

Lacan's logical square is, according to Urban (2022, p.81), 'a more natural (and less logical)' reading of Aristotle's original logical square, sometimes termed the 'square of opposition' (ibid, p.87), the treatises of which were expounded by Aristotle in the *Organon*, 4th century BC. This exposition's references to Lacan's his logical square can be found in his Seminar XIX (2018, p.186) and Seminar XX (1999, p.78).

In the account of Aristotle's logical square provided by Urban (ibid, p.82-3), the world is consequently conceived of categories of **substances** of two kinds, primary and secondary, and categories of each of **quantity** and **quality**. The three categories are elucidated in language through several fundamental propositions. Each proposition is comprised of a **subject** that names a substance, and a **predicate** that names a property, hence 'Subject is Predicate', or 'S is P'. In addition, two distinctions may be applied to a proposition, that of **particular** and **universal**, relating to individual and groups of man and woman, and things. Whatever the proposition it must also be **affirmative** or **negative**, true or false.

When Lacan developed his own variant on the logical square in the 1960s', according to Urban (2022, p.90) it was due to a loophole of 'equivocation which roots itself at the formal level of any articulated system of logic' How Lacan (2018, p.86) alters Aristotle's logical square is by complicating the negation of true by false, and visa-versa, by introducing 'one standing as the obstacle to the other'. This occurs along the top line of the square as '*there exists*' and '*there does not exist*', and along the lower line, '*all x*' submitted to the phallic function and '*not all woman*' – where woman can alternatively be man, in certain circumstances, or an object or object-element.

Another consideration that maps with Aristotle's logical square, to an extent, is the so-termed 'hermeneutic circle'. According to Urban ibid, p.14), this is a concept that developed in the 19th century that seeks to account for the element of subjectivity that permeates one's assumptions of the independent existence of objects, where '...it is the object itself that must now be conceived as conforming to our thinking', or in other terms the consideration of '...relation between the whole and the part' as the cycle of thinking (Urban, p.87), and thus the development of hermeneutical phenomenology, or the phenomenological study of texts. This had early historical implications for the

understanding of the subject as what has now become 'subject to' and 'subject of' language. Consequently, but after Aristotle's original formulation, this has brought the productive question of less logical subjective meaning into the logical square.

Urban (ibid, p.67-8) equates Lacan's 1964 Seminar XI, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, with his development of the Real as one of the three structural registers of the human psyche, Real, Symbolic, Imaginary. (In many texts on this topic, including Lacan's own texts, each of the three structural registers is spelt lower case.) Then, according to Urban (ibid, p.68), in the 1970s' the Real is conceived as 'impossible – a conception notoriously expressed in his [Lacan's] declaration of the impossibility of the sexual relation' that his logical square sets out to determine.

Chattopadhyay (2022, p.120) states: 'In Seminars XIX and XX, Lacan relates the real to a logic of writing. Moving through Aristotle's modal categories of necessity, possibility and contingency, he inscribes a fourth modality, i.e., the real as the impossible through a logic of double-negation: "what doesn't stop not being written" (1998, 59)'. While the Real is equated with the impossible, far from its not being there, it is there all the more cogently in and through its very absence. At each end of the left column, or, following Aristotle's square, the masculine side, are **necessary** and **possible**, while on the right side, feminine, **impossible** and **contingent**. In addition, at each of these four corners, Lacan has used mathemes to define how the subject is in each circumstance spoken in and by language.

Reference

Chattopadhyay, A (2022) 'Logical space in Lacan: from Poe's letter to Valdemar's body', *S: Journal of the Circle for Lacanian Ideology Critique*, vol. 13, pp. 119-137, Oct. 2022. Retrieved from:

https://www.academia.edu/37502597/Title_Logical_Space_in_Lacans_Purloined_Poe

Lacan, J. (2018) *...or Worse*. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XIX. UK: USA: Polity Press

Lacan, J. (1999) *On Feminine Sexuality, The Limits of Love and Knowledge*, The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XX. New York, NY; London: Norton

Urban, W. J. (2022) Lacan, Aristotle and Sexual Difference. *Swing Trade Systems*, uploaded 28 May 2022. Retrieved from <http://www.swingtradesystems.com/lacan/lacan-and-aristotle.html>

Urban, W, J. (2015) *Lacan and Meaning: Sexuation, Discourse Theory, and Topology in the Age of Hermeneutics*. Retrieved from: <http://www.swingtradesystems.com/lacan/lacan-and-meaning-pdf-download.html>