the torus. What reappears is “the unconscious minus one,” One of the element. “Something of that is preserved at the level of the point.” (2002b pp. XII, 14, 15) “The unconscious … is a supposed deduction, nothing more,” and it contains an error in the deduction, which never succeeds better than when it fails. (Lacan 2008 p. 63) (Lacan 2002j p. I, 8) As I

---

338 Symbolic suppletion is generally associated with a psychotic’s construction with delusion. “Some psychotics have been capable of making important scientific or artistic contributions. Cantor ... is a famous example.” (Grigg 2008 p. 17) Joyce is understood to have constructed a Symbolic suppletion.

339 Sessions 16th March and 13th April 1976.

stated previously, Lacan refers the May ’68 students precisely to the Real point of the event in the site, that it is this point which is at stake in exponentiation. (Lacan 2007 p. 190) Thus, the being-there site of the viewer is the unconscious. It is a false hole, a set, \{a\}. (Lacan 1994 p. 178) The singular viewer in the ontological sense is One as an element of la langue, \(\alpha\), but in the logical sense of a being-there site she inexists as non-being. As I discussed above with the gaze and the function of desire, the viewer approaches the world of a painting as the One of the element but that has to be cut to enable a gaze of others, a being-there site in the field of the Other. The reason for this is that Lacan’s Real nomination names the Symbolic and Real holes. As the inexistent of the being-there site, her unconscious blunders with the evental site of the object-element of pigmented colour, which contains an unpresented element \(\alpha\). As a minimal effect of structure, the multiple’s consistency is composed from what, with respect to \{a\}, in-consists. In fact, the element \(\alpha\) causes the void to appear as the \(\alpha\) intersects with the evental site of pigmented colour, \{a\}. The disjunctive but supposed unity of the historical situation is specifically built on a viewer’s symptomatic instability, a Real blockage in the hole of the Symbolic unconscious. A viewer, in a Real synthetic relation with the pigmented colour’s evental site, is in a situation of historicity. In fact, the event’s errancy with the symptom in sentience creates the

---

341 Session 8th December 1971.
342 Session 11th May 1976.
343 Badiou states, “We can recognise that \(\alpha\) is on the edge of the void for the situation formalized by \{a\}. In fact, \{a\} has only \(\alpha\) as an element. It so happens that \(\alpha\) is not an element of itself.” (Badiou 2005 p. 185) The subject convokes a decision as to whether the \(\alpha\) belongs. The situation \{a\} presents the evental site but nothing which belongs to it is presented in \{a\}.
344 “The multiple \(\alpha\) being a site in \{a\}, and \{a\} thus formalising a historical situation (because it has an evental site as an element), can be expressed in the following manner – which causes the void to appear: the intersection of \{a\} (the situation) and \(\alpha\) (the site) is void, because \{a\} does not present any element of \(\alpha\). The element \(\alpha\) being a site for \{a\} means that the void alone names what is common to \(\alpha\) and \{a\}: \{a\} \cap \alpha = \emptyset.” (Badiou 2005 p. 185) The site, \(\alpha\), is non-void but the intersection is void such that in \(\alpha\) there is \(\beta\) which is on the edge of the void relative to \(\alpha\). “The void names what \(\beta\) presents in \(\alpha\), namely nothing. This multiple \(\beta\), formalises an evental site in \(\alpha\). Its existence qualifies \(\alpha\) as a historical situation. It can also be said that \(\beta\) founds \(\alpha\), because belonging to \(\alpha\) finds its halting point in what \(\beta\) presents.” (Badiou 2005 p. 185) There is no common element between \(\beta\) and \(\alpha\), which means, as Badiou states, the intersection of \(\beta\) and \(\alpha\) can only be named by the proper name of the void, \(\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset\). Belonging to \(\alpha\), \(\beta\) cannot infinitely regress, thus this halting point establishes a kind of original finitude. (Badiou 2005 p. 186)
345 The evental site is a historical situation. (Badiou 2005 pp. 175, 177)
site. The singular symptom aligns as non-being with the site. It exhibits the false whole of the unconscious along with the transcendental degree of its existence and aligns or associates with colour’s evental site. The subsequent relation with envelope-value is between the inexistent being with pigmented colour and non-being (the minimum in every transcendental). Localization occurs with the evental signifier in the relation between the inexistent in two objects, viewer-object and object-element. A viewer confers existence upon a Real element of colour, which retroactively confers being upon a viewer.

The multiples of a situation are retroactively structured by their objectivation in appearing: compatibility, order, envelope. In particular, there exists a real synthesis of every part of a being whose elements are compatible in pairs. Relations conserve this structuration. (Badiou 2009a p. 339)

The viewer is part of subjectivation when the artistic subject convokes the event to decide. Subjectivation becomes necessary because, as Badiou states, [the event’s] “belonging to the situation of the site is undecidable from the standpoint of the situation itself.” (Badiou 2005 p. 181) As a being-there site, she confers existence upon the object-element of pigmented colour, that is, she identifies the singularity of the disjunctive site α. Furthermore, the decision with the identification of the element of colour, the Real point, exists in the situation. In other words, if it is identified, an element of pigmented colour belongs to a concept of sight in appearing. A set theory ontological formulation of the event allows for its existence as a count-as-one, of a set that belongs to itself, α ∈ α. Thus the signifier of the event exhibits self belonging. As Badiou states, “the belonging is the belonging of the signifier of the event to its signification.” (Badiou 2005 p. 189) The subject is with both the viewer and the colour, that is, the latter is a site for the former. The event deploys “the being of non-being,” namely, existence. (Badiou 2005 p. 183)

Badiou describes the operation of localization as justifying the passage of thought from the guaranteed being to the one whose identity needs to be established. The guaranteed being is the viewer.
One can say that the identity of a being is guaranteed, always in a local sense, on the basis of that of another being. … Thus a being is only exposed to the thinkable to the extent that - invisibly in the guise of an operation that localizes it - it names within a world, a new point. In so doing it appears in that world. (Badiou 2009a p. 113)

A multiple (viewer) can think another multiple (pigmented colour), the elements of which are the elements of the first. The classical world of artistic semblance is created for the event precisely because a viewer cohabits with a symptom in sentience. As such the event can be convoked. The element of the multiple of pigmented colour is realized as literality, colour in its own right within a world of painting. It is thinkable because she declares the literality is a sign for her. “The letter of the literality becomes a signifier with the real” and pigmented colour is realized as a subject-body with a concept of sight as literality, inimitable wit. (Lacan 2008 p. 50)
Conclusion

The intention of this thesis was to argue that an artistic event can occur with pigmented colour in painting and its subject includes its viewers. I have explored how and why pigmented colour is conducive to an event immanent and singular to painting. Chapter One was the beginning of an analysis of two aspects about colour.

1. Colour is threatening and dangerous.
2. And it evokes a nil-value relation.

As I demonstrated in Chapters One and Eleven, colour generally and in painting, is considered secondary. In Western art history, colour has been marginalised in comparison with line (drawing) and tone (light and dark) in painting because colour is considered to be secondary and a threat. Over the centuries it has been aligned with the feminine and, along with women, it has been associated with inexistence. What is minor is a threat to what is major. Also colour’s peripatetic errancy causes instability. This errancy combined with secondariness makes colour a threat to ruling social orders and the certitude of the count-as-one within human discourse. As I showed in Chapter Two, if its threat is weak it can still effect discursive change. In fact, if it is a strong intensity it can subvert the master’s discourse. Also, as I showed in Chapter Eleven, its invisible and visible materiality aligns with inappearing or nil-value. This gives credence to a long held tenet that colour is distinct from light. Despite a sufficiency of light, colour’s invisible materiality seems to inappear and its visible materiality inappears when it is considered subordinate to light. Moreover, negativization is connected to inappearing. (Badiou 2009a p. 105-6) Thus both non-ontological categories of colour’s materiality inappear and have nil-value for discursive sentience. This points the viewer toward colour’s inconsistent multiplicity.

The two aspects of colour combine to make pigmented colour conducive to an event. The errancy of colour is associated with its inconsistent multiplicity, which underpins its nil-value, and the repetition of the errancy resonates with the singular symptom as a threat to the certitude of the count-as-one. Furthermore, subtraction that promotes a nil-value relation between pigmented colour and a viewer, impacts upon sentience when it
uses colour’s association with inconsistency and repetitive resonance with the symptom. An intense errancy emanating from colour’s inconsistency, combined with subtraction employed to make colour stand out as inimitable, culminates in an aleatory event. Falsity with the non-sequitur causes a shift in logic, such that it no longer coheres and the viewer is confronted with a void, which, if supplemented by an event, comes to exist as the being of non-being with a being-there site. Following Lacan in Chapter Thirteen, I stated such being-there is the unconscious of a viewer who has second count specificity with the evental site. She acknowledges the inconsistency of the site and identifies with it which convokes an unnamed element in the site to re-present as an extra signifier. As Lacan showed in *Radiophonie*, the subject is between the body (empty set of bones or pigmented colour) and the name, which signifies something for someone and becomes a new signifier in a new discourse. Her specificity within the tie points to the name. Furthermore, her unconscious being-there site is subsumed by the event. In short, the extra signifier with colour as an event supplements the specific inconsistency she acknowledges, which is, in the logic of appearing, a localization process.

Major change with pigmented colour occurs with worldly objectivation. Localization involves the exposition of a relation via another relation between an unpresented element (pigmented colour) in a relation to another element (a viewer) which declares the former exists because she identifies it. Retroactively with the transcendental functor, an extra signifier emerges as designation for the element of pigmented colour and whilst obtaining consistency as it is localized upon the viewer-element, it confers being upon the viewer. It is a new atom and the two elements, one of colour and one of the viewer, prescribe the same atom. (Badiou 2009a p. 228) The new atom is realised with a concept of sight to be a literality related to pigmented colour as sensorial colour. Pigmented colour in a world of artifice (re-semblance) is sensorial colour literally in its own right as a signifier in comparison to sensorial colour in worlds of the sensorium (semblance).

In Chapter Nine, I discussed Lacan’s theory of the worldliness of the symptom. His theory on the singular symptom across worlds focuses on viewer engagement with an artistic evental site. He describes a deceptive trap for a viewer’s symptom in the world
of a painting. Her concept of sight confronts her gaze in a world that has been integrated into the field of desire. (Lacan 1979 pp. 93, 85, 86, 85) Although the gaze is part of sight, the trap displaces sight to reveal a viewer’s specificity as a privileged contact with the Real. Swindling duplicitous deceit with semblance is revealed as related to sight across worlds. (Lacan 1979 p. 89) A truth about what is objectivated with the phenomena of sight, which is immanent and singular to the painting’s enveloped materiality, emerges from its deceptive semblance.

As I discussed in Part A, it is not that colour exists as an illusion in the human mind. Its functional usage is a transcendental related to an error in the count-as-one which is subsumed by a new concept. The subject’s declaration ‘colour as an event exists,’ retroactively shows the event is a supplementation within the envelope for the universal located with the singular symptom. The unconscious hasn’t been able to logicize the symptom. (Lacan 2002k p. III, 3) If the unconscious exists it is proof the inexistence in the symptom is preliminary to the necessity for a new signifier. As Lacan shows there is a necessity of logic with discourse. “This necessity is repetition itself, in itself, by itself, for itself.” (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 6) The necessity with such self belonging can forge an extra signifier as a new logic with objectivation. Badiou and Lacan state logic with non-classical worlds doesn’t require human sentience. However, Lacan’s theory shows logic with artifice, that is, resemblance within a classical world, uses inexistence with the resemblance retroactively. (Lacan 2002k pp. IV, 4, 7) A new signifier cuts the logic to reveal that a symptom’s functional usage is a transcendental related to the inexistence in resemblance. The truth-body, immanent and singular to the envelope, is not only about a rupture to resemblance but also semblance per se in non-classical worlds specific to the singular universal symptom.

The third question for this thesis arose from the application of Badiou’s and Lacan’s theories: ‘What kind of philosophy prohibits compossibility with Lacan?’ As I demonstrated in Chapters Five and Six, philosophy is not compossible if it completes Lacan’s master’s discourse, that is, if it is emancipatory and or indifferent to the singular symptom. In Parts B and C, I addressed and refuted Badiou’s criticism of Lacan and analysed whether Badiou’s definition of an artistic subject furthers the master’s discourse. I have argued there is a subject-body in Lacan’s theory and stated
Lacan is the forerunner to Badiou and his theories about the event and the subject-body. My research shows that the relevance of a viewer has eluded Badiou and Lacan. Badiou doesn’t include the viewer in the artistic envelope or with the subject. His viewer feels pleasure from a perceptual intensity, which signals an artistic event. I have argued such an affect means his viewer remains a divided subject. This is also the case because he doesn’t theorize a cut to her Imaginary identification. In *Logics of Worlds*, a viewer sometimes partakes in the “transport of the true” (cave paintings and Picasso’s paintings) without disturbing the logic of the classical world (Opera) because she is excluded from localization and the artistic subject (Robert’s paintings). (Badiou 2009a pp. 20, 131, 224-5) As I have discussed, she may partake in the “transport of the true” but the viewer doesn’t just participate and become educated and attuned and thus remain caught in the prevailing discourse. She is a being-there point for the object-element in the envelope. As I showed in Part A, as light is seen and colour sensed by what light and colour cause, a concept of sight is also known by what it causes.

In contrast, Lacan’s affect of anxiety is a relinquishment to, and indexation of, the event’s emergence. It becomes the enjoying substance of jouissance. However, although Lacan includes her in the arrested moment with painting, he highlights the artist with the seminar on Joyce and ignores a viewer. 346 Nevertheless, he places relevance on the singular symptom. In the seminar on Joyce, he analyses how art deploys what a singular symptom imposes and in his theories on the political event with the May ’68 student uprising in Paris he places emphasis on the singular symptom of an activist. (Lacan 1994 p. 7) 347 As I stated in Chapter Thirteen, a singular representative in a political situation is the pivotal figure who turns an object-element in a world into an evental site. Although a nomination can be thought by everyone, the subject with a singular human is pivotal. (Lacan 2008 p. 53) Lacan’s theory remains with the individuated representative of the collective of protagonists because the singular unconscious corresponds to an evental site. (Lacan 1990 p. 16) It preserves it at the

346 He occasionally aligns the viewer’s integrality with the analysand. (Lacan 2006a p. 52)
347 Session 18th November 1975.
level of a point. (2002b pp. XII 14, 15) 348 In other words, evental change can only advance with a singular unconscious because there is no collective unconscious. (Lacan 1994 pp. 4, 3) 349 Although the error is common, he refers the May ’68 students to the Real point in the site. (Lacan 2002j I, 8) 350 (Lacan 2007 p. 190) This has implications with intentionality and philosophy such as Badiou’s philosophy, which proclaims emancipatory politics. The intentionality of a political party or a leading activist sits well with a divided subject who wants an authority figure who is supposed to know and the divided subject wants maintenance of an old symptomatic knowledge where a master signifier is already functioning. However, truth emerges from what is false and old knowledge then falls to the rank of symptom. Lacan thinks a political subject with emancipatory politics can exist but only if an individual can locate herself with something that has never been produced before, a new signifier. It arises from a false hole in a singular symptom, for example, shamelessness rises from a hole of shame, and the singular is justified with the proletariat or the gaze of others. (Lacan 2007 pp. 192, 186-7, 188, 189, 192)

Badiou on the other hand ignores the singular symptom and identification. He sees the political event as involving group identification with the “social symptom” of a collective. (Badiou 2009a p. 365) Also with the artistic event, as I showed in Chapter Ten, he ignores the singular symptom and emphasises art’s universal address. I argue, in a classical world of re-semblance with artifice, a viewer’s singularity with the second count is required for what Badiou calls art’s universal address because her count is exchangeable with others. According to Lacan, the possibility for this exchange value of a symptom, a sign of the false hole, is the only thing that matters. (Lacan 2008 pp. 10, 9, 10) The singular symptom is involved in localization with a viewer-element on the basis that it is declared and identified with the object-element. In Lacan’s theory a symptom is individuated with each member of the collective. She is typical of the group and integral to the universal but the site or symptom is individuated. This means that

349 Sessions 16th March and 13th April 1976.
350 Session 8th December 1971.
not only is the site’s specificity individuated but the event’s localisation is also. The relevance of the singular symptom goes to the heart of the main difference between Badiou and Lacan. In fact, I have argued in Chapter Five and Thirteen, unless the singular symptom is pivotal for the event, the nomination is Imaginary.

As I stated in Chapter Ten, the impasse in Badiou’s theory, where his philosophy is not compossible with Lacan, is most obvious with the artistic subject. He ignores the viewer in the art’s envelope and thus the error in her count. And although the political subject arises from the artifice of politics, just as the artistic subject does with creative artifice, he doesn’t ignore the individual activist. Nevertheless, he ignores her singular symptom. The issue is not that a group can be a subject, such as the army of Spartacus, but that the singular soldier is pivotal as are all the singular soldiers. What is of value with the evental site in the artifice “comes through its master signifiers” and is valuable because it engages the singular viewer or activist. (Lacan 2007 p. 192) In other words, emancipatory politics can be successful if the emergence of truth is from the false hole of an individual. Also, as I mentioned above, intentionality has implications for philosophy which purports to have emancipatory politics. Lacan declares evental change doesn’t occur because of the intention. As I stated, truth emerges from where knowledge is considered false. (Lacan 2007 p. 198) Badiou’s theories of artistic evental change involve new formalist subtractive strategies with an ongoing purification of such artistic configurations. However, inventions of new form in art falter with intentionality which only results in better forms of old knowledge. At best it can perhaps entail a Symbolic nomination as described in Lacan’s theories about Joyce. Successful evental change with politics or art depends on a lack of supposed knowledge. A Not All strategy which works with the supposed knowledge of Symbolic transference provides for a cut that allows a new truth to emerge. This involves the Real signifier of the event “realizing” the Symbolic in the Imaginary. (Lacan 1974-1975 p. 108) (Lacan 2002b pp. XII, 5, 7, 14-15) 351 (Lacan 2002k p. IV, 3) In short, evental change can successfully occur with art and emancipatory politics if a Real nomination occurs with a singular symptom.

351 Lesson 7th March 1962
As I have shown, there is an interdependence between the object-element in art and the viewer-object. Thus I posit the subject is a combination of the painting and the viewer: colour as an event thinks itself via pigmented colour in conjunction with the singular of the universal.
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