The omphalos is a symbolic means to give a focal importance to the exchange between the reader and a book, whereby a book—which is acquired as an object—is embodied: that is, transformed to convey the extended sense of bodies (like heavenly bodies)… as in times of old.

That is, a reader can reliably expect that embodiment will take place, from the point onwards—in the reading—at which s/he intercepts the book project. Which, when it occurs—usually some point after the middle— succeeds at making the book applicable in the reader's *life-world*.

Embodiment thereby constitutes a case of point of programming, in Karl Gerstner's sense of the term. That is, the outcome of gap-gaming doesn't solve a problem to be fixed, but programmes for solutions. Programming, in this sense, is a category of design-work which is virtual *and* actual/neither.

The given material for the gap-game pilot is *Sarah Davies' book Hacker-spaces—Making the Maker Movement*. The two norm sets (the literalist precepts and the oblique strategy cards) instruct shaping operations at the entrance to and exit from this material. It led to a discovery about the book.

The discovery is that the way she returns to certain topics repeatedly—iterating them in her field-inquiry—is in itself an instance of the individual query in a collaborative collective setting, which is also her research subject. She treats it and proceeds as makers do in their maker-space.

By proceeding as a maker, she not only mirrors the maker-movement in her own literary *modus operandi*, but she hopes to hack the movement to disclose those critical aspects of which the maker-milieus she has been working with, only are marginally aware of. But her success is limited.

In fact, she cannot succeed. Because she has no other protocol than her written output to home in on criticality. As little as her sour-dough nerding makes her a maker, the mimetic trope she uses to hack the maker-movement in her book cannot succeed at adding to the maker-repertoire.

This owes to some intricacies of mirroring in transposition. The test project has shown that triangulation readily transposes from one level to another—a total of three levels. For triangulation to occur the (triangulating) elements must define in strictly non-mimetic terms. Yet, they mirror between levels.

Hence the relevance of discussing the relation/difference between mirroring and mimesis. Mirrors are machine-like in the way they operate, but depend on occurrences in their environment to reveal their presence. Mirroring is correspondingly an occurrence, more than an approach (or a trope).

Because it can be counted on to operate across levels, there are two other topics that turn up on the radar: **1)** Max Weber's idea of the *mechanism* [that combines natural law with historical occurrence]; **2)** whether the fact that it can be counted on, entails reliability and—beyond this—even *precision*.

In the pilot gap-game there are transpositions at three levels, and hence two mirrors: **a)** from triangulating norm-sets (Potter and Eno/Schmidt) to triangulating readings [devised vs. habitual reading, in the edgeland between formal and natural language]; **b)** and from this to critical theory.

The basic assumption—with a status of hypothesis—is that that mirroring twice (mirroring a mirror) is a potential pattern-breaker, or leads to the breaking of mirroring in the sense intended here. Which basically means that a way is found to *interrupt* the feed previously named *metalepsis*.

This form of *controlled*—or, limited—metalepsis can yield **i)** *reliability* in the internal relation between the elements of the game [*hit*]; **ii)** *precision* in the relationship between the game and its environment [*impact*]. This set of provisions brings us back to the learning theatre [and to the *omphalos*].