

POEM(S:45023)

a broken bracket)

and

Sophia Grieving:
a critique written upon
Finnegans Wake

I proclaim this object
poetry unless this seal
is broken in which case
it reverts back to a pro-

POEM(S:45023)

GREGORY PRICE GRIEVE



HIGH MODERNIST PRESS

San Francisco • Berlin • Alamogordo • Bhaktapur • Paris

COPYRIGHT 1991 BY GREGORY PRICE GRIEVE

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY HIGH MODERNIST PRESS©, INC, 3465 SUITE 9, 25TH STREET,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

EXCEPT IN THE AUTONOMOUS STATE OF GEMINIA, THIS BOOK IS SOLD
SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION THAT IT SHALL NOT- BY WAY OF ORAL,
ELECTROMAGNETIC, CINEMATIC, OR ANY OTHER MEANS OF
DISSEMINATION, EITHER THAT DOES EXIST NOW OR THAT WILL EXIST
AT A FUTURE DATE, AND WITH A SIMILAR CONDITION INCLUDING THIS
CONDITION BEING IMPOSED ON ANY SUBSEQUENT PURCHASER, EITHER
BY WAY OF TRADE OR OTHERWISE, LENT, RE-SOLD, HIRED OUT, OR
CIRCULATED (WITH OR WITHOUT THE PUBLISHERS PRIOR CONSENT) IN
ANY FORM, INCLUDING THIS TEXT NOW
- BE READ IN ANY MANNER.

Dedicated to
Icarius or Sancho Panza
nor
~~**Edmund Husserl**~~

. . . . the following sixty-six poems were written between noon and midnight on March thirtieth nineteen-ninty-one. Each poem revolves around, and attempts to explore, a space which current discourse designates as the unthought thought. This space, or unthought thought, is that difference which our current language not only finds impossible to communicate, but which language must fail to communicate so that there can be meaning at all. The accidental impulse, or spark which engendered the writing of these poems, was the interaction between a rain soaked McDonalds napkin, and my copy of Finnegans Wake.

life past befoul his prime.

My colonial, wardha bagful! A bakereen's dusind with tithie tillies to boot. That's what you may call a tale of a tub! And Hibernonian market! All that and more under one crinoline envelope if you dare to break the porkbarrel seal. No wonder they'd run from her pison plague. Throw us your hudson soap for the honour of Clane! The wee taste the water left. I'll raft it back, first thing in the marne. Merced mulde! Ay, and don't forget the reckitts I lohaned you. You've all the swirls your side of the current. Well, am I to blame for that if I have? Who said you're to blame for that if you have? You're a bit on the sharp side. I'm on the wide. Only snuffers' cornets drifts my way that the cracka dvine chucks out of his cassock, with her estheryear's marsh narcissus to make him recant his vanitty fair. Foul strips of his chinook's bible I do be reading, dodwell disgusted but chickled with chuckles at the tittles is drawn on the tattlepage. *Senior ga dito: Faciasi Omo! E omo fu fd. Ho! Ho! Senior ga dito: Faciasi Hidamo! Hidamo se ga facessà. Ha! Ha!* And *Die Windermere*

~~Dichter and Lefanu (Sheridan's) old House by the Coachyard and MNI (J.) On Woman with Ditto on the Floss. Ja, a swamp for Altmuehler and a stone for his flossies! I know how racy they move his wheel. My hands are blawcauld between isker and suda like that piece of pattern chayney there, lying below. Or where is it? Lying beside the sedge I saw it. Hoangho, my sorrow, I've lost it! Aimih! With that turbary water who could see? So near and yet so far! But O, gihon! I lovat a gabber. I could listen to maure and moravar again. Regn onder river. Flies do your float. Thick is the life for mere.~~

~~Well, you know or don't you kennet or haven't I told you every telling has a taling and that's the he and the she of it. Look, look, the codd is growing! My branches lofty are taking root. And my cold cher's gone ashley. Fieluhr? Filou! What age is at? It saon is late. 'Tis endless now senné eye or erewone last saw Waterhouse's clogh. They took it asunder, I hurd thum sigh. When will they reassemble it? O, my back, my back, my bach! I'd want to go to Aches-les-Pains. Pingpong! There's the Belle for Sexaloitez! And Concepta de Send-us-pray! Pang! Wring out the clothes! Wring in the dew! Godavari, vert the showers! And grant thaya grace! Aman. Will we spread them here now? Ay, we will. Flip! Spread on your bank and I'll spread mine on mine. Flep! It's what I'm doing. Spread! It's churning chill. Der went is rising. I'll lay a few stones on the hostel sheets. A man and his bride embraced between them. Else I'd have sprinkled and folded them only. And I'll tie my butcher's apron here. It's suety yet. The strollers will pass it by. Six shifts, ten kerchiefs, nine to hold to the fire and this for the code, the convent napkins, twelve, one baby's shawl. Good mother Jossiph knows, she said. Whose head? Mutter snores? Deataceas! Wharnow are alle her childer, say? In kingdome gone or power to come or gloria be to them farther? Allalivial, allalluvial! Some here, more no more, more again lost alla stranger. I've heard tell that same brooch of the Shannons was married into a family in Spain. And all the Dunders de Dunnes in Markland's Vineland beyond Brendan's herring pool takes number nine in yangsee's hats. And one of Biddy's~~

writing upon the wake
of *FINNEGANS WAKE* :
**AN EQUATION FOR RE-WRITING
UNTHOUGHT THOUGHT
THROUGH THE ERASURE OF
JOYCES TEXT**

(or)

IF: {Thirty-Three Sophias
dancing upon the corpse of God
... or the lingering death of a
Modernist poet}

Implies:

{That this Writing Is An Attempt At
Dis-solving Destructive Dilemma(s:
through the mapping of authentic
temporality) at. . .11:23am
February 30th 1991- or in
POEM(S:454024)}

(and)

IF: [**S**_{n+1} = "a non reducible variable for the phenomenological whole of an actual moment of time"] is a pen, attempting to ensnare a 'moment of vision ' in the text by mapping actual temporality by carving a semi-circular line into a napkin which had been appropriated from a McDonald's on the corner of twenty-fourth Street and Mission to mark page 213 in my copy of *Finnegans Wake*. A black curved semi-circular line, etched into the napkin by the pen only half a second ago, which completely brackets off the "S" from the rest of an embossed McDonalds Logo superimposed over the golden arches- the obstinate iconic simulacrum of pure capitalism. Yet, once finished with this appropriation, the pen stops writing for an instant, and the just conceived bracket's original meaning, {a meaning that some how became the trace to a center of a constellation of meaning, is quickly forgotten through the enveloping background noise of muffled rain, automobile traffic and the <<always already droning of a distant television in which the writing, confused and unfocused, while the pen hesitates, steps back and watches. Hurriedly, as the grammar . . . 12:00.01]

OR

Let "S" (designate the sign S {e.g.. not "S" <<the nineteenth letter of the alphabet. A suffix used to form The plural of nouns, abbreviations, numbers, letters, and symbols; used to form *adverbs*, as in *desirings*, *always* , and *besides* : used to form third person singular present indicative of verbs such as, *writes* or *reads* - or even "S" the symbol for sulfur}, not even {say outloud "es" because, "It is impossible for sound alone, a material element to belong to language. . . . The Linguistic signifier . . . is not phonic but incorporeal. The idea or phonic substance that a sign designates is of less importance than the other signs that surround it." This is Ferdinand de Saussure's concept of the arbitrariness of the sign by which the "same" phoneme {e.g.. "es"} pronounced twice by two different people is not identical with itself. Its only identity is its difference from all other phonemes.})-**LET "S" BE THIS DIFFERENCE-**} Thus, Let S designate simultaneously both the actual writing of the signifier, grammé , script or written mark *and* the logos, law, grammar or structural difference that creates the significance of **S:** (an S which is simultaneously not only different and the same, plural and indivisible, finite and infinite, **but both is and isn't.** (e.g.. is) (See: Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, Trans. Gayatri Chakrovrti Spivak, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London©1976). an S which now (11:43.37PM) asks itself) "But furthermore an "S: {which is the reproduction of *the "S"*} from an exploitative dominating "other" S hand, which was embossed on the McDonalds napkin ". . . 2:22.09]) designate that moment in the act of writing which seems to transgress its own system of values.]

OR

[S₁]: Let "S" designate the present moment

now 11:23.24 + one second = (a present that traces back its meaning not only to midnight of the day before, (OR back to the the beginning of a new year three months and thirty days ago, (OR back to the birth of the avatar (that anthropomorphic vegetable spirit nailed to a tree) of a Christian God approximately two thousands years ago, (OR to the beginning of the writing of the Old Testament some six thousands years ago, (OR to the beginning of (metaphysics) through Greco-Roman time with the birth of the Titian Chronos, (OR to the birth of the physical universe according to a scientific explanation some twenty billion years ago, (OR even to the stylus of the first Babylonian Cleric who conceived of the twenty four hour day to mirror the twelve major deities of the earth and sky.))))) But rather it is a present which traces itself back exactly one second to a moment of vision which is presently being recorded upon this McDonalds Napkin.) A "Now", which now, (about another minute later) must conceal the fact that it has already been recorded by physical marks, ink traces which in turn must conceal themselves, upon this tangible surface

OR

[S₂: . . . 2:58.43 is the condensation of arbitrary serpent tracks slithering across sifting desert sands, momentary traces which are writing, "For the reproduction of the invocation to proceed, marry the 'world' in which you are currently dwelling with the designated "S." Let the grammar of this "S" bind the moment Only in this way can an actual mapping of temporality be conceived . . . 3:05.58 and the ~~un~~thought ~~thought~~ ensnared in the moment of the text . . . 3:05.58"] . . . 10:43.42 because according to Kierkegaard, the first response to anxiety is not a 'leap' into a new *sphere* of existence, but rather a concealment which avoids the "decision in existence" by immersing ourselves in the spiritlessness of the present age. In *Sickness Unto Death* (a malaise that is currently being replaced with television), Kierkegaard describes the way in which "we" of the present age forget the possibility of the infinite/finite distinction by ascribing, "value to the indifferent" and how through the concept of probability and relativity people 'cover-up' the difference between possibility and necessity. . . . "being altogether finitized, instead of being a self, having become a cipher, one more person." Or in a similar (but different) vein, . . . 10:50.23 ". . . I suddenly woke up (understand in the context of *Finnegans Wake*) in the midst of this dream, but only to the consciousness that I am dreaming and that I *must* go on dreaming lest I perish- . . . Among all these dreamers, I, too, Who 'know,' am dancing my dance."(Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, TRANS. Walter Kaufmann, vintage Books © 1968 pg. 116)] a surrendering, which is neither active nor passive, but transgresses the horizon of a particular text.]

OR

[**S**₃: Let "S" stand for spacing, the source or ungraspable foundation of the grammar. {e.g.. the wonder of wonder <<the mere ability of the pen to place marks upon the page. . . 10:50.49 (written in the narrow sense) which , "really knows no distinctions between the present, the past and the future, and the eternal. Its life and its history go on crabbedly like the writing in ancient manuscripts, without any punctuation marks, one word, one sentence after the other." {Kierkegaard, *The Concept of Anxiety*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980 page 94 }. . . 11:04.23AM>> because , "for us difference remains a metaphysical name . . ."Older" than Being itself, our language has no name for such a difference. . . . not even the name 'difference' which . . . continually breaks open up in a chain of different substitutions." (Jacques Derrida, *Margins of philosophy*)) Hence "S" is the conceiving of difer(n)ce, surrounded(and surrounding) in all the glory of its brackets.]

OR

[S₄:>>Here on understand (writing in the narrow sense) as scriptural wonderment>>} which, as it were, stands out against] . . .

11:04.45PM (Kierkegaard's analysis of the present age (which) goes past the idea of the "leveling" of distinctions and significance and describes the way in which the present age creates the illusion of infinite and finite, possibility and necessity and the eternal and the temporal. {Kierkegaard, *The Present Age*, San Francisco, Harper and Row, 1962 pages 33-41,68-77}). . .

11:11.45PM] The mere ability to form marks on a tangible surface stands out against "The Simulacrum (which) is never that which conceals the truth- it is the truth which conceals that there is none." (Ecclesiastes)]

OR

[S₅: let "S" designate (all S's) or, . . . "Thirty Sophias dance the dance of desiring :"{only five things at once, <<or the spilling of automobile sound into>> - S_{n+1}" - <<<<<AND>>>>} is, the writing of this writing. (the navel, (*Umbicus mundi*) the spot where the text reaches down into the unknown space, the moment of transgressing the laws which the text has apparently set for itself) {this is where, at 11:28AM, the writing started to originally write this constellation of text} begins to unravel the web of significance which always already supports the meaning of the writing - which is Sophia's despair: "That nothing has any significance and (even the marks of drying ink left by the pen on this page) seem to fall away into the banality of meaninglessness."]

OR

[S₆: (in an even more narrow and bracketed definition created in an attempt to liberate the meaning of the present moment from the universal horizon created by the ideal of Presence.) Let "S" stand for the act of actually placing the writing on the page (yet still Sophia knells like a domesticated sun . . . 2:37.00 . . . 92 Or as Kierkegaard in a analysis of modern Nihilism calls it, "leveling" - as a situation in which **"qualitative distinctions are weakened by a gnawing reflection."** {*The Present Age*, New York: Harper and Row, 1962, page 43} (**NOT SIMPLY**, "This common way a man can take in his dressing-gown. But Spiritual elation in the eternal, the sacred, the infinite, moves along the highway of truth in the robes of the high priest. (Hegal, *The Phenomenolgy of Mind* , TRANS. Baillie, Harper Books © 1967, page 127-128)) But rather an existence in which everything is left standing but is cunningly emptied of significance bound and gagged, exposed by the grammar which creates its meaning . . . 11:23.23PM) *from oblivion to oblivion*]

OR

[S₇: Let the sacrifice of impassioned embodied Sophia, through the solidification and axiomatic commodification of temporal actuality . . . 11:44.56AM {not only, the dissolving of "S" as the mere receptive reproductive vehicle of temporal presence, but also the constantly gnawing expansion of meaning around the slippage of this grammar << a desiring 'lack' which constantly breaks loose . . . 11:52.56PM . . . 4:16.57 yet with this (sic) state of mind Sophia says, "I am so receptive for (e.g. . . . 4:24.12 ~~Vineland beyond Brendan's herring pool takes number nine in yangsee's hats. And one of Biddy's pool beads went bobbing till she rounded up lost histereve with a marigold and cobbler's candle in a side strain of a main drain manzinahurries off Bachelor's walk. . . . 4:31.32"]~~

OR

[S₈: Or . . . 11:23.22PM Or *Bricolage* (Or in the year 1925- at 11:59Am the writing originally bracketed this writing with the title of: (*IN THE WAKE OF*)): *FINNEGANS WAKE*:]'S. . . 12:58.24 whose . . . 1:24.34 "Ambiguity. . . 11:11.43 extends not only to the world, but just as much to Being-with-one-and-an(other) as such, and even to Dasein's Being towards itself." {Heidegger, *Being and Time*, page 217, H. 173}]]

OR

[**S**₉: let **S** stand as an apotheosis (the deification of a metaphysical erasure, (a naive self reflection)) for the lack of an apostrophe {e.g.. **1. n.** the sign (') used to indicate omission of a letter or letters from a word, the possessive case, and certain plurals. **2. n.** a digression in discourse, esp. a turning away from an audience to address an absent or imaginary person.} and presumably by this means, meaning will, in all its will, focus open the actual writing of the writing. (e.g.. the spacing which has been concealed in *FINNEGANS WAKE*):]

OR

[S₁₀: whose title is from an Irish-American Ballard about Tom Finnegan, a sod carrier who falls off a ladder while drunk and is killed, but who is awoken when during his wake someone spills whiskey on him. . . .

1:24.59 ~~Well, you know or don't you Kennet. . .~~

•1:31.48 Into the- [S₉: -the Intellect desiring Sophias desiring. . . .2:29.02 This cyclic theme of death and resurrection, of cycles of change and coming round in the course of history is central to *Finnegans Wake*, which derives one of its main principles of organization from the cyclical theory of history put forward by Giambattista Vico.] . . . 11:04.23PM]]

OR

[S₁₁: Let "S" designate the awakening (resurrection and rebirth) of *Finnegans Wake* {Because the meanings in *FINNEGANS WAKE* are developed not by action but by language- a great network of multiple puns that echo themes back and forth throughout the book, a careful reading of a single passage will convey more than any summary of the "plot". The particular passage selected here was one of Joyces favorites, and there exists a phonograph record of it. It consists of the closing pages of chapter eight {. . . 1:38.54 *Ann Livia Plurabelle* was published separately in 1928 and 1930, although the finished book omits this title} of book one. The entire chapter is a dialogue, and the scene is the river Liffey: two laundry-women are washing in public the dirty linen of HCE <<The hero . . . 1:46.25 . . . 2:29.02 [S_{S1}: 1:15 p.m. [S_{S2}:1:30pm.]]

OR

[S₁₂: Therefore . . . 10:43.24 "Here Comes
Everybody"] in . . . 1:46.23>> and ALP. . . 1:53.56

in . . . 2:37.08 Or rather, "G" is "one in the sound of a bell" . .

. 2:44.23 to become the text, in all its illusions (and allusions) to a
"fictive" reality of a time space continuum which to exist must
repress (and conceal) actual temporality, and the writing of the writing
in the narrow sense. . . . 2:44.33 Or even "The Human

Being is spirit. But **what is spirit?** Spirit is the
self. But what is the self? The self is a relation
which relates itself to itself . . . A human being is a
synthesis of the infinite and the finite, of
possibility and necessity, of the eternal and the
temporal." {Søren Kierkegaard, *The Sickness Unto
Death*, Trans. Alasdair Hannay, London: Penguin
Books, 1989}. . . . 10:44.33 **HENCE:** *enthumesis* .

. . . . or the labyrinth formed from the ruins
of the tower of Babble and the creation of. . .
. *horos*.]

OR

[S₁₃: the heroine { or Anna Livia Plurabelle

<<who is also Eve, Isuelt, Ireland, the river Liffey, and Sophia>>]]. . .1:53.54 gossiping as they work. As the

excerpt opens, it is growing dark; things become gradually less and less distant, so that the washerwomen cannot be sure what the objects seen in the dusk really are. as it grows darker the river becomes wider and wider, and the wind rises, so that the women have more and more difficulty hearing each other. And as night finally falls, they become part of the landscape, an elm tree and a stone on the river bank] . . . 1:31.49 or rather, The

actuality of the spirit (a *Zeitgeist* whose contemporary manifestation seems to be language, especially, script, text, or can we even venture writing) constantly shows itself as a form that tempts its possibility but disappears as soon as it seeks to grasp it. . . .{Kierkegaard, *The Concept of Anxiety* page 42}. . .2:44.28

] because 'I' haven't been there as of desireS₅ . . .

2:51.43] ~~Or haven't I told you every telling~~
~~has a taling and that's the he and the she of~~
~~it. Look, look, the dusk is gowing!~~ . . .

1:56.31]

OR

[S₁₄: because the author, while writing the writing above, hears the clock strike Three O'clock, momentarily distracted, he goes and shuts the window, attempting to block out . . . 1:56.37 ~~My branches lefty are taking root.~~ ~~And my cold cher's gone ashley.~~ . . . 2:15.48 * * 2:51.43 and Sophia receptive. The Grammar is. 'I' Dan Rathers on a **Disney afternoon**, as the voice of God/Open Sophia you're no better than that 'that' that's gone with cognition . . . 2:58.05] . . . the television static, mixed which with rain and the sound of death and trade that drifts up off the street invading the text like a phonemic plague. A phonemenological static which is both a clearing into pure experience, and an oppressive grammar that controls all discourse.]

OR

[S₁₅: (now 11:37am) Let "S" designate the supplement of this source, ("the supplement is always the supplement of a supplement. One wishes to go back *from the supplement to the source*: one must recognize that there is a *supplement at the source* .(see: Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology* , page 304, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London ©1974)). . . 11:59:59PM (simply that there is no transcendental supplement) Or as Wittgenstein puts it in *On Certainty* : "Giving grounds -must- come to an end sometime. But the end is not an underground presupposition: it is an ungrounded way of acting."} lost in the labyrinth that the bracketing of this supplementing creates.]

OR

[S₁₆: Let "S" designate the translation of *De la Grammatologie* {or the lack of *Aufhebung* <<e.g.. the sublimation of the physical script on the page into the meaning of the text, and the dissolving, or crystal like splintering of the boundaries into . . . 12:20.31>>}}>>}}. . . 2:15.47 *Aufhebung* is a relationship between two terms where the second (or dominate term) annuls the first term and lifts it up to a higher sphere of existence. Hence, a word (or supplementary bracket) is *aufgehoben* into its meaning. It is (to use a Derridain metaphor) as if the son or seed (word or enclosed bracket) is engendered by the father (text or meaning) and is thus justified. However, from within this metaphor Derridas (for the meaning or lack of the apotheosis see S₉) cry is "dissemination," the seed that neither inseminates nor is recovered by the father, but is scattered abroad. . . . 3:05.45 ~~Fieluhr? Filou!~~
~~What age is at? It saon is late.]~~

OR

[S₁₇: these Signs="This view is entirely antithetical to the philosophical ideal of total clarity and ultimate intelligibility. And creates an anxiety in which our taken-for-granted cultural ground drops away. "Everyday Familiarity collapses" (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, page 233 H. 189) "Anxiety discloses an insignificance of the world; and this insignificance reveals the nullity of that which one can concern oneself." (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, page 393 H. 343. (But Now . . . 2:58.06 You may, as 2:45. As all of it, submissive- but-manipulative- because we can not find controls. They are other(S: . . . 3:12.23 however . . . 3:19.48 Heidegger, in an *Introduction to Metaphysics*, suggests that there can be no such metaphysical grounding: " It remains to be seen whether the ground arrived at is really a ground, that is, whether it provides a foundation; whether it is an ultimate ground; or whether it fails to provide a foundation and is an **abyss**; or whether this ground is neither one nor the other but presents only a perhaps necessary appearance of foundation- in other words, it is a nonground.". . . 3:05.54)" ~~They took it asunder, I heard thum-sigh. When will they reassemble it? O, my back, my back, my back!.~~]

OR

[S₁₈: then in a violent act of interpolation, because of an over abundance of ambiguity, trying to prove its existence and sustain significance by once again invoking subjectivity, some six hours after the writing of the original writing, the author wonders, {<<with all the premises inherent to a hidden ghostly self which is absolute, ineffable and timeless.>> knowing, "that the 'subject' is nothing that acts, but only a thing of folly, there is much that follows.<<see: Nietzsche, Friedrich, Will to Power, Edited by Walter Kaufman, Vintage Books, New York, New York, ©1968>> e.g.. that "the subject is not something given, it is something added and invented and projected behind what there is." . . . 3:26.51" . . . In a composite mass, these elements may, one by one, *without noticing it*, be replaced by others, which others again eliminate or reinforce, until in the end a change has been brought about which it would be impossible to conceive if we were a single person."(Proust)]

OR

[S₁₉: Simply the author(s) wonder(s) <<

"what difference does it make who is speaking?". .

.3:19.40 : ("The "who" is not the one, not that one, not oneself,

not some people, and not the sum of them all. The "who" is the neuter, *the "they"* {*Das Man* }. {*Being and Time*, page 167 H. 129}

The self of every day Dasein is a *they's self*. . . . as a they's-self, the particular Dasein has been dispersed into the 'them,' and must find itself. Hence, a particular Dasein can get its "role" and even its moods only by being socialized into the "stock" available in its society. **Even authentic Dasein must manifest its unsettledness through these everyday possibilities.**

"Dasein is for the sake of the "them" in everyday manner, (ie., all for-the-sake-of-whichs are supplied by the one) and the "they" itself articulates the referential nexus of significance.") Or in a

different vein, we see that Husserl's final answer to objectivity, according to Derrida telescoping of

The Origin of Geometry, is that objectivity is lodged with in the subject's self presence. That the

transcendental subjects ideal object is itself, but that in the contemplation of itself the self cannot

remain within the "simple now-ness of a living present." The self must give itself a history, it

must differentiate itself from itself through a backward glance which also makes possible a

forward looking.") . . .3:33.40 ~~Pingpong! There's~~

~~the Belle for Sexalotez! and Concepta de-~~

~~send us pray! Pang! Wring out the clothes!~~

~~Wring in the dew!]~~

OR

[S₂₀: See: Michael Foucault. "What is an Author?". *Partisan Review*.] . . . 3:26.53 {In other words, what function does the author play in any discourse? "(A)uthorship is not simply the attribution of a work to an individual. It is the result of a complex operation which creates a rational being called the author. . . 12:28.28 Thus, the author is able to write, "The author's name plays a certain role in any discourse: it assumes a classificatory function." Hence, the traditional view that the meaning of a text raises out of a subjective author is a Husserlian view, that begins with Descartes and is still carried on by Paul Grice and Stephen Schiffer. It is that 'other' 's have beliefs about our beliefs about their beliefs, etc. This "mutual Knowledge," to use Schiffer's term, provides the basis of what Husserl calls "intersubjectivity . . . 3:33..43)" ~~Will we spread them here now? Ay, we will. Flip! spread your bank and I'll spread mine on mine. Flep! it's what I'm doing. Spread! It's churning chill. Der went. . . 3:41.50]~~

OR

[S₂₁: If Grammar('s significance) is (niether objective nor subjective) not analytical, "a 'true' body of rules and definitions that can be applied university to language", what is it?"(11:23.24 begins to slip away, . . . 11:30.20" . .

*3:12.27 To "T" must "S"- to Nietzsche's' Dice roll. .

*3:48.23 to. . *3:55.42 (the sounds of dice rattling in a cup) ("Habitus is the product of the work of inculcation and appropriation necessary in order for those products of collective history, the objective structures- e.g. of language, economy, etc. - to succeed in **reproducing themselves** more or less completely, in the form of durable dispositions, in the organisms -which one can if one wishes call individuals - lastly subjected to the same conditionings. (Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, page 85)) . . . 10:28.21

Hence, "-There is no will: there are punctuations of will that are constantly increasing and losing their power". Nietzsches idea of a will to punctuation remains unclear; however, it suggests that the will is not a single entity but more like a constantly shifting federation or alliance of drives. (Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* 715(Nov. 1887-March 1888)) or as Derrida writes, " . . . The 'active' discord of different forces and of the differences between forces which Nietzsche opposes to the entire system of metaphysical grammar" (*Margins of Philosophy* page 19) . . . *3:41.01 ~~Six shifts, tenkerchiefs, nine to hold to the fire and this for the code, the convent naplins(eg. NAPKIN), twelve, one baby's shawl.]~~

OR

[S₂₂: For God (and without God there is no grammar (for derrida, by contrast even the signifier is not the source of meaning, the signifier and and signified are interchangeable; one is the differance of the other; the concept of the sign itself is than a legible yet effaced, unavoidable tool, and repetition leads to simulacrum not to the same) there is nothing significant and nothing insignificant . . . in a certain sense the significant is for Him insignificant, and in another sense even the least significant is for him infinitely significant. {Kierkegaard, *The Concept of Anxiety*, page 42} To have an absolute relationship to the absolute means to see every object of desire as relative and therefore as of absolutely equal in significance. But this is to say that God- and by extension, a human being who has an absolute relationship to God- is in despair. "There is thus, sheer fear and trembling in this thought of the unchangeableness of God, almost as if it were far, far beyond the power of any human being to sustain a relationship to such an unchangeable power; aye, **as if this thought must drive a man to such unrest and anxiety of mind as to bring him to the verge of despair.**" {Søren Kierkegaard, *Edifying Discourses*, New York: Harper and Row, 1958. page 42}]

OR

[S₂₃: See: the German original, *Sein und Zeit*, 7th edition, *Neomarius Verlag, Tübingen*]>> Simply, "Listen not to me but to the Logos it is wise to agree that all things are one." <<see: Hericlitus Fragment 50, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* >> Because, "the real constitution of things is accustomed to hide itself." <<see: IBID fragment 123>>} . . . 11:30.21AM Yet then, on the verge of loosing all meaning, the pen triumphantly {in all the endurance of thought <<see: Derrida, *Margins of Philosophy*, 'Ousi and Gramme'-Note on a note on Being and time.' Page 27}>> **Becomes** "A nerve-stimulus, first transcribed into an image! First metaphor! The image again coped into a sound! second metaphor! and each time (the creator of language) leaps completely out of one sphere right right into the midst of an entirely different one." (Friedrich Nietzsche, "On Truth and Falsity in ther Ultramoral sense", *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*, ed. Oscar Levy, New York, ©1964 2:174} and} Hence **the the pen spreading ink upon the page**, places two dots upon the paper, and then writes in the blank space to the right of the newly created semicolon scrawled upon a McDonald napkin being used to capture a moment of time by attempting to clarify the "S" :] . . . 11:37.42AM . . . 10:21.51

OR

[S₂₃: (the writing writes itself by always already writing) ". . . simply conceiving a new grammar which suddenly transgressing its own system of rules) a *Befindlichkeit* {an **always already there**} which in English can be thought of as the 'state-of-mind' or systematic holism in which the writing of the writing displays itself} but in which the current transgression can never be explained.]>> . . . 2:08.21 this is the creation of a new grammar, the dawning of a textual under-standing that steers the meaning through the creation of literal demarcation.}] . . . 11:44.19AM]

OR

[S₂₄: S=wisdom (This actuality of temporal Sophia as wisdom. Which is a more primordial meaning of philosophy {eg. 'love of wisdom'}, then the traditional simplification into the ritualistic fetishism of logic, the analytic tribal chant of the AngloSaxon. HENCE: Let Sophia stand phenomenologically exposed as what is PRESENTly being written.(but a writing which understands that to mean at all it must conceal itself) . . . 12:06.12 Hence: "I do not think it is too far-fetched to compare the celluloid and waxed paper cover with the system *Pcpt.-Cs.* (perception-consciousness) and its protective shield, the wax slab with the unconscious behind them, and the appearance and disappearance of the writing with the flickering-up and passing away of consciousness in the process of perception.(Sigmund Freud, "A note Upon the 'Mystic writing-pad.'"] (1925). let Freuds flickering be designated as "S". . . . 4:57.12]

OR

[S₂₅: (At 2:00, as the significance of the writing once again begins to lose itself (as its meaning oscillates between profundity and complete non-sense) - I do solemnly marry Sophia and her Father, and (the joining together of the actual act of writing in the narrow sense of the word, with the metaphysical grammar which presently conceals this tangible process conceives) the incestuous abortion that proceeds (see *Eucharist of Capitalism* Grieve © 1992) (ie not S) is my fault. I tie them together with a string of material logic . . .
• 4:38.56 ~~Throw the cobwebs from your eyes, woman, and spread you washing proper! It's well I know your sort of slop. Flap!~~

OR

[S₂₆: Sophias "do crying", Father, "Yes."] Was
+ ~~What, hobbledyhips? Flop!~~ : T=time=2:14, now 9:14,
now 11:13pm, now=*now+one* . . . 4:52.], ~~the laundry-~~
~~man with the lavandeir flannels? you won-~~
~~you limpopo limp form the husky hussars~~
~~when Collars and Cuffs was heir to the town-~~
~~and you slur gave the stink to Carlow. . .~~
5:20:01]

OR

[S₂₇: Rather, let Lucia's plunge=Sophia's dancing] . . . 11:37.43 but the pen continues writing "Like the dying rays of a black sun raising, the presumed nothingness of the blank page cleaves off an'other ellipsis." . . . 11:59.00 AM . . . 4:52.23 which I on the cross will bear. Enter, again, "T"- I'm a domesticated light. Start a read(ing) - when S_s . . . 5:21.12 ~~Subdue you noise, you hamble-creature! What is it but a blackburry growth- or the dwyergray ass them four old codgers~~ . . . 5:14.41 . . . 9:45.54 ~~owns~~ . . . 5:36.03]

OR

[S₂₈: Hence: This is the conception of a textual clearing. An *Augenblink*, which is Luther's translation from the biblical Greek for the - "twinkling of an eye" in which, "we shall be changed,". But which in German means literally "the glance of an eye". {for further meaning on this term see EITHER: 1. Kierkegaard's use of *Oieblik*, the traditional translation of Luther's *Augenblink* Into Danish, as a technical term for 'the moment'. "For as you are fighting for 'the moment' against time, you actually are fighting for what has vanished IN 'THE TWINKLING OF AN EYE.' <<Kierkegaard; *Either/Or*: a fragment of life. >> OR 2: In Heidegger's work '*Augenblink*' is usually translated into English as "the moment of vision". . . .5:43.23 Hence: an "I" as Sophia= one more surfacing into the "T" . . .6:04.23 . . .5:50.41]

~~I meyne now, thank all, the four of them, and the roar of them, that draves that stray in the mist old Ronny McDonald along with them. Is that the poolbeg flasher beyant, pharphar, or a fireboat coasting nyar the Kishna or a glow I behold within a hedge or my Garry come back from the Indes. Wait till the honeying of the lune, love! . . .6:11.23]~~

OR

[S₂₉: Thus, *Augenblink* is a term used to designate: "When resolute, Dasein has brought itself back from falling, and has done so precisely in order to be more authentically 'there' in the 'Moment of Vision'. . . 11:45.45am "<< 'in the twinkling of an eye' "as regards the Situation which has been disclosed." . . 6:04.28 eye, Sophia, am here. but it hurts. the bounds of the mapping hurts. but its now. . 6:18.43 . . 6:21.25 ~~Die eve, little eve, die! we see the wonder in your eye. We'll meet again, we'll part once more. The spot I'll seek if the hour you'll find. My chart shines high where the blue milk's upset. Forgivemequick, I'm going! Buby And you pluck your watch . . . 6:25.19]~~

OR

[S₃₀: see: *Being and Time*, Martin Heidegger, Copyright 1962, Harper & Row, Publishers INC. English translation by John Macquarrie & Edward Robinson. {Or see: the German original, *Sein und Zeit*, 7th edition, Neomarius Verlag, Tübingen}]>> However, in the latter parts of his text, Heidegger uses the more literal meaning of *Augenblink*, as 'a glance of the eye'. <<see: translators' footnote number two on page 376 of *Being and Time* >> Hence Heidegger writes in *Being and time*, "That present which is held in authentic temporality <<Heidegger had earlier explained that 'Temporality "Is" . . . the meaning of care'>> and is *authentic* in itself, we call *Augenblink*. <<Either: Kierkegaard's use of *Oieblik* as 'the moment'. . . 6:18.41 all, even me, fictive and over powering- it controls. me, an insane grammar in which my meanings are always already a Disney afternoon mapped out across a Mcdonalds napkin. . . 6:32.24 . . . 6:25.02 ~~So save to Jurna's end! My sights are swimming thicker on me by the shadows to this place. . . 6:40.00]~~

OR

[S₃₁: Heidegger's pragmatic use of *Augenblick*. as 'the moment of vision' <<or: {or: Heidegger's literal use of *Augenblick* as 'a glance of the (yet, if "the present of self-presence . . . (seems) as indivisible as the blink of an eye" (Derrida, *Speech and Phenomena* page 59) we must recognize that, "there is a duration to the blink, and it closes the eye" (Derrida, *Speech and Phenomena* page 65)) eye'. . . Luther's "twinkling of an eye" in which, "we shall be changed." OR as Heidegger explains : "This term <<*Augenblick* >> must be understood in the active sense as an ecstasis. <<the root meaning of which is "standing outside">> "It means the resolute rapture with which Dasein is carried away to whatever possibilities and circumstances are encountered in the Situation as possible objects of concern {eg. care/fascination}, but a rapture which is held in resoluteness.] . . . <<"the Resoluteness intended in *Being and Time* is not the deliberate action of a subject, but the opening up of {Dasein}, out of its captivity in that which is, to the openness of being."{Heidegger, "The Origin of the work of Art" in *Poetry, Language, Thought* page 67}>>> . . .>>>]

[S₃₂:S (a vague form of ontic rapture) ...

6:32.23 = "in this process we have always already found that Sophia continually conceals her metaphysical nature by the constant invocation of the present moment. (ie. NOW) But this invocation is the mask behind which Sophia hides her own metaphysical image of the father. The Present becomes (The Father in "drag") a universal presence, which like a Platonic form is never actually present, but believes itself, in its transcendental purity, some how more "real" than the other moments that surround it. Or rather, we have an ungrounded faith in the present moment's ability to justify the meaning of the text. Hence, the meaning of the text always finds itself a supplement to the present which acts as the ultimate foundation on which to base all discourse. That The Present (a present which is never actually obtained but which is always spoken of and referred back to) becomes the transcendental signifying back to which we must trace all meaning. Not only, does this continue the idea of the present (material)/transcendental(eternal) split, a spilt which is purely one of Occidental convenience, but it also furthers the need for discourse to be based in a logos so as to avoid the horrors of ambiguity. This is where (from the present standpoint) the modernists went astray, in their blind faith of an eternal Presence. (a Presence whose structure duplicates all logocentric

thought.) Thus, in the case of Joyces text, if we do not ground its meaning in the Author Joyce, we must (to avoid the abyss (**dissiminations**) through the loss of all significance) base it in the present moment, either of its writing(eg. Joyces Dublin), or even more radically we must base its meaning in the text being read now. This "Now" (which is actually never, but which is always held in reserve) becomes a guarantee for meaning out of which writing finds it hard to leave, finding itself still bound within the comfortable chains of metaphysical thought. **Therefore, the writing must, in its attempt to write the unthought thought, put the Present moment under erasure**(we must encapsulate presence within brackets so as to free the writing form the grammar which enslaves it!).. .6:32.23]

[S₃₃ . . . 6:32.24 However, not S, or \$,
(eg. S(pacing (eg. the present(eg. Sophia (eg. this
writing)))) . . . 6:32.25) under erasure) becomes,
(an abstract concept, which in the
current vacuum of meaning which we call
Western Culture, finds itself as being related to.
. . .) or even more simply, the money used to
purchase the Mcdonalds napkin. (or my copy of
Finnegans Wake) . . . 6:40.01 Simply, although S
Under Erasure is not present it is still
currency as such. (or "The Joy in the Thought
that it is Not the way Which is narrow, But
(Grammatolgy is not simply the valorization of writing over
speech, a simple reversal of the traditional hierarchy. Rather,
the repression of writing in the narrow sense (the
repression of graphic notation on a tangible
material) is a pervasive symptom of the logocentrism which
infects our present age. The usual notion of writing in the narrow
sense does contain the elements of the structure of writing in
general: absence of the "author" and of "subject matter",
interpretability, the deployment of a space and a time that is not
"its own." We recognize all this in writing in the narrow sense and
"repress" it; this allows us to ignore that
everything else is also inhabited by the
structure of the repression of the narrow
writing in general, that "the thing itself always (already)
escapes" The Narrowness Which is The Way"))

Simply, S in the present age can not be
communicated outside the bounds created
by (not S) nor \$. Yet this (not S) or \$
cannot communicate S. However, (not S) or
\$ with out the S to negate, would simply be
(not) or I. And this (not) or I, because it is
not, can not exist except as nothing.) (a
nothing which we invoke through every
utterance, yet still a nothing that is neither
Heideggers musing that the "nothing
nihilates itself" nor the failure of Hegels
attempt to establish the *union* of union and
nonunion and the *identity* of identity and
difference.(nor even the lack of meaning
created by the means of a propostions
verification) **HENCE:** ~~as I sow home slowly
now by own way, moyvalley way. Towy I too,
rathmine. . . 6:54.43]~~

Implies:

[\$_{N-1}: The seduction of Sophia by the Grammar, a dominate understanding that binds Sophia with chains of logic, enslaving existence into contorted bureaucratic rituals which drive the very essence into concealment] = S. . . 10:07.23 . . . imply, that there is no escape from the Father, even in the negation of the Father, (even if this negation manifests itself as the "mother" goddess, (or even Kali the goddess of destruction) who currently can be none other then the Judeo-Christain god in drag). There is no release through language, nor through the negation of language, through Being, nor the negation of Being, through the present, nor the negation of the present, through negation, or even the negation of negation. Through S nor the negation of S. (the ultimate bastion of nihilism). THERE IS NO ESCAPE BECAUSE THEY ARE ALL WRITTEN ON A MCDONALDS NAPKIN THAT IS BEING READ IN THE BACKGROUND OF A DISNEY AFTERNOON. *Fade to commerical* 11:59.56PM marking the placement of differance upon the page.]

NOR

[S_1 : S =transcendental Signified. the repression of the actual S, or the track, footprint, or imprint upon the page.] Because, "What are man's truths after all? They are man's *irrefutable errors*." (Friedrich Nietzsche, *Gay Science*, page 219) "Truth is the kind of error without which a certain species of living Being could not write." (not(Friedrich Nietzsche, *Will to Power*, 272))]

NOR

[$\$_2$: Or time] = \$(The sacrifice of infinite possibility for the supposed necessity of a singular moment. . . . of a moment which receives its ultimate justification in an anterior presence, origin, or metaphysical realm. See: **Jacques Derrida, of Grammatology . page 72]** "The *signatum* always referred, as its referent, to a *res* , to an entity created or **at** any rate first thought and spoken, thinkable and speakable, in the eternal present of the divine logos and specifically in its breath." {see: *ibid* page 73}. . . . 11:59.02PM]

[\$₃: . . . 11:59.35PM eg. the lack of the
Father(eg. the son)] = \$. . . 11:59.39PM the
galvanization of a difference, so that meaning
becomes an alienating (yet profitable) grammar.
This will eventually bring about a 'legitimation
crisis', because of the systems own contradictions,
(Habermas ©1973), which manifests itself phenomenologically
as alienation.(and textually as an *AugenBlink*) And albeit no
one has succeeded in creating an empirical test of
this malaise, (a lack of verification that causes much dread to
analytic philosophers, and acute schizophrenia to oralytic
phenomenologists)the ego still can be traced as a
symbolic construct, which with the growing
complexity of society must stabilize itself on an
ideology that rests further and further from that
which it experiences in the everyday. But to
understand this situation we must first realize
that Marxs idea of Alienation differs from Hegals
who felt that alienation was fundamentally an
account of mind, whereas for Marx alienation is
when a "man's own deed becomes an alien power
opposed to him, which enslaves him instead of
being controlled by him."(*German Ideology*) Marx
derived his definition of Alienation from
Feuerbachs study on Christianity, (*Das Wesen des
Christentums*) where Feurbach set out to show
that the essence of religion was the essence of
man himself projected outside to be reified and
personified. Hence for Marx wealth became
alienating when it became regarded as an

independent, active force, which 'employs' human
beings. It was the "domination of living men by
dead matter."(*Das Kapital*) We could understand
this in a crude way by saying that a concept
becomes alienating when it becomes metaphysical.
Currently, it it our very significance for existence
which has become a force for alienation. We
could even write Da\$ein- which is none
other then existence under erasure, or the
capital produced by Heideggers concept of
Being-There freely selling itself in an open
market place. Simply Heideggers
(un)intentional collaborations with an
alienating supra-structure. (see: "Letter on
Humanism".]

NOR

[\$₄: . . . 11:59.40PM moreover even not \$, is still \$. Because it does not matter if Yahweh is replaced with economics; Or Capital, Or the Good, Or any metaphysical realm, even the radical relativism of pure nihilism, because each of these explanations fits within the metaphysical framework that originally housed the Christian deity. This is "the Possession of the single eye"(Mt.6:22-23), a proselytizing universal logocentrism in which all meaning must be grounded in one and only one transcendental reality. Presently this "reality's" own contradictions have left only a shell of a cynical nihilism that cannot even believe in itself. Hence, even the rejection of these metaphysical realms does not escape the shadow of the Father. This destruction is 'a belief by virtue of nonbelief', about which Nietzsche writes, "this violence always manifests the need for a belief, for a prop, for a structure." \$, then, is neither a lack of content nor even of a methodology. Rather, it is the very way the West gathers 'meaning'. Presently, this \$ can be witnessed in the "control of the code" (the central structural problem of capitalist society) by whose means all existence has been leveled down to easily consumable signs, "not only that which can be reproduced, but that which is *always already reproduced* . . . which is entirely in simulation" (Baudrillard). We are always consumers in someone else's transcendental creation, passive observers who are desperately attempting to organize a privatized existence and invest it with meaning. And as we consume the code in a vain struggle to construct this meaning, we in effect "reproduce" the system.]

NOR

[\$₅: Sometime later, waiting for some sign of resolution (even catharsis), while the Author mindlessly toddles my copy of *FINNEGANS WAKE*, (or as a reader mindlessly clutches a copy of that copy) as the pen's drumming rhythmically fills the air, as the sound of rain continues to fall, two dirty copper pennies, one from 1991 and the other from 1964, but both with a bust of Lincoln on one side, and *E pluribus unio* on the other, two of what are literally billions of existent pennies, tumble out of my copy of *Finnegans Wakes* . These two cents, around eight seconds worth of labor at minimum wage, (or 3.7 pages of Joyces text at 1988 prices) spin for a "blink of an eye" on the desk, while the author careful to mark the page, places the book down, as a memory of concealing this change, what was left after paying the cashier two dollars and sixty cents for my copy of *FINNEGANS WAKE*, is hastily written down by the pen, which monetarily is released from its boredom.]

NOR

[\$₆: The Pen writes, " Let the symbol \$ (which is Sophia Grieving); designate forgotten change (a concealed bracket, or boundary)- e.g. my two cents] "but the act of equating it to the weaving, reduces the tailoring to that which is really equal in two kinds of labor, to their common character of human labor. In this round-about way, then, the fact is expressed, that weaving also, so far as it weaves values, has nothing to distinguish it from tailoring, and consequently, is abstract human labor. . . .11:59:54PM" every other commodity now becomes a mirror of the linens value. . . . X commodity A=Y commodity B, Or X commodity A is worth Y commodity B, Or 20 yards of linen= 1 coat, Or 20 Yards of Linen are worth 1 coat." {Karl Marx, *Das Kapital*. Part I Section 3 <<or Section 4b>>} (Or one used copy of *Finnegans Wake*. ". . . when the exchange is no longer purely transitive, when the object(the material of exchange) is immediately presented as such, that is reified into a sign. Instead of abolishing itself in the relation that it establishes, and thus assuming symbolic value(as in the example of a gift), the object becomes autonomous intransitive, opaque, and so begins to signify the abolition of the relationship." {Jean Baudrillard, (begining to place reality under erasure . . . 10: 23.34) For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign, Telos Press, 1981, page 65}. . . 11:59.46PM]

NOR

[\$₇: . . . 10:07.24 an ideal, nor in the words of Nietzsche and Idol. {nor in the words of Marx exchange value, <<nor in the words of Baudrillard use value>>} what a foundation to base reality in- an always already other that can never be . . . 6:47.23 "In no case is Dasein, untouched and unsecluded by this way in which things have been interpreted, set before the open country of a "world-in-itself" {Heidegger, Being and Time, page 213 H. 169} And why "before God you are always in the wrong." {Kierkegaard; *Either/Or : a fragment of life.* pages. 335-354}] "What therefore, is truth? a mobile army of metaphors, metonymies, anthropomorphisms; . . . truths are illusions of which one has forgotten that they are illusions, . . . coins which have their obverse effaced and now are no longer of account as coins but merely as metal." (Nietzsche, "on Truth and Falsity in their Ultramoral sense.") HENCE: " 'Thinking' in primitive conditions is the crystallization of forms . . . in our thought, the essential feature is fitting new material into old schemes, *making equal* (*Gleich machen*: which calls to mind *Gleichnis*- image, simile similitude, comparison, allegory, parable, etc.) what is new." (Nietzsche, *will to power* 273)]

NOR

[\$₈: "Augenblink", which is already being created by the procustean sacrifice inherent to the brackets. A violence that seemingly must presently occur for the text to have any meaning at all. But this meaning which causes *Finnegans Wake*'s text to become {my version of of *Finnegans Wake* ©² was bought for \$2.58 {tax included},

indirectly form **James Joyce** who..

·10:54.45 {<<through a change becomes. . ·10:54.43
~~Ah, but she was the queer old skewsha anyhow,
Anna Livia, trinkettoes! And sure he was the quare
old bunts too, Dear Dirty Dumpling, foostherfather
of fingalls and dotthergills. Gammer and gaffer
we're all their gangsters. . ·7:01.00]~~

NOR

[\$₉:*Differenzschrift*Because of the grammar enforced by the mere existence of the script upon the page {and the logic assumed to lie behind this writing <<as such>>}. Simply that this writing in an attempt at writing 'writing' {read as reading attempting a reading of 'reading'} writes {reads} :] . . . "In the beginning was the opening bracket, which demarcated the meaning of the script from the {virgin absence assumed from mere existence of the blank page} . . . 11:44.10AM This process, which takes place temporally, is the ritualistic invocation of the script, and the dis-solving of grammar{for what the author means by grammar see S_n <<eg. the opening bracket>>}, which must proceed any actual writing. A concealed process of forgetting which {always already} continues in violent scrawling gestures sacrificing the bracketed purity of the virgin page.] . . . 5:28.21 Then probing a point of pleasure- *Heaven and Hell are equal possibilities*. . . "It wins as truth only when in utterdismemberment, if finds itself. " 5:43.23 . . . 5:36.03 ~~Are you meanam Tarpey and Lyons and Gregory?~~ Or simply, as Hegel would have us believe that the logos (sic) is the concrete structure of everthing that exists. And that through always present from the beginning of the natural historical process, this structure is only manifested in absolute knowledge. This absolute subject Hegel describes as *Giest* . . . 5:50.47]

NOR

[\$₁₀: His overriding concern is to establish the union of union and nonunion and the identity of identity and difference. 10:54.44 to the past perfect tense by interpolation at 17:56:17>> **is now** dead}. . . 10:54.46

copyrighted the text in 1939. {For referential legitimacy <<or a trace to. . . 6:47.23 The actual writing of the script, this writing which we are led by this writing to believe can not exist with out the sacrifice and erasure of Sophia into \$ (over). . . 7:52.01 but. . . 7:01.00 ~~Hadn't he seven dams to wive him? And every dam had her seven crutches. And every crutch had its seven hues. And each hue had a differing cry. . . 7:15.40 of. . . (a writing - which must conceal not only itself, but must also conceal the grammar which makes its meaning possible- concealing itself so that the meaning of the nostalgic impossibility of the blank page can be communicated . . .~~

10:07.21]

NOR

[\$₁₁: see: Habermas: *The Legitimation Crisis*, copyright 1975, Beacon Press. Translated from the German, *Legitimationsprobleme im Spätkapitalismus*, by Thomas McCarthy] . . 7:58.25
Or in other words, }. . 11:59.50PM Perhaps Nietzsches boldest insight, in the face of the inescapable boundary, is an exhortation to the will to ignorance ("it is not enough that you understand in what ignorance man and beast live; you must also have and acquire the will to ignorance." (*Will To Power* 328)), which is not so much a lack but rather a forgetting. Nietzsche first called this forgetting "joyful un wisdom", but later went on to call it "joyful wisdom"-the gay science. Nietzsche saw this as the greatest threat to the chain of self perpetuating interpretations that accepts its own activity as "true" and "good", or should we say real? : "The greatest danger that always hovered over humanity and still hovers over it is the the eruption of madness- which means the eruption of arbitrariness in feeling, seeing, and hearing, the enjoyment of the mind's (*understand in this discourse as Befindlichkiet*) , the joy in human unreason. Not that truth and certainty are the opposite of the world of the madman, but the universality and the universal binding force of a faith in sum, the nonarbitrary character of judgments."(*The Gay Science* 130):]

NOR

[\$₁₂: . . . 11:23.08AM is everything that we are constantly forgetting so that things can be present at hand: . . . (eg. forgotten change) . . . {{{yet still, the media is always there so we don't have to be, even the bridge has been absorbed by channel forty four}. . . 7:29.08 (but) and the voice of authority screams to itself. . . . <<<aktive Vergeszlichkiet>> . . . 7:15.43} ~~Befor! Bifur! He married his markets, cheap by foul, I know, like any Etrurian Catholic Heathen, in their pinky limony creamy birnies and their turkiss indienne mauves. . . 7:22.00}~~ (HENCE: ". . . the antidotes of history are the 'unhistorical' and the 'super historical'. . . by the word 'unhistorical' I mean the power, the art of *Forgetting*, and of drawing a limited horizon around one's self" (Nietzsche)) as if Dan Rathers, with history dying, was the last man left on Earth.]

NOR

[\$₁₃: see: 'Limited Inc abc' {response to John Searle}, *Glyph*, vol II (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1977) PG. 162-254]>> which still functions within the constant constellation of an absent minded economic sphere which is, not only <<Austin, John L.: *Philosophy of Language*, Englewoods Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964 >> the commodification of language, through exchange value and the vulgarized monstrosities which Madison avenue creates, but by the very constant reference to the bourgeois ideal of a transcendental empirical material referent] solidified through commodification *Fineggans Wake* was first published in Great Britain by Faber and Faber in 1939, and in the U.S.A. by Viking Press 1939. {"my" (quotes added by a reader) version was) Printed by Penguin in USA by Kings port Press inc.; Kings port Tennessee. "set in Old Style and Baskerville" }} into . . . 7:29.01 Not only, the little leprechaun that is putting marshmallow trees into every box of lucky charms, to erase the threat of deforestation, but the Disney channel that jumps into my text every time I open *Finnegans Wake* . . . 3:23.34 but . . . 7:22.34 ~~all that was was fair. Tys-Elvenland! Teems of time and happy returns. The seim anew. Ordevico or viricordo. Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle's to be. . . 7:44.23]~~

NOR

[\$₁₄ . . . 10:28.58 {searching vainly for referents}
and no teleology in sight, the eyes, the right one
blood shot and sore, dance doggedly over the text
trying to trace back to the original moment of
meaning out of which the writing of the bracket
sprang. Because, the ground on which the writing is
writing is a napkin, a napkin whose original
writing, is not only an approbation from an
exploitive and leveled social sphere of a simulation
devoid of significance, but even more simply,
because the actual script of the McDonalds logo is
merely an embossed printing, a slight bump of
differ()nce on a soggy napkin. A differ()nce that
will not reproduce in any way. { But the grammar that
has begun to slip away in a loss of meaning, remembers reading,
"that is it accidental that in one of the oldest fragments of
Heracleitus- <<see: Fragment 1, *Die Fragmente der
Vorsokratiker* >> the oldest philosophical doctrine in which the
logos is *explicitly* handled-the phenomenon of truth in the sense
of uncoveredness, as we have set forth, shows through?"
<<*Being and Time*, Martin Heidegger, page 220.
Copyright 1962, Harper & Row, Publishers INC.
English translation by John Macquarrie & Edward
Robinson. . . . 3:48.21 2:50pm(con't). . . 4:02.56 . . .
3:55.42 ~~Good mother Jossiph knows, she said. Whose
head? Mutter snores? Deataceas! Wharnow are alle-
here childer, say? In Kingdome gone or power to
come or gloria be to them farther? Allalivial,
allalluvial! . . . 4:09.07 . . . 4:02.06 . . . 4:16.09]~~

NOR

[\$₁₅: . . . 10:36.09 Thus how to get (beyond the son of god nailed to a tree. . . 11:52.06AM beyond a Socrates who writes {to one who is writing, "that there is no thinking back to an authorized voice that doesn't pass by way of certain images or metaphors derived from writing"} . . . 2:08.23] to beyond the stability of grammar, to an ungrammar, a joyful grammar which is constantly breaking in on itself, calling attention to its labor. . . . 4:24.00 It works if you follow rules-grammar and do not forget your way (along the path which is narrow) . . . 4:45.07 However, even if Heideggers use of Nietzsches text is superb, in many instances Heidegger reduces it to fit within his ontological project. Thus, when Nietzsche writes of our world and our sensations as chaos, Heidegger explains chaos as "the exclusive blueprint of the world in totality and its working. . . 'chaos' cannot simply mean waste confusion, but the secrecy of the unsubdued domain of becoming."(Heidegger, *Nietzsche* 516) . . . 4:31.36 Yet . . . 4:31.36 ~~Ussa, Ulla, we're umbas all! Mezha, didn't you hear it a deluge of times, ufer and ufer, respund to spond? You deed, you deed! I need, I need? It's that Irrawaddyng I've stoke in my aars.~~ . . . 4:38.56 Hence, now (at 8:23.23 PM) , "I do not know any other way," Nietzsche writes, "of associating with great tasks than play" (Ecce Homo, 41). This imprudence, the constantly attempting to bypass the prudence of stability and clarity through "interpretation, is what Nietzsche calls *amor fati*, the love of fate or what Derrida calls, "the game of chance with necessity."]

NOR

[\$₁₆:In the words of a text not yet written (a text which for lack of time will probably never get written) : . . . 11:23.20PM **PING** . . . 11:23.21PM

PONG . . . 11:23.22PM **BOUNCE** . . . 11:23.23PM

The text (surrounded in all the glory of its difference) which is never physically read, but in a sense is always already known {1. Because as Heidegger writes in section 37 of *Being and Time*, "Everything looks as if it were genuinely understood, genuinely taken hold of, genuinely spoken though at bottom it is not; or else it does not look so, and yet at bottom is. . . . 11:40.23PM . . . Everyone is acquainted with what is

up for discussion and what occurs, and everyone discusses it; but everyone also knows already how to talk about what has to happen first. Already everyone has surmised and scented out in advance what

Others have also surmised and scented out . . . 11:47.45PM" { . . . a great network of multiple puns>> the suburban grammar} . . .

11:47.45PM Thus: because, "to display an idea in its original elements means returning upon its moment." (Hegel) a moment which for lack of source can never be original, "Idle talk and Curiosity take care in their ambiguity to ensnare that what is genuinely and newly created is out of date as soon as it emerges before the public" <<at 10:43.00pm February 28 one thousand nine hundred and one years after the birth of the son of God, the seed of meaning which creates the arche-text nailed to a tree. . . 12:35.06 . .

.7:37.00 today after all these years, baby face, twist and turn in so many ways, I love you all unconditionally, because he will come again. . .

.7:51.45 ~~Northmen's thing made southfolks place but hommuluty plurators made eachone in person. Latin-me that, my trinity scholar, out of eure sanscreed into eure eryan!~~ . . .7:44.23]

NOR

[\$₁₇:{10:43.10pm or }]. . . 12:35.06 ~~is~~ . . .

12:35.06 an \$ (an S under erasure) which because of its ambiguous nature both is and isn't.) Furthermore, "What if even the language of metaphysics and metaphysics itself, whether it be that of the living or of the dead God, as metaphysics, formed that barrier which forbids a crossing over . . ." (Here we see, that " Man does not only stand *in* the critical zone . . . He himself, but not he for himself and particularly not through himself alone, *is* this zone." (Heidegger, *The Question of Being* pg. 82) pg. 70) This is a dangerous decent, but one in which we can not merely write *Fineggans Wake* .(because it is copy righted) Because what exposes authentic temporality . . . 12:43 Hence: "a thoughtful glance ahead into this realm of "Being", can only write it as ~~Being~~. The drawing of these crossed lines at first only wards off, especially the habit conceiving "Being" as something standing by itself . . . The sign of crossing through can, to be sure, . . . not be a merely negative sign of crossing out . . . Man in his essence is the memory(memorial) of Being, but of ~~Being~~. This means that the essence of man is a part of that which in the crossed intersected lines of ~~Being~~ puts thinking under the claim of a more originary command ." (Heidegger, *The Question of Being* pg. 81-83). . . 7:51.45

However, Heidegger's greatest injustice to Nietzsche lies in his (ab)use of Nietzsche's concept of Art., which Heidegger describes as the supreme will to power, which, giving form to chaos is "the creative experience of becoming." (Heidegger, *Nietzsche* 568). Heidegger puts art under the service of being. Hence, even when Nietzsche writes in the *Will to Power* (617) that, "To impose upon the becoming of the character of being- that is the supreme will to power.", Heidegger must conceal the double irony of the texts meaning. A meaning which critiques Heidegger's own project. . .

8:05.34 . . . 7:44.23]

[\$₁₈: . . . above all the "vulgar concept of time." I borrow this expression from Heidegger. It designates, at the end of *Being and Time*, a concept of time thought in terms of spatial movement or of the now, and dominates all philosophy from Aristotle's *Physics* to Hegel's *Logic*. This concept which determines all of classical ontology . . . is intrinsic to the totality of the history of the Occident, of what unites its metaphysics and its technics. . . . This linearist concept of time is therefore one of the deepest adherence of the modern concept of the sign and its own history." . . .

8:05.34 Derrida's own critique of Heidegger's Nietzsche, *Spurs: Nietzsche's Styles.*, in the traditional dance step of deconstruction, fastens upon an apparently unimportant moment in the Heideggerian text. In this particular essay, the moment is Heidegger's overlooking of the words "It becomes a woman" in the chapter entitled "How the 'true world' ultimately becomes a Fable: the History of an Error," in Nietzsche's *The Twilight of the Idols*. Nietzsche's brief chapter gives the history of Western Metaphysics in six paragraphs, at the moment when metaphysics changes from Platonism to Christianity, "*The idea Becomes a Woman.*" Heidegger takes no notice of this in his extended commentary on the chapter. An omission Derrida fixes his gaze upon . . . 7:59.45

What next? We reenter the script because we noticed noticing a difference that we had earlier conceived. But now it is over and we

. . . 8:19.07 . . . 8:12. 56 ~~Can't here with the waters~~ . . .

[§₁₉: find at (12:42) , even if Heidegger could purge Dasein of its "vulgar Temporality", that there can be no concept of time that is not caught within the metaphysical closure. Hence, "wishing to produce that *other* concept, one quickly sees that it would be constructed with other metaphysical or onto-theological predicates." (Derrida, *Margins of Philosophy* page 89). Heidegger catches a glimpse of this thought with his crossing out of "Being" in *The Question of Being*. However, in the Heidegger of *Being and Time*, time is still a model of auto-affection, where something Ideal (metaphysical), such as Being, is produced without having to relate to an object. Derrida places this

concept under erasure, and suggests that Being is always already an irreducible element of hetero-affection, desiring and relating to an other. In Heidegger's case, Being (*for Being and Time*), or ~~Being~~ under erasure (*for The Question of Being*). And by the time of "The Anaximander Fragment" Heidegger himself sees Being as precomprehended and nonsignifiable, and the presence seemingly signified in a text is seen as the only means for language to point at the effaced *trace*. (*Margins of Philosophy*, "Ousia et Grammé"). Simply that Heidegger abandons the quest for the meaning of Being in temporality, by the effacing of time itself through the (crossing out of) the word "BEING".]

[\$₂₀: which is not merely the question of being, but also the never-annulled difference from the "completely other". Such is the strange "being" of the sign: half of it always "not there" and the other half always "not that"; even if it constantly appears on the page. The signification for the presence of the sign is the trace to an other that is forever absent. Hence, "the sign ~~is~~ that ill-named ~~thing~~, the only one, that escapes the fulcrum question of philosophy: "What is . . . ?" Because this will leave a trace back to the original moment, of the writing of "the ideal for the obstinacy of believing in the concept of a text, an idea that must be sacrificed (at 11:52p February 28 1991). . . 7:51.46 . . . 8:05.35 "Simply, two readings of the same text are never the "same", rather each shows an identity which can only be defined as difference. The text is not a metaphysical stability, rather each reading of a text produces a simulacrum of an "original" that is itself the mark of a shifting and unstable means of significance. "From the moment that the circle turns, that the book is wound back upon itself, that the book repeats itself, its self-identity receives an imperceptible difference with allows us to step effectively, rigorously, and thus discreetly out of the closure. **Redoubling the closure, one splits it open.** Then one escapes it furtively, between two passages through the same book, through the same line, following the same bend " (Derrida). . . 7:44.24 However, "as soon as writing, which entails making a liquid flow out of a tube on to a piece of

write paper, assumes the significance of copulation, or as soon as walking becomes a symbolic substitute for treading upon the body of mother earth, both writing and walking are stopped because they represent the performance of a forbidden sexual act"(Freud). . .
~~.7:44.42 He had buckgoat paps on him, soft ones for orphans. Ho, Lord! Twins of his bosom. Lord save us! and he! Hey? What all men. Hot? His tittering daughters of. Whaek? . . . 8:12.56~~ We find this discourse played out in the divine couple of Dionysus and Ariadne. "Who besides me knows what Ariadne is?" (*Ecce Homo*, "Thus spoke Zaratuhstra" p. 106, Penguin Classics, R. J. Hollingdale, ©1979). Ariadne loved Theseus, who is a representation of the higher man; he is the sublime and heroic man, the one who takes up burdens and defeats beasts. But what he lacks is precisely the virtue of the bull. . . 8:19.56]

NOR

[\$₂₁ : which . . . 8:19.08 Sophia wants others to
desire . . . 8:19.43 Yet, as long as 'women' loves 'man', as
long as mother, sister wife of man, even if he is the higher man,
she is only the feminine image of man: the feminine power
remains fettered in man. (Thus spoke Zarathustra, "Of the Virtue that
Makes Small", Friedrich Nietzsche, Trans; R.J. Hollingdale, Penguin
Classics ©1961) As Terrible mother, terrible sisters and wives,
femininity represents the spirit of revenge and resentment
which "animates" man himself. But Ariadne, abandoned by theseus,
senses the coming transformation which is specific to her: the
feminine power emancipated becomes beneficent and affirmative. .
. . 8:23.09 a general reading of Neitzsches text would find him as a
raging misogynist. But Derridas careful reading reveals a more
complete collection of attitudes toward women. Derrida breaks them
into three positions that are contiguous with a psychoanalytical
position, " a modality of the subjects relationship with the object." (1).
The woman . . . condemned as . . . figure or power of lying . . . He was,
he feared such a castrated women . . . (2) The women. . . condemned as
. . . figure or power of Truth (understand as Sophia) . . . He was, he
feared such a castrating women . . . (3) The Women recognized, beyond
the double negation, affirmed as affirmation, dissimulating, artistic,
Dionysiac . . . He was , he loves such an affirmative women."(Derrida,
Spurs) If we to concentrate on the tripartite schema, and glance again
at the "History of an Error," we might begin to distill a Derridian
reading of Nietzsche. 8:34.12 . . . 8:29.12 ~~The chattering
water of. Flittering bats, fieldmice bawk
talk. HO! are you not gone ahome? Thom
Malone? Can't hear with bawk of bats, all
thim liffeying water of. Ho, talk save us! . .~~

8:26.12]

[\$₂₂: Or "Dasein is an entity which does not just occur among other entities. Rather it is, . . . 11:59.03PM . . . distinguished by the fact that, in its very being, that being is an issue for it." {Heidegger, *Being and Time*, page 32 H. 12}, and it must be remembered that this way of being, which Kierkegaard calls "spirit" Heidegger calls "existence." "Dasein always understands itself in terms of its existence - in terms of a possibility of itself: to be itself or not itself." {Heidegger, *Being and Time*, page 33 H. 12} And just as spirit for Kierkegaard is not merely a "synthesis" of factors but the way the relation relates itself to itself, so for Heidegger "man's 'substance' is not spirit as a synthesis of soul and body; it is rather *existence*." {Heidegger, *Being and Time*, page 115 H. 117}]. . . 8:19.09 According to Nietzsche, with the coming of Christianity, the period of castration begins, and the idea of a (castrating and castrated) women, was pursued by the male type of the philosopher for possession and appropriation. Derrida believes that Nietzsche is caught up within this scheme, that he speaks for men about the over-man, but that Nietzsches text is still capable of pointing out that women undermines the act of masculine possession by "giving herself" (in the act of playing a part), even in the act of giving herself up to sexual mastery. However, this truth is not answered by the ontological question of "what is she?" Because "each time that the question of the proper emerges, the onto-hermeneutic form of interrogation shows its limit" (*Spurs*). . . 11:59.06 . . . in relation to Dionysus, Ariandne is a second affirmation. The Dionysian affirmation demands another affirmation which takes it as an object. "Eternal affirmation of being, eternally I am your affirmation" (Nietzsche) The eternal

return "is the closet approximation of being and becoming", it affirms the one of the other" (Will to Power 617). This is why from in a Dionysian universe, the eternal return is a wedding ring, ("The Seven Seals), the eternal cycle, a mirror that awaits the Anima(soul) capable of admiring itself there, but also of reflecting it in admiring itself. This is why Dionysus wants a Fiancée: "it is me, me that you want? the whole of me? . . ." (Friedrich Nietzsche, *Dionysian Dithyramb* "Ariandne's Complaint"). . .

8:19.10]

NOR

[\$₂₄: . . . 11:59.34 and {in justification for this writing} "As for the concept of experience, it is most unwieldy here. Like all the notions I am using, it belongs to the history of metaphysics and we can only use it under erasure. "Experience" has always designated the relationship with a presence, whether that relationship had the form of consciousness or not. Yet we must by means of the sort of contortion and contention that discourse is obliged to undergo, exhaust the resources of the concept of experience before attaining and in order to obtain, by deconstruction, its ultimate foundation. It is the only way to escape "empiricism" and the "naive" critiques of experience at the same time." {Derrida}] . . . -12:43 is not merely Heideggers losing of the bounds of logic. . . -12:50.43] . . . 8:48.56 Not any time in particular, 7:15, 3:03, 10:43]

NOR

[§₂₅: . . . and the goal is the desire of being read- the writing desires reading by an'other, which the writing has always already created . . . 11:09.23 . . . 8:19.10

in the very act of surrender, women dissimulates. Here we find a sexual description of that double register of knowledge-forgetfulness that forever ruptures Nietzsches style. To posses the women , one must be the women, and yet the being of the women is unknown. .

· 8:41.32 . . . 8:26.43 ~~My Foes won't moos..~~ . . . 8:48.53

. . . 8:41.32 Here we find the symbolism of the Labyrinth which designated the eternal return itself: circular, it is not the lost way but the way which leads back to the same point, to the same instant which is, which was and which will be. Thus, from the perspective of the construction of the eternal return, the labyrinth is becoming, the affirmation of becoming. Being comes form becoming, is affirmed of becoming itself, in as much as the affirmation of becoming is the object of another affirmation. This trace is Ariadne's thread. A thread which guides through the maze of becoming. . . . 8:19.76]

[\$₂₆: Nor even the consideration of Heideggers text, "The End of philosophy and the task of Thinking" {1. what does it mean that philosophy in the present age has entered its final stage? 2. What task is reserved for thinking at the end of philosophy? <<see: Martian Heidegger, *On Time and Being*, page 55-73, TRNS. Jaon Strambaugh, Harper and Row, New York, 1972>>}}]. .

• 12:50.45 The masculine style of possession through the stylus, the stiletto, the spurs, breaks down as protection against the enigmatic feminizing of truth. "Perhaps truth is a woman who has reasons for not letting us see her reasons? Perhaps here name is -to speak Greek- Baubo(female genitals)?" (Nietzsche, *Gay Science* 128) Man must constantly attempt to be the truth as woman (articulated forgetfulness) in order to *know* her, which is impossible. "Man and women change places, exchange their masks to infinity."(Derrida *Spurs*) . . . 8:19.09 which in its interpolation is writing 11:19p 2/28/91 . . . 12:58.21 . . . 8:41.32 We must maintain the brackets, or meaning will dissolve. . . . 8:55.23 . . . 8:48.56 I feel as old as yonder elm. A tale told of Shaun or Shem?...

9:02.32 **(N)OR**: the sign ~~is~~ that ill named ~~thing~~] . . . 1:17.45 in which the meaning of "S", may not survive the sacrifice for the signification of . . . 1:17.12 . . . 9:02.03 ~~All Livia's daughters.~~ . . . 9:02.32 . . . 8:55.12 No, there are no brackets, only the desire for brackets, a desire of control of an'others brackets. . . 9:16.34 Derrida would infer that Nietzsche placing the castrating

idea within history is akin to Freuds rewriting of the primal "scene" into childhood. Yet, isn't Nietzsches text, in suggesting that in order to have (possess) the truth (women) the philosopher must be the truth (women); undoing Freuds incipient phallocentrism: that if the son (man) disavows sexual difference, he seeks to be the phallus for the mother (women) and becomes a lost object or lack, when the sexual difference is acknowledged, the son (man) has the phallus through identification with the father. Isn't Nietzsche seeking to undo that repudiation of femininity in the male, the other side of which is possession(which Freud states is nothing less than a biological fact), which describes femininity as a male desire to supply a lack? . . . 8:19.15 Thus, Negation is *opposed* to affirmation but affirmation differs form negation. We can not think of affirmation as being opposed to negation, this would plant the seed of negation with in it. Rather, affirmation is the enjoyment and dance of its own difference, just as negation is the suffering and labor of the opposition that belongs to it.]

[\$₂₇:Nor Derridas, "The end of the Book and the Beginning of Writing." {"By a slow movement whose necessity is hardly perceptible, everything that for at least some twenty centuries tended toward and finally succeeded in being gathered under the name of language is beginning to let itself be transferred to, or at least summarized under, the name of writing." <<see: Jacques Derrida, *of Grammatolgy* . pages 6-26>>}] and, Hence, at 10:43.23pm the writing already finds itself . . . 9:16.09 wondering what if an'other does not desire to read the writing and calls it meaningless? . . . 9:23.06 within our sexual fable of the reproduction of meaning, Derrida conceives the term **dissemination**. Exploiting a false etymological kinship between semantics and semen, Derrida offers this version of textuality: a sowing that does not produce plants, but is simply infinitely repeated. A semination that is not insemination but disseminations, seed spilled in vain, an emission that can not return to it origin in the father. . . 8:45.5 ~~Dark hawks hear us. Night! Night! my ho head-halls. I feel as heavy as yonder stone. Tell me of John or Shaun? Who were Shem and Shaun the living-sons or daughters of?)~~ But what is affirmations dance? it the multiplicity between becoming and chance. For multiplicity is the difference of one thing from another, becoming is the difference form self, and chance is difference between all. Affirmation then is divided in two, difference is reflected in the affirmation of affirmation: the moment of

reflection where a second affirmation takes the first as its object. It is the nature of affirmation to return or of difference to reproduce itself. Return is the being of becoming, the unity of multiplicity the necessity of change, the being of difference as such or the eternal return. The first Affirmation, Becoming and Being are a single affirmation, the first is Dionysus, becoming. The second affirmation is the self reflexiveness of Ariadne, the mirror, the the fiancée. And by the second power the first affirmation is the eternal return or the being of becoming.]

[\$₂₈: . . . 9:45.56 Nor: Let "S" be a boundary whose meaning is created in Alphabetic script with the mark: "—" . This sign has the grammatical ability of erasing the presence of the the writing while leaving a trace back to what was {The value of the transcendental arche <<origin>> must make its necessity felt before letting itself be erased. The concept of the arche-trace must comply with both that necessity and that erasure. It is in fact contradictory and not acceptable with the logic of identity. The trace is not only the disappearance of origin, except reciprocally by a non-origin, the trace, which thus becomes the origin of the origin.} left of a static transcendental stopping point. In effect an ellipsis says this "—" does not exist, that this writing is **absent**. Yet, it is just as, or more obstinate then the designated "S" in it's belief of a presence. simply, that the "—" is a mark of the absence of a presence, and always already absent present, of the lack at the origin that is the condition of thought and experience {eg: "act as though this makes no difference." << see: *Margins of Philosophy*, page 3>> }]. . . 9:23.23 "For the signifier is a unit in its very uniqueness, being by nature *symbol only of an absence*." It signifies a desire for something that the subject has not, the other of the subject. And the master signifier of these signifiers of desire is the Phallus, reflecting the powerful human passions, the fear of castration, in the male and envy of the penis in the female. This is not the phallus as an actual organ, penis or clitoris. It is the phallus as signifier, that can come to take the place of all signifiers signifying all desire for all absences. "Its the most profound relation: that be which the ancients incarnated the *Nous and the Logos*." (Lacan) Castration, the lack of superintendence, by

phallic authority, it^{is} what transforms the "author", or the "book", into the "text". Because, presence can be articulated only if it is *fragmented* into a discourse; "castration" and dismemberment being both a menace to and the condition of the possibility of discourse. . . 11:59.45PM and once again a meaning is conceived between the chaotic regions of an 'other', and the actual physical marks which are the letters scrawled across the page. . . 11:30.20AM . . . 5:21.09 except now go to the end. return -"S"-then read(ing) ". . ." . . . 5:28.02 . . . 5:14.43]

[~~\$~~₂₉: Night now! Tell me, tell me, tell me,
-elm- ! . . . 9:38.32 . . . 9:31.12 . . . 9:23.23 Hence, the
brackets, which are a convenient illusion of static
safety in which the flow of becoming was, as it is,
an allusion of what will be its own illusion, didn't
exist, but is real . . . 9:31.12 Derrida offers a *different*
hymeneal fable to replace phallogocentric understanding. The hymen is the
always folded (therefore never single or simple) space in which the pen
writes its dissemination. "Metaphorically" it means the consummation
of marriage. "literally its presence signifies the absence of
consummation. This and-or-structure bodies forth the play of presence
and absence. The hymen undoes oppositions because it acts as it
suffers. This fabulous hymen, "always intact as it is always ravishes,
a screen, a tissue," undoes "the assurance of mastery." (Derrida) . . .
• 9:00.12 Hence, Nietzsche does not do away
with the concept of being. Rather, he
proposes a new concept of being-
Affirmation. (an affirmation which currently
can only be explicated as the negation of
negation(not the redoubling of the closure)
Thus, writing "this", (this which is
simultaneously the physical marks on a
tangible surface, the differ(ence) that gives
these marks meaning, and the
self-reflexive quotation marks which
erases what the the text) crates a particular
text, an active seeking, an affirmative
creation that leads to the actual Being of

the being who writes. It is a writing which,
through the script, reports not only upon its
textual and cultural interpretations but also
upon its own phenomenological structures.
And It is through the creation of this actual
writing, that bridges the meaning between
the physical symbols and what transmutes
meaning, between the physical text and the
meaning which organizes these arbitrary
scribbles, that embodied difference or
Affirmation can be achieved.]

NOR

[§₃₀: And because Affirmation (what Joyce forgot) has no object other than itself, "this" writing which I now write (and read) both is and is not. And by tracing the continuous bridging between 'me' and 'other', "you" and "them", between ubiquity and singular location, between eternity and historicity, the actual writing on the page allows us to approach the difference between the absence of the 'other' and the 'presence' which is now (always already) writing itself. The writing becomes that which erases itself. Hence, Affirmation as an object of affirmation is ~~Being~~. While in itself, and as primary affirmation, it is becoming. This is why affirmation in all its power is always double: and affirmation must be affirmed (redoubling, or self reflexive metaphysics, as such).]

[\$₃₁: (nor in a textual example) almost reproducing Borges (at 11:59.01PM), "Pierre Menard, Author of *Don Quixote* " {"He did not want to compose another *Don Quixote* - which would be easy- but the *Don Quixote* . It is necessary to add that his aim was never to produce a mechanical transcription of the original; he did not propose to copy it. His admirable ambition was to produce pages which would coincide- word for word and line for line - with those of Miguel de Cervantes. 'My intent is merely astonishing,' he wrote me from Bayonne on December 30th, 1934. 'The ultimate goal of a theological or metaphysical demonstration- the external world, God, chance, universal form- are no less anterior or common than this novel which I am now developing. The only difference is that philosophers publish in pleasant volumes the intermediary stages of their work and that I have decided to lose them.' and , in fact, not one page of a rough draft remain to bear witness to this work of years."<<see: Jorge Louis Borges, *Ficciones*, pages 45-57, Grove Press, New York>>]].

.. 8:59.59 "If we Imagine one hand writing upon the mystic writing-pad while another periodically raises its covering sheet from the wax slab, we shall have a concrete representation of the way in which I tried to picture the functioning of the perceptual apparatuses of our mind."(Freud, *A note upon the Mystic Writing Pad*). Derridas fable of the hymen dissolves Freuds phallus through a

double-jointed notion like the Freudian mystic writing-pad . No longer castration (the realization of sexual difference as the model for the difference between signifier and signified) as the origin of signification. Rather *involve* that sexual difference in the "concrete representation" (the pen etching into the virgin surface of the page) of marking meaning: dissemination into the hymen. . .

.. 11:59.59PM "the text of Cervantes and that of Menard are verbally identical, but the second is almost infinitely richer." . . .*Torat yyy Hedut yyy Piqqude yyy*]

NOR

[\$₃₂:And it is in this bridging which is Ariadne's tread, because this bridge is neither a spanning that simply connects already existent banks, nor is it a tightrope by which to cross over and return. Rather, the writing is a river that first produces the banks and then gathers them together through the continual creation of itself... 8:59.59 into the (n)ever-virgin, (n)ever-violated hymen of interpretation, always supplementing through its fold which is also an opening, is spilled the seeds of meaning; seeds that scatters itself abroad rather than inseminates. Or turning the terms around, the playfully dissemination rather than continually hermeneutic gesture of interpretation (n)ever penetrates the hymen of the text. It is a sexual consummations forever differed.) This is an act which, although not opposed to nihilism, will always in the end subvert it through the clearing of the moment.. . . 11:59.57.(into) You ask , "what does this have to do with Joyces text?" Nothing, because to understand Joyces text is not to read it, but to write (what Joyce forgot, and continues Forgetting). And to write what Joyce forgot is not to vivsect Joyces text with a linguistic scalpal. Rather, it is to use it to form a transgression, a clearing. It is to become Joyces pen, a pen that forgot that it was writing-(Joyces Text , then, when it

remembers its writing is not a re-presentation, nor even an interpretation. It is rather (if this is even possible) an invocation of the other. A bridge to the unthought thought's thinking, which does not so much as repeat Finnegans Wake as duplicate it. (See: \$₃₁)]

[\$₃₃: . . . as I read, the sound of automobiles mixes with the long awaited rain, and if language is the prison house of being, then I'm trapped within, "Cross on over, there is more fun at home on the Disney afternoon with channel forty-four ." the writing grows old and tired, where have all the years gone? the lighting which was its opening has subsided. and the meaning that it was has lingered, glooming and now dies. (. . . 11:59.56. at 11:57pm on March 28 1991 this twilight clearing has darkened into . . . 11:59.58). the writing yields to its lack of inertia, becomes closed off and uprooted. And turning away from itself becomes entangled in an undifferentiated mode that leads to . . . ~~Night-night! Telmetale of stem or stone. Beside, the rivering waters of, hitherandthithering waters of.~~ . . . 11:59.55 . . . eg. . . . 11:59.56.

Night!] 8:59.59 . . . Because, as Derrida writes, "It(dissemination) comes to soon." However, the English does not catch the full play of this text. In French, "Elle-le laisse d'avance tomber". "She lets it (the meaning) fall in advance." Derrida takes advantage of the simple grammatical fact that dissemination-the male act-being a noun ending in "tion," is feminine in French. The Pronoun "elle" confuses sexual agency. And the "-" between subject and object Predicate commemorates, the deferment inhabiting the hymeneal dissemination of meaning. 11:59.59. In which the writing falls (at least for now) into that absence which always lies just out of the pen's grasp, the unobtainable purity of the blank page, the implied lack which always calls the violence of the pen forward through the inevitable sacrifice of the infinite for. . . tick 11:59.58 . . . talk 11:59.59 . . . tick

12:00.00 . . .]]]] e.g. NIGHT]

THEN:

**1. S EQUALS: ([Thirty Three
~~Sophias dancing upon the corpse of God~~
~~... or the lingering death of a Modernist~~
~~poet]~~)**

(N)OR

**([This Writing Is An Attempt At
~~Dis-solving Destructive Dilema(s: through~~
~~the mapping of authentic~~
~~temporality) at . . . 11:23am March 30th~~
~~1991- or in POEM(S:454026)])~~**

AND

2. ((not) \$) EQUALS:

~~((not)[Thirty Three Sophias dancing
upon the corpse of God . . . or the
lingering death of a Modernist poet])~~

(N)OR

~~((not) [This Writing Is An Attempt At
Dis-solving Destructive Dilema(s: through
the mapping of authentic
temporality) at . . . 11:23am March 30th
1991 or in POEM(S:454027)])~~

(N)OR

Should we say, in the most round about way that (not ~~not~~ \$) does not even equal S. Or even more simply that, even S does ~~not~~ equal S, and that only the play, or the desire to write S, can in any way ~~be~~ S. But this misses the point .(eg. . .

THEREFORE:

At 12:00.01 AM on March 31th 1991(which can never again be represented) Joyces text is not dead (but is resurrected), because its (re)writing becomes a path by which to think the ~~unthought thought~~. A thought that must always already have been sacrificed upon the alter of logocentricity so that significance as it is presently explicated can become. . . .

32
copy

എയർമാർക്ക്

അയയ്ക്കേണ്ട കയ്യെഴുത്തുകൾ

ഇവയ്ക്ക് ഉദാഹരണം:

എ

അയയ്ക്കേണ്ട കയ്യെഴുത്തുകൾ

BOEM(2:42052)