



Box 1 —Top row: the Holy Face of Laon (a Serbian mandylion from the shroud of Turin) in France. Below: Slavoj Žižek, François Laruelle and Jon Fosse in a sequence of a GATE permutation. In the logic of the two stops and flow that make up a disordered system, Žižek and Laruelle are stops, while Fosse features the flow (that will be marked by the stops).

If Slavoj Žižek was our [psychopomp](#) could we be so bold to ask him—*whereto*? Would he lead us to achieve *anaptúxis* on our own, or to a library with growing shelves with books by him? It is a relevant question given that the death drive is the handmaiden of knowledge to Lacan (besides Hegel, one of his teachers). His turn to Christianity without G-d—that G-d withdrew to the same extent as the Christ descended: hence amounting to nothing as the Christ achieved fullness of being. Christianity is a religion that needs another to exist (Judaism): atheism needs Christianity.

“Who do you say that I am?” Note that for Nogaro, Christ is not a figure of authority telling people what they are: he is asking them about what they are saying that He is. And one should not take this as a cheap rhetorical trick in the sense of “I know who I am, the son of God, I just want to check if you know this.” Christ is aware that, in some way, his very existence is at stake not only in what and how people are talking about him, but above all in how they act (or don’t act) in society. Each of us has to give a reply to Jesus’ question from one’s existential depth” *and enact this reply*.

In Žižek’s verbatim it is written: and *then* enact this reply. Why this second time after the reply? In the Hebrew expression *al pi ADNY b’yad Moshe* (from the mouth of G-d by Moses’s hand), the connection between the word of G-d and enactment is *immediate*: like at the reception of the Shabbat when the washing of the hands and the blessing of the bread is considered as a *single* act (and no word is spoken in between the blessing of washing and the bread). If in either case there is *no* delay. Why, then, is there a delay between the reply spoken by wo/man and its enactment?

Is the mediacy, thus introduced, an assumption held by Žižek? Or, is it what one might call the *caesura* of assignment: which is more likely *now* or *never*, in the teachings of the Christ. So, if

procrastination may be forgiven—in this sense of system—it is certainly *not* recommended. The alternative to the definitive answer (demanded by reason) the alternative is the provisional, in the sense of: 1) as good as it gets; 2) temporary; 3) a store of for the future. If temporality here is the *meantime* (the trope of possibility) it is also the vantage point of the infinite in its record of the finite: precisely where we are invited to take a stand. Where the parallels of *in progress* and *future anterior* meet.



Box 2. Sephardic [phylacteries](#) as two stops: the one without (locked out) and the other within (locked in). In Box 3 the reflective Hey is included, yielding a lopsided magic square. The body takes place between the two (i.e. in the place of the split subject \$).

It appears that Žižek will gladly occupy that position, addressing his readership at the level of assumption—with what he calls his radioactive critique—while keeping the work of assignment to himself? I am making this statement in the form of a question. Like in Laruelle’s book (2015) *Christofiction—The ruins of Athens and Jerusalem*, Žižek in *Christian atheism—How to be a real materialist* (2024) it is the doctrinal denomination of the Christ that dominates completely: in

Žižek's volume the name Jesus (Yeshua/יֵשׁוּעַ) appears 22 times. While the Christ/ianity is beyond a meaningful count (in this sense innumerable). They are not interested in the Hebrew name יֵשׁוּעַ.

This, despite the fact that Yeshua underscores the importance of his *name*: of doing in his name. In the provisional nature of what he asks, there is a promise. The name Yeshua contains two letters of the Tetragrammaton (*Yud* and *Vav*), with two letter substituting the two letters *Hey* in the Tetragrammaton, for Shin and Ayin: one is the door-post (or Tooth), the other is nothingness (or, Eyes). It evokes the immediate assignment of the response to action, with the promise... *and you shall see G-d*. Assigning double reflective *Hey* to all humans (beyond AbraHam and SaraH): H-spirit.

To *both* the real is awesome—yes—but dark and desolate (in some aspects similar to Latour's idea of the universe): epitomised by the quantum void in field theory. As also Karen Barad. In Spinozist terms, however, they are all holding **1) *natura naturata* over 2) *natura naturans***: **1)** “by *natura naturata* I understand everything which *follows* from the necessity of the nature of God”; **2)** “I think it is plain that by *natura naturans* we are to understand that which is in itself and is conceived through itself, or those attributes of substance which express eternal and infinite essence”.

However, if we consider that the split subject \$ located in the *gap* (threshold) between our *reply* and *action*—as discussed briefly above—the *immediate* and *delayed* action bring us to two different places. The first, into the precincts of *natura naturans*, the other under the yoke of *natura naturata*. If so, *natura naturata* is **a)** what follows (it is the shadow) it is *not* **b)** what precedes (the light). The first is intuitive (interceptive flow), the other caught in between *thought* (locked in) and *extension* (locked out). With Laruelle we can consider how fiction can be marked by the real.

But this understanding is based on the (immersive) premises of being *locked in*: immanence. We do not really understand how the marking takes place. While Žižek's premise is *atheism*: that we are *locked out* (from G-d): transcendence. We do not really understand the delay between the *reply* and *enaction* works: the assignment. Jon Fosse brings us the interceptive maelstrom of intuition. Here the markings take place in the flow of epi/cycles. When the painter Asle goes to Bjørgvin obliquely pledged to his boozy doppelgänger Asle. And always with his departed wife Ales.

Though his gallery and the art shops—where he acquires his paint and canvases—are in Bjørgvin, he appears to himself to have departed to Bjørgvin on a whim (though not quite a whim, obliquely for his doppelgänger Asle, but not squarely for that reason, flooded with images on his way back to Dylgja—his home—from the romance between Ales and an Asle of which we do not know exactly which one it is). In my own book, he reminds me of Bjørn Blikstad's woodcarvings: from the maelstrom of epi/cycles in ornamental pattern—the growth, development and explanation of the surge.

Ranging from the monsters of Egyptian idolatry (at the edge of our world) and Alchemical emblems (within it) emerge on the backdrop of a furry woodcarving by Tilman Riemenschneider (1490 Münnerstadt). To my mind Bjørn Blikstad could be the Jon Fosse of woodcarving. Be that as it might be. The disordered system emerging from two stops (\perp and \vdash) and flow (\oplus) does *not* just accept that ‘a sum is a sum’. A sum is a unique striated space of differentiated impacts between **i)** the sum of the *elements*; **ii)** the elements of the *sum*. This is the principle of markings: it is *not* smooth.

Enacting the reply which is in our existential depth (above) immediately—which is Jon Fosse's contribution—yields a soul-print which is unique to that aspect of human being which will be its own cause. Which is precisely the point of יֵשׁוּעַ of placing the finite before the infinite (in judgement). If I have here given a reply from my existential depth, and also enacted it in the *learning theatre*, then this is a case for the *ethos* in question.

Box 3—a model of two stops and flow (disordered system) featuring in the lopsided magic square resulting from the inclusion of the two Hey. The effect of what happens within הַהֵי, by the intermedium of יֵשׁוּעַ.