



Diana/Djana and Actæon

The following eight “theorems” are presented to account for the durability of the story of Diana and Actæon, whose probable origins in shamanistic theology created constructs that were resistant to multiple additions, subtractions, misinterpretations, and falsifications of the original. Ovid: Actæon, a member of the house of Cadmus, goes out hunting on a hot summer’s morning. He and his companions, nearly exhausted by the extent of their kills, retire for lunch and short naps and return to the forest for more killing in the afternoon. Actæon, separated from the group, stumbles across the grotto spring where Diana and her attendants are taking their daily bath. Offended by this invasion of privacy, Diana splashes Actæon. The water has the magic effect of transforming him into a stag, whereupon his hunting dogs give chase and devour him. The story is given a moralistic spin in the Middle Ages. Actæon “has it coming to him” for being so wealthy as to have thirty-three dogs or for killing more than he can eat; or, in some versions, he imagines himself a rival of Diana as an expert huntsman or, even, her lover. But, in all variations there are two main parts of the story: discovery and punishment, privation (violation) and prohibition (enforcement).

Whatever links these two components (water or an arrow, jealousy or retribution, voyeurism or competition, etc.) fits around a tight minimalistic logic of action and reaction. However, in the many retellings and visual renderings, there are constants: the bath, with its goddess and maidens; the hunter, with his dogs; the forest and the concealed grotto. Ovid differs from other tellers of this tale by “signalizing” to the reader that the issue of dogs is key. There are 33 of them, and 33 is a number of mortification and finality. Dogs are the traditional guardians of Hades (Αἰδῶς, “the invisible”), and the three-headed Cerberus uses the number three to represent the boundary condition between life and death. While it might seem to be a boundary like any other, the Styx is like Okeanos. On the “other side” is a nothing, a void, from which return is impossible. Where ordinary boundaries are transitive in that crossing from one side or the other and back again is equivalent in either direction (ABA = BAB), Hell’s boundary is asymmetrical, or rather “super-symmetrical.” Out and return, ABA, brings with it the contamination of death, the third element, 3, which is both “back home” and “still away,” $A_1B_2A_3$. The super-symmetry of the third, the return, echoes in Actæon’s *return* to the forest, just as the number three is multiplied by 11, a number associated with Janus/January, to produce 33, the number of death but also rebirth.

Over the centuries of retelling, Ovid and select others have recognized these “mystery elements” and “signalized” to knowing readers that this is more than a simple warning against greed or voyeurism. It is a shamanistic tale about death and transformation, akin to the story of Lucius in Apuleius’s Latin novel, *The Golden Ass*, where religious elements are reinforced by the insertion of the story of Psyche, another mortal who “sees what she should not have seen.”

The idea of extracting eight theorems is an attempt to discover the logic of the Diana–Actæon. Some theorems treat aspects rather than narrative components, but these are themes that must be carried along to complete the idea’s trajectory.

The “theorems” of Diana/Djana and Actæon

1. **Forest = field.** The forest is a “field” (domain of defined operation); the grotto where Diana takes her bath is a site of exception within this field. When the field is inventoried, Diana will not appear, except through *accident*. (Ovid recognizes this, and introduces the tradition that Actæon is blameless.)

COMMENT: The field is a defined physical range of affordances constructed by adjacencies. Although there may be barriers defining varying frictions of distance between points in the field, the principle is the same as that for geographical terrain. No place is theoretically inaccessible; it's just a matter of relative costs. It is in this field that the paradox of Diana's grove appears. She is both there and not there, findable and inaccessible. As if to prove the geographic relevance of Lacan's formula for the woman, she uses her divine right of appearance/disappearance, $\phi/-\phi$, to ambiguate her presence in the field. This is probably the direct cause of Actæon's innocence in discovering her location.

2. **The inventory.** Actæon is performing an inventory (hunting to hunt whatever is there to be hunted — evident in his decision to *return* to the forest). The numbers of inventory are 3, 6, and 11. 6 is an “aliquot” ($1+2+3=1\times 2\times 3$); 3 is A_3 (the uncanny return); and 11 is Djanus/Djana.¹

COMMENT: The hunt as inventory is an ancient trope, equivalent to the idea of earth as both resources and domain — something created to nourish and support habitation and activity. Numerical equivalents express the idea that everything that can be found will be found, everything within the field has a use value. Yet, inventory as such contains a Hegelian irony. Just as some numbers are both present and absent — or like the number 9 can be “cast out” without effect — the rational project of completion encounters a point of radical irrationality. Just as a bartering process reaches a termination thanks to a balance between a “too much” and “too little,” the inventory process finds a limit beyond which further action is useless. This is a tipping point between two logics; one of deduction, another of flight. We move from anxiety to fear to fright.

3. **Two spirals.** As a result of the process of inventory (binary deduction²), there are two “spirals” in the inventory, with a small space between them; this is the space where Actæon discovers Diana, whose original name, Djana, reveals the sinthomatic status of this space. (A “sinthome” is a relation to the unconscious, which in the case of the field is the space between the spirals of the binary deduction inventory.)

COMMENT: Binary deduction, a stereognostic procedure where inventory is restricted to a single form of inquiry serves as the experimental control. The existence of something in a location simultaneously creates locations where it is absent. This is the same as saying that “masters” create “servants” in Hegel's famous parable of Lordship and Bondage. This is reducible to the principle of the excluded middle in logic: X and $\sim X$ constitute a complete definition of the field.

4. **The not-all.** As $\phi/-\phi$ (which is, after all, the essence of any god/demon as “epiphanic”)³, Diana/Djana is a boundary coefficient written as a “not-all” (*pas tout*), able to permeate transitive boundaries. Actæon has permeated the boundary

1 The “uncanny return” refers to the superimposition of time sequence on geographical repetition. Leaving and returning a location are: ABA. In “journal” form, the same sequence is 123. The return occupies the same position geographically but cannot in the journal, thus A_3 .

2 The “twins rule” (\emptyset) says that you can't be in two places at once. The field must be inventoried one *part* at a time, and the part that has no game becomes a part of the field that has game. The phallic law, ϕ , is manifest spatially. “Castration” is, as in the case of sexualization, symbolic. One subscribes to the Symbolic, one accepts misrecognition, the $-\phi$, in exchange for the privilege of membership. Spatially, this is inclusion into a positive territory at the “loss” of the exteriorized space outside the bracketing frame, the exclusion zone. Within the zone, bracketing proceeds as inventory, where location is affirmed by a process of showing where it is not, to assure completeness. This is the “privation” phase of the story, and privation is the name of the process of deductive binaries where 1 indicates success and 0 non-success. The choice in any case is a space inside of which is another space, inside of which

3 A god may be defined in terms of the “not-all” of location theory, an exception to the rule by which a god must be either present or absent. Gods break the “twins rule.” Heroes may break the twins rule by using a “rotation motif” (one twin lives in the world above while the other abides in Hades, on a calendar basis).

protecting Diana, but this is counted as a transgression. The Lacanian *matheme* for the not-all, $\sim(\forall x)\Phi x \rightarrow (\exists x)\sim\Phi x$, emphasizes that the “no exception” component leaves Diana no choice, even in the face of Actæon’s lack of intentionality.

*COMMENT: Diana’s relation to the boundary is an overlap of Agency and Other. She is both the boundary and the space divided by boundary. This is an “impossibility motif” in Lacan’s terms, because Agency and Other lie on opposite sides of the mathemes of discourse. As “impossibility” Diana is able to give the Law to which Actæon, even though technically innocent, must plead guilty and suffer. In the distinction of $\phi/-\phi$ as the rule by which Diana, ϕ , predicates/transforms Actæon, $-\phi$, Actæon gains the power of the not-all as a feminized victim (or “fictional victim,” a “fictim”), i.e. a transcendence of predication and conversion to a “dæmon” of the margin. In *metalepsis calculus*, $\phi<...>-\phi$ contains the forest as field, $<...>$, the place of inventory. Within the field is the invisible, \diamond , the grotto where Diana bathes with her attendants. It has the form of the forest, with a “hunter and companions,” in that the attendants parallel the role of Actæon’s dogs: $\diamond = <>$. The splash of water, \diamond , has the value of a magic agent of transformation, meaning that the interior of the $\diamond/<>$ is equivalent to the $\phi<...>-\phi$ exterior bounding elements.*

5. **The reversed predication mandate.** Diana is the “not-all” (i.e. a goddess), Actæon is the reverse-predicating hunter, whose obedience to the $\phi/-\phi$ requires conversion from hunter to hunted.

COMMENT: This theorem is coupled with the previous theorem, the “not-all.” Diana stands for “impossibility” in discourse terms, Actæon for “impotence.” Privation (Law as discipline) converts to Prohibition (punishment). Privation is the same as hunting, where one being kills another, eats it. As the cowboy sage of The Great Lebowski says, “sometimes you eat the bear, sometimes the bear eats you.” But, the grotto is also predicated by the forest. It is contained by the forest, but its status as a site of exception makes it invisible to all but Actæon, whose privileged entry comes at the cost of his reversed predication into prey to be consumed by his dogs.

6. **The twins rule.** What is conventionally “the phallic rule” in Lacan’s *mathemes* of sexuality, is also the “twins rule” — that two people cannot occupy the same place at the same time, and one person cannot be in two places at once — a rule violated in theater and cinema by two actors playing the same person or one actor playing two people (e.g. David Lynch’s *Mulholland Drive*).

COMMENT: Spatializing the Lacanian mathemes for gendering provides the more readable version of sexuation as territory, movement, transgression, and architecture. The “not-all” or permeable boundary (the boundary itself) is easily demonstrated in the role of Hestia as protector of the hearth and domestic flame, later elided to the civic flame via the Vestal College in the case of Rome. This spatial translation is corroborated by Richard Onians “clarification” of the meaning of the Herm, the boundary markers showing only heads and phalluses.⁴

7. **Super-symmetry.** Transgression must be balanced by $\phi/-\phi$ as reversed predication. The hunter becomes the hunted. The dogs retain the super-symmetry of the hunter, namely the number of completion proper to the full inventory, in the same way as Dante’s hell contained 99 stanzas superimposed by 9 rings. 33 is similarly “canonical” as $3+3$ (6, an aliquot) and 3×11 . 11 is the number of Djana as “one adjacent to one that is an Other one,” i.e. a chirality; and 3 is a number of completion.

*COMMENT: Super-symmetry is the combination of the predicate and its reversal, by which the reversed term is the “gnostic interpretant” of the dialectic pair (e.g. the hunted reveals the nature of the opposition of hunter and hunted). The gap is materially expressed in this myth through the splash of water or, in other versions, the shot of the arrow. January is the “gap month,” where the old meets the new in a period of inversions. In the Roman *Saturnalia*, servants played the role of their masters, who were required to serve them. The tradition of fool-kings and boy bishops continued through the Middle Ages, and is preserved in the celebration of Twelfth Night. Even the popular Christmas carol, “The Twelve Days of Christmas” involves an inventory, made at *Saturnalia* by friends who would gather in the evening to recount fables and*

4 Richard Broxton Onians, *The Origins of European Thought About the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate: New Interpretations of Greek, Roman and Kindred Evidence Also of Some Basic Jewish and Christian Beliefs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 122.

legends while dining on canonically determined foods.

8. **Stereo-gnosis.** The shamanistic interpretation of Actæon (that Diana has baptized him so that he may take on the body and mind of a stag to understand the mysteries of the forest) is allowable and ethnographically probable. The tradition of Actæon's horns is related to the mask, particularly as demonstrated by Robert Thompson to be seen in terms of "flash movements" made during ritual dances.⁵ The trope of horns is the same as "hair streaming upwards" in the icon tradition: i.e. a connection to the True ("azure"; *cælum*) via divine frenzy. Shakespeare: "horn-mad" (*Merry Wives of Windsor*, III, 5). To wear horns is, ambiguously, to be made fool of and/or simultaneously to be given possession of full wisdom (the "gate of horn" in classical poetry was the gate by which true dreams came to the dreamer, as opposed to the "gate of ivory").

COMMENT: The splash of water indicates a baptism of the initiate who is transformed into a totem animal. The dogs (cf. Hades as "the invisible"; the mortification of the rite of passage; the ritualized count-down of transformation enumerating the re-mapped body as vessel and passage) must be emphasized as both numerical (canonically complete) and geometrical (a circle). Wisdom is always in relation to a celestial reference; horns connect the head to the sky in the same way the phallus is connected to the head in the stone boundary markers known as Herms. The gate of horn was thus a "psychic" gate, hence the connection of Eros and Psyche in the stone marker. Stereo refers to the fundamental geometry of predication: it subordinates one thing, person, or object to another. It creates a positive identity by creating a negative one, but the negative one ironically assumes a superiority "outside the predication," as in the case of Hegel's parable of Lordship and Bondage. Diana splashes Actæon but Actæon gains perfect wisdom thereby, thanks to the mortification process and its canonical number of completion. Reverse predication of hunter to hunted emphasizes this point and gives Actæon's death a religious function, hence the comparisons of Actæon to Jesus, the "sacrificial lamb of God."

Discussion: the significance of the eight "theorems"

The traditions surrounding the story of Diana and Actæon are ancient and durable. That is to say, that they resist attempts to reduce them to sheer content or advice. The accidental additions or subtractions sometimes reinforce latent themes. Such durability requires a "polythetic" rather than a "monothetic" approach.⁶ That is, interpretation *per se* will always amount to a falsification of the myth, whereas the active telling and even distortion of the myth will involve a transaction that fuels the myth's essential logic.

This is a story that has been told in print since antiquity, and was clearly an oral tale, possibly masking an occult tradition, before that.⁷ One trait of such durable tales is their "metaleptic" structure. The tale is on one level "representative." It seems to give an account of events in an actual or imaginary past. On another level, the tale is "enactive." It contains, within its structure, significant clues about the event or magic that is described. This double logic of reading/telling constitutes a "stereo-gnosis" — a way of knowing something on two levels or in two parts. Reversing the process, we look for the story itself to be in some way "about" stereognosis. This was shown to be the case with the story of Simonides of Ceos's "accidental discovery" of the art of artificial memory. Not intending anything more than an application of a

5 Robert Ferris Thompson, *Flash of the Spirit: African and Afro-American Art and Philosophy* (New York: Random House, 1983). Other connections to religion and shamanism can be found in Norman O. Brown, "Metamorphosis II: Actæon," *The American Poetry Review* (November–December 1972): 38–40.

6 For an introduction to the polythetic method employed in a "hard science" analytical way, see David L. Clarke and Robert Chapman, *Analytical Archaeology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978). Extending this protocol to narrative analysis requires a theory of reception with multiple active agencies contributing to a cumulative and dynamic/dialectic model of meaning.

7 Leonard Barkan, "Diana and Actæon: The Myth as Synthesis," *English Literary Renaissance* 10, 3 (1980): 317–359. Actæon falls into the category of those who have seen something they shouldn't: Cadmus, Tiresius, Narcissus, etc. See also G. R. Levy, *The Gate of Horn* (London: Faber, 1948) for background on the use of horns on graves, crowns, and as gates to heaven/underworld.

mechanical memory method to remember the names of guests at a *sitesis* (banquet honoring Scopus, a local celebrity), Simonides, hired to recite a poem dedicated to the celebrity, had inserted a dedication to the twin gods, Castor and Pollux, to protect the celebrity from the evil eye (Scopus had paid for his own *sitesis*).⁸ Scopus however refused to pay Simonides for this part of the poem. Simonides was called outside by a page, who said that two strangers were waiting to speak with him outside. When he got the street, no one was there, but before he could re-enter the prytaneion hall, it collapsed, killing all occupants. Relatives who came to claim the bodies were distressed that they were crushed beyond recognition, but Simonides, who had for no other reason than to be sociable memorized each name by picturing the guest's place at the table, could identify the bodies and allow the families to bury them with the required rituals.

The Simonides story itself is a chiasmus, or double structure, just as the story itself was about a double structure. The discovery of the coincidence of the "casual technique" with the sacred function of naming the dead occurs to the reader in the same way it occurred to Simonides, with the realization of happy coincidence. In the story of Diana and Actæon, this stereognostic reading occurs if we presume that Actæon's horns constitute accession of wisdom, in addition to being a part of Actæon's conversion from hunter to hunted. Wisdom comes to the reader in the same way it came to Actæon, accidentally and as a result of the "mortification" process — stripping away the "flesh" of the story to arrive at a purely spiritual content.

Taking this reverse-engineering reading further, we recognize Actæon's transformation not as what it seems to be, a punishment for the transgression of Diana's privacy, but as an initiation component. Actæon has been ritually "sacrificed" — hence, the status of the splash of water as a kind of baptism — so that he can be reborn as a demonic spirit. His horns constitute a mask, like those worn by dancers in rituals, to invite divine inspiration. In the same way, the reader must pass a liminal threshold while reading/hearing the myth, to arrive at the secret content, where the field of the poem enters a "gate of horn" — celebrated by antiquity to be the portal by which true dreams come to the dreamer.

The sacrifice as mortification is an old motif, a traditional component of the rite of passage, where initiates must die symbolically in order to be reborn. In this sense, the story of Diana and Actæon runs parallel to the account of Lucius in *The Golden Ass*, who must endure a year in the body of an abused beast of burden before he can find and eat the roses that are the antidote to the spell of his imprisonment.⁹

The gate of horn is the stereognostic reading — the chiasmus structure applied to the reception process as well as to the content of what is being told. This is metalepsis in Gérard Genette's sense of the narrative technique of including framing elements (diegesis) within the frame of mimesis.¹⁰ The reader in the first case is "diegetic" and the reading appears within the mimetic frame, disguised. The recognition of stereognosis constitutes an arc connecting all previous stereognostic readers who have "gone through the gates of horn" to understand the polythetic meanings of the myth. This is myth as enactment, not myth as fictional account of a fantastic event. The chiasmus of reading and story appear within the mimetic frame as a transformation whose structure is also a chiasmus/metalepsis.

8 About the prytaneion and its uses see Stephen G. Miller, *The Prytaneion: Its Function and Architectural Form* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).

9 Apuleius, *The Transformations of Lucius, Otherwise Known As, the Golden Ass*, trans. Robert Graves (New York: Farrar, Straus & Young, 1951). For background on the liminal space of ritual initiation, see Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960) and Victor W. Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977).

10 Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Thus, when Ovid “adds” the element of accidental discovery to clear Actæon of intending to violate Diana’s privacy, he does so in two registers, one to demonstrate that Actæon qualifies as a victim of ritual sacrifice (one had to be pure, not a criminal); another to demonstrate the reader’s freedom of choice. The stereognostic reading cannot be a determinative representation, a “correct interpretation.” It must be freely chosen, freely discovered. Like a dream, its meaning must come of their own accord.

Anyone feeling that the stereognostic reading is a late and eccentric addition to the myth’s lore, consider Vico’s prominent placement of Diana in his major work, *The New Science*.

§528 From [the idea of Styx as the source of sacred springs] imagination conceived the third major deity, Diana, representing the first human need which made itself felt among the giants when they had settled on definite lands and united in marriage with particular women. The theological poets have described the history of these things in two fables of Diana. The first, signifying the modesty of marriage, tells of Diana silently lying with the sleeping Endymion under the darkness of night; so that Diana is chaste with that chastity referred to in a law proposed by Cicero, *Deos caste adeunto*, that one should go to the sacrifice only after making the sacred ablutions. The other tells us of the fearful religion of the water-springs, to which was attached the perpetual epithet of sacred. It is the tale of Actæon, who, seeing Diana naked (the living spring) and being sprinkled with water by the goddess (to signify that the goddess cast over him the great awe of her divinity), was changed into a stag (the most timid of animals) and torn to pieces by his dogs (the remorse of his own conscience for the violation of religion). Hence *lymphati* (properly, sprinkled with *lymphæ* or pure water) must have been originally a term applied to the Actæons who had been maddened by superstitious terror. This poetic history was preserved by the Latins in their word *latices* (evidently from *latendo*), to which is always added the epithet part, and which means the water gushing from a spring. The *latices* of the Latins must have been identical with the Greek nymphs, handmaidens of Diana, for *nymphai* in Greek meant the same as *lymphæ* [in Latin], The nymphs were so named at a time when all things were apprehended as animate and for the most part human substances, as we have set forth above in the Poetic Metaphysics.¹¹

Latices turn out to be *laticis*, “water; (any) liquid/fluid; running/stream/spring water; juice,” but Vico connects this to *latendo*, from the verb *latere*, “lie hidden, lurk, live, escape notice.” This is the same word Vico used in the motto inscribed on the plinth shown in the “impresa,” as is called the engraving shown on the title page of *The New Science*. Metafisica (Metaphysics) is shown leaning against this plinth holding a triangle (a builder’s square, a right triangle?) in her right hand while gazing into a mirror she holds in her left. This is a direct reference, it seems to a “stereognostic” method of knowing. It is clear that Metafisica is not looking at herself, as Verene has claimed, but at the triangle/square. Why? Verene may be correct in his assessment of this image as a “before” picture of the New Science, to the “after” of the *dipintura* or frontispiece, but I disagree that “before” means “inferior.” Rather, this image offers instructions on how to read the frontispiece; and elsewhere I have detailed the means by which the frontispiece should be mounted on a board with an eyepiece that allows the reader to take the position of the divine eye. The image is then seen in reverse, as it is reflected in a mirror, with the divine eye the living eye of the reader. In this position, the reader takes up the role Vico elsewhere specifies for him/her — i.e. as the true author of *The New Science*, rewritten with every new reading, constructed with every mis-, de-, and re-construction. While Vico gives no support for the before-and-after view as imperfect attempt followed by a perfect attempt, he gives ample support for Metafisica showing us how to view the frontispiece, and the frontispiece’s role as a means of visualizing the New Science.

The motto on the plinth, *Ignota Latebat*, is translated “She lay hidden.” The She seems to be Metafisica, but Vico connects this central role (the appearance of the human world as such) to

11 Giambattista Vico, *The New Science of Giambattista Vico* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), §528.

another She, Diana — or, rather, *two* Dianas. Just as Diana is also Djana (a feminized form of Janus, the god of boundaries), there is one Diana for dreams, the Diana who anesthetizes Endymion so that she may kiss him — a progenetory of Shakespeare’s episode of Titania and Bottom in *A Midsummernight’s Dream*; and another Diana for the mystery of the sacred spring, whose waters transform Actæon into a stag (reversed predication).

“She lay hidden.” Certainly this applies to Diana bathing in her secret grotto. It also applies, *via* the word *laticis* to milky moonlight which conceals Diana’s erotic visits to Endymion. A lattice is an architectural device that conceals through woven strips, usually of wood. The forest’s trees and branches are poetically close by. But, sticking to the facts of the case returns us to Vico’s at-first moralistic interpretation. Citing Cicero, he reminds us of the tradition of purification required by ritual. A sacrifice could not be made, nor any auspices taken, if the participants were impure. This is why Actæon’s “innocent encounter” is nonetheless a matter for severe punishment. He did not prepare himself! The other references relate to the demonic habitation of natural substances — springs, streams, but even water droplets — so that the power of water and fire could be transferred metonymically; the part constituted a medium of contagious magic; Actæon could be transformed by a splash of water.

Thus, “she lay hidden” has both a privation aspect (the demon within material being, inaccessible to “mortal eyes”) and a prohibition aspect (magic places require ritual purification by any who would enter). Privation, in short, converts to prohibition. At least, this is what the two Dianas tell us, and what Vico uses as nothing less than the beginnings of human perception and religion. What the senses cannot reach become the *via negativa* of the spiritual human, who must first see the natural world in terms of demons, then gods, then heroes, then causes — but *in this order*. The demon predicates the god, which predicates the hero, etc. Vico’s *ideal eternal history* (*storia ideale eterna*) is a series of nested predications.

Metaleptically we might say that *storia* is entirely a matter of “mimesis,” a content framed by — what? By the thunder, Vico teaches, in the striking metaphor that Joyce borrows in his four famous words of the thunder. But, the law of metalepsis is that diegesis invades mimesis. The frame appears within the framed. Just such invasion is the occasion of a myth, whose “free floating” aspect as one narrative among many, contains the secret of origins and is a frame of itself framing. Metalepsis is the secret that Ovid discovers, and at the same time discovers that *others have discovered*. This is why he “signalizes” with the added detail about each of the thirty and three hunting dogs — a number of completion that shows that Actæon is mortal but must be made immortal by an action of *mortification*.

If the Diana–Actæon story is metaleptic, it is also evidence that a “fetish stage” has given way to a “sinthome stage” — and the idea of a two-part logic of cathexis informs the theory of metalepsis. Adding back the eight theorems (field, inventory, double spiral, not-all, reverse predication, twins rule, super-symmetry, and stereo-gnosis) to metalepsis tells a story that can be represented by the “calculus of predication” that reduces metalepsis to the logic of $F \langle \dots f \rangle f \dots F$, a (global) predication of (consecutive or nested) predications, repredicated internally. This, in short, is as short as it gets. Diana is the “one” who is “one again” — 11. Or, considering the aspect of sleeping/dreaming Endymion, 1(1), the one who dreams herself.¹²

12 This is by no means the same subject as described by Pamela Field, the self-help American-Spanish author of *The Woman Who Dreams Herself A Guide for Awakening the Feminine* (Xlibris Corp, 2011). Diana² of Vico fame does not need any help, and the advice she might give to men, i.e. fall asleep or kill yourself, may not be helpful. Rather, dreaming relates more to Eastern and Middle-eastern myths of gods who bring the world into being through dreaming, or to shamanistic versions where dreaming is used to conceive temporary worlds where cures and corrections can be made to the waking world.