



**Box 1**—the diagram above is read from right to left. First to the right is (1) blue code—the basic count [horizontal/vertical]; (2) red code—subsequent counts of more than one count, till the basic count is reached; (3) green code—the stack-count that counts the operations of counting [which is 5 in all]. A relation between a count-perception-operation.

If do a count to 5 (*basic count* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5), and then wish to do 5 counts to five, there is a simple way of counting these: / 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; / 2, 3, 4, 5, 1; / 3, 4, 5, 1, 2; / 4, 5, 1, 2, 3; / 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. So, we simply employ the ordinal sequence 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to count the counts to 5 (a derived count 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). But by proceeding in this way the basic count is *no longer* in *ordinal* sequence. Only the count of the count is. The basic count is permuted according to the script: when counted first in row, each number is moved to the end. In sum, there are *two* counts to 5 going on *at once*.

It means that through practice hatches a sense of pattern-in-performance: an enskilment whereby one does not really have to count mentally in numbers, but can just follow the process. But there is till a *third* count—which is more of a gesture—which is to move horizontal/vertical slices of the figure in **Box 2** and move them according to the above script/algorithm: that is, take a slice from the start and place it at the end, and proceed like this till the first pattern is reproduced. Since this is done 5 times, it is *also* a count. New patterns emerge in process. The same in the vertical. *Depth*.

A protocol of *horizontal* and *vertical* stacks. In sum, we have moved from counting—in a straightforward and simple sense—to pattern-in-performance, or *perception*; to gestural drill, or *operation*. There is a cohesiveness across the three, because they are *all* (in different modes) *counts to five*. But also one may define the relationships such that the first *begets* the second, and the second *begets* the third. That is, we move from an *in depth* relation between a *count*, a *perception* and an *operation*. The matrixial relation at the basis of the possibility for the development of *models*.

That is, in the transition *from rote counting to perception*, a *capacity is liberated*. And the same thing holds for the passage *from perception to operation*. The first transition opens for *interception*, the second for *possibility*. Together interception and possibility are affordances of the *meantime*: *growing, developing* and *explaining* in a time-zone between the *short term* of things happening, and the *long term* of history. By describing the question and expanding the problem, I am theorising. I am thereby opening for a cumulative understanding that adjoins to the matrix. This understanding is *cardinal* (not ordinal).

5	4	3	2	1
1	5	4	3	2
2	1	5	4	3
3	2	1	5	4
4	3	2	1	5

We are clearly talking about growth, development and explanation tethered to materials alongside the performance of the count: that is, *not only* conjectural knowledge (Lacan) but the knowledge of *contingencies*. So, it is not an abstract matrixial understanding we are monitoring in outline here, but one that is fundamentally dependent on, and hinged to, *performance*. There is a lateral drift of *subjectivity* since the counts occur in different *modes*: different ratios of *thought* and *extension* (Spinoza), that *together* triangulate what we call *intuition*. It covers what Leach called the *communicative aspect* of behaviour.

**Box 2**—all the rows and columns in the square add up to 15. But only one diagonal adds to the same number. But the diagonal from top left to bottom right adds up to 25. So, it is what I have called a *lopsided* magic square. It can be seen in two ways: the basic count and its permutations—in horizontal and vertical—or a count (S<sub>1</sub>) and a count of counts (S<sub>2</sub>).

Between the three levels of count there is a different that makes a difference, or informa-

tion according to Bateson. Featuring a *non*-linguistic structure of signifiers. Perception and operation: interception and possibility.  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . However, *neither* of these are exhaustive in relation to the basic count /1, 2, 3, 4, 5. There are part of the basic count that are oblique and incomplete in terms of the numeric count. At the same time there is a dependency—and, in this sense, a *debt*—to the basic level. Because the transpositions from one level to the next are, in this sense, deficitary they need to be made up for. The relation to the basic count must *always* be re/established.

The process leading to Laban's change of *face* in Jacob's account, was preceded by Laban's double-crossing Jacob (exchanging Rachel for Leah the night of their wedding), and subsequent attempts to prolong his dependency into a permanent relation of exploitation. He cheated and changed Jacob's wages 10 times, till it was clear that he was drifting out of the family-relationship. Jacob subsequently establishes a [matrixial setting](#) in which the *specked, striped and ringed* sheep and goats allotted to him, breed and increase his flock dramatically in number. To Laban's regret.

Jacob literally grows out of his relationship to Laban. After establishing a boundary between them—at their subsequent reconciliation—Jacob moved into lands dominated by Esau, his brother. He then organised his enormous flocks into smaller droves. In the mean time, Jacob battles the “man” when the droves are gone and he is left along behind: is it an angel? a demon? his brother's guardian? or, simply *himself* (his former self in dependency to Laban)? The latter sticks with the passage: “And Jacob saw Laban's face; and behold, we are not with him, like three days ago.”

That is, the literal translation of *Vayar' ya'akov et pnei lavan, v'hine enenu imo kitmol sh'loshim* (Gen./Ber. 31, 2—*וַיֵּרָא יַעֲקֹב, אֶת-פְּנֵי לָבָן; וְהִנֵּה אִינּוֹ עִמּוֹ, כְּתִמּוֹל שְׁלוֹשִׁים*). A massive increase in the flock, and then the progress into the land in smaller droves. If the relation between the groups and the groups of groups is variable, the basic count needs to be established. This is one way to understand sacrificial practice: both at its early beginnings, and with the detail brought to the matter from the Exodus onwards. Which, in Hebrew, significantly is called Names/*shemot* (rather than Exodus).

Both the animals fit for sacrifice and the sacrificial ritual are *unique*: they do not form groups and groups of groups. And it is at this level it is determined whether the groups are (named) *signifiers*  $S_1$ , and the groups of groups are *signifiers of signifiers*  $S_2$  (words/*devarim*). Without them there are evidently neither stories to tell, nor language. Before they are called they are counted. This is a different way of understanding the saying “if you cannot count it, it doesn't count”. Because in the European mainstream words come *before* numbers. While in the tradition discussed here, it is the opposite: the words need to be accounted for, not the opposite.



**Box 3**—the ritual of *kapparat*—“This is my substitute, this is my exchange, this is my atonement. This fowl will go to death, and I will be written in the book of life.” Chickens are then slaughtered and the meat given to the poor.” *This life for my life*: count of one.

We live in a culture where numbers are the subject of discussions. Rather than living by the ethos that words peel off the face that speaks them, when the count is not upheld. Rather than, *performed counting* in which the counting is upheld by 3 adjacent levels of practice (**Box 1**). Along this line of performative thinking, there is no counting *in general* (abstractly, virtually or *in principle*), there are actual counts that are performed, and also *completed*. In this sense, the sacrificial count is the last count, that returns to basics. It is corrective, instead of sacrificial practice in return for which one hopes to obtain rewards. The roundup is unique of people and animals. Avoiding the loss of face before one's count, is a possible sense of *panim-u-panim* (face to face of G-d and Moses) because the face of G-d is implied by the face that does *not* cheat.