any square, but also concrete manifestations, often in the form of a character system, of the relationships formed between the two contrarieties (S and –S; barred –S and barred S) and the two implications (S and barred –S; –S and barred S). (The joining of the two logical contradictions or simple negations resists anything more than a formal presentation for the simple fact that they are self-consuming artifacts, a collision of matter and anti-matter, or concept and not-concept.)

A significant shift occurs in Jameson’s use of the square, first evident in his 1977 review essay of Louis Marin’s *Utopiques: jeux d’espace* (1973), from an emphasis on the narrative manifestation of the topmost contrariety, which Greimas labels the Complex term (C), to the lower, or Neutral (N). The consequences of this shift becomes especially evident when the three planes formed by the square—those of the Complex, the two slots formed by the joining of the implications, and the Neutral—are identified “with” (avec) Jacques Lacan’s three orders of, respectively, the Symbolic, the Imaginary, and the Real.

The effect is to transform the square from a device for mapping narrative and ideological closure—as Jameson deploys it, for example, in *The Political Unconscious* (1981)—to a way of formally presenting the emergence in any concrete situation, narrative or historical, of the unexpected or uncounted new. The latter is what Alain Badiou refers to in *L’Éthique* (1998) as an *event*, located on the “void” of any situation. The Complex term “names” the event that occupies this void of the Real. Such a shift of attention thereby effects a transvaluation of the Neutral from the term for the “radical evil,” monstrous Other threatening the continuity of the ideal or Symbolic order, designated by the Complex term, to a name for the radically new. The square thus also offers a way of formally presenting what occurs in the language game Jean-François Lyotard terms in *The Postmodern Condition* (1984), *paralogy*, a way of achieving not merely “a new move (a new argument) within the established rules,” but “the invention of new rules, in other words, a change to a new game.”

*(See also Badiou, Alain; Event; Jameson, Fredric; Lacan, Jacques; Lyotard, Jean-François; Political Unconscious; and Semiotics)*

Phillip E. Wegner, *University of Florida* (United States)

Further Reading


**Seriality**

Seriality is a formal property and/or organizational principle that is commonly associated with ongoing narratives, recurring patterns, and periodic publication schedules. As a narrative form, seriality is perhaps most readily associated today with TV—especially the recent explosion of narratively complex television series, which inherit and adapt strategies from twentieth-century film and radio serials and popular serialized literature of the nineteenth century. Outside of popular culture, seriality also characterizes a variety of tendencies or attitudes in modern art, exemplified by conceptual artists such as Sol LeWitt, Pop artists like Andy Warhol and Roy Lichtenstein, or the twelve-tone music of Arnold Schönberg; in each of these cases, seriality refers less to narrative continuity than
to aesthetic modularity and material repetition of visual, acoustic, or other elements. Critical discussions of seriality tend to focus either on popular/narrative or on artistic/nonnarrative expressions, thus suggesting a split between “high” and “low” forms; however, there are blurrings and borrowings on both sides: for example, pop art appropriates serialized comics and popular culture generally, while the discontinuous, episodic forms of sitcoms and procedural crime shows embody the modular and quasi-industrial repetition that characterizes so much post-War gallery art. At the root of seriality in all of these forms is an interplay, highlighted by Umberto Eco, between repetition and variation (or innovation).

Seen in terms of this formal interplay, seriality is pervasive across literary and cultural traditions, from the Homeric epics to J. S. Bach’s *Goldberg Variations* and beyond. However, serial forms have proliferated at an unprecedented rate since the nineteenth century, when technological advances like the steam-powered printing press enabled serialized publication to dominate the literary marketplace. As Roger Hagedorn has argued, nineteenth-century *feuilletons*, penny dreadfuls, and dime novels attest to close relations between seriality and media-technical innovation: serialized stories “serve to promote the medium in which they appear” and thus “to develop the commercial exploitation of a specific medium.” Moreover, this explosion of serialized culture corresponds to advances in serialized production more generally; the steam engine not only enabled the daily newspaper but also promoted deskill factory work, leading eventually to the Taylor/Ford assembly line. Thus, both narrative and nonnarrative forms of seriality find impetus in industrialization; Eugène Sue and Donald Judd alike owe debts to industrial technologies, which are inextricable from capitalism. According to Karl Marx, capital operates according to serialized processes of its own (not just factory production but the process of repetition and variation expressed abstractly as M-C-M’ chains of value-production). This grounding of modern seriality in industrial capitalism helps explain the suspicion and scorn heaped on the “culture industry” by the likes of Horkheimer and Adorno, but it also points to the necessity to regard seriality not just as a formal property of cultural objects but as a social phenomenon that is central to the contemporary lifeworld: both our collective identities (such as “the nation,” according to Benedict Anderson, or gender for Iris Marion Young) and modern subjectivity itself (in Jean-Paul Sartre’s pessimistic view) can be seen as products and expressions of seriality.

(See also Chapter 2, Narrative and Narratology; Chapter 15, Biopower and Biopolitics; and Chapter 22, Identity Studies)

Shane Denson, *Stanford University (United States)*

**Further Reading**


**Sexuality**

The term *sexuality* can be understood as an individual’s sexual desire for certain types of bodies and the acts that constitute one’s sex practices. Historically, the term *sex* has been