Exergue

###  Birth surmounts to an arguable extent the interest in rational science. The modesty of critical unknowability demands a perspective on language as a proposed horizon, on the science of writing, on teleology in the interest of totality. What is origin, genesis in the absence of the question of birth as such? What is it to inscription, that is to the prospect of writing to writing in writing? To what does extent birth as such proclaim the nuances of the miraculous birth and anticipate in that mode of precision, out of lag measures of demarcation? Is there a mobility in that ventured demarcation that is in cognitive recognition? Language, in the unknown that has no exergue, remains a worrisome horizon in the extremity of infliction and the longevity of drifting, whose shores are neither a matter of precision, nor for that reason are they here in deliberate deliberation. *Frankenstein* exemplified in monstrosity wearing of framed – disclaimer, a divine precise generality to an astronomical proposition, seamlessly hyphenates a precursor intention in calculated calculability. Perhaps in co-opting to disclaim or transcend danger, we are ‘co-opted’ to a particular sense of mourning. Writing eulogies or obituaries habituates the specificity of intellectual memory and coincides, with acknowledgment. Temporal specificity, historical unfolding as distinct and isolable dates, the death of princess Diana August 31,1997, John Kennedy has just been shot November 22 ,1963, The attack on the World Trade Center September/11 are not hypotheticals rehearsed in presumed vulnerability, but as Ferguson puts it, occurrences significant in “localized impact.” (314) Derrida’s exergue on monstrosity, hence, is anything but an entitled grievance. Disclaimed monstrosity, though, questions at once and simultaneously the ‘as such’ of their ‘localized impact. This foreground simply out-source the claim to legibly disclaim-the self. The supposed inflation of *Frankenstein* is perhaps an exergue on these ‘simulate’ ‘inventions. The future in its unknowability risks the foreboding grounds of monstrosity. A contextualized, monadic steppes up, goes forth beyond itself, in the milieu of disclaimed responsibility. In this tentative mapping, we are far from declaring a “communicative intent to these preceding issues, when being in closer proximity to the problematic nature of “involuntary association” *(Speech and Phenomenon 34).* The future that has no exergue is a crossed-out contingency whos*e* visibility and spatiality, at the level of the literal death of self-presence, signify the death of speech. Post post-script, is an unfathomable conquest but circumstantially apprehends the in- finitude writing this ‘dis-claimer’ to Derrida exergue on monstrosity that arguably apprehends an author. In this cordially conjoined, and hyphenated topography intertwined with pure receded intelligibility, I dare to foresee a more effective -general preoccupation with the problematic notion of birth as such within and in the outskirts of *Of Grammatology*.

###  The science of writing foresees no reading of genesis outside the question of birth, nor can accredit ‘origin’ to cybernetic writings, nor can extend genesis to the Freudian notion of “self -assembly-psyche.” (316) A constituency of a sort, “circumfesses’ the problematic preemptive ventured within circumscribing-effect and co-intent. Diachronic mobilizations are, thereafter, intentions intending at reality not simply to our discretion but to their noted disclaim. Paul de Man observed in form and intent as Ferguson argues that” intentionality in Husserl’s intuitive articulation may convert a rock into a seat without any further material working.” (Qtd. In Ferguson 321) Cognitive - ponderings risk their mobilizations, perhaps even underscore the difference between literary and textual analysis, but above all presume the exodus that must exceed - writing.’

### Birth as such, seamlessly confronts a philosophical contention with an involuntary exposition, nonetheless, cohorts an exclamation of a different intention than strictly or only *Frankenstein*. Dissemination is a vastitude, at once “violent and arbitrary” in a beginning” arguably fictional, and far from being inaugural, implemented by an overwhelming absence. (Dissemination 300) *Dissemination* writes about*,* a contended scientific contingency of ‘fictitious beginnings’, surrounding the singularity configuration, and a murder in the unfold. The latter is to an arguable extent, the of writing under -erasure. ‘The murder of the unfold’, however, what does it unfold into? The unconditional intrigues of such a binding subtlety, the liberty of its illustrative understanding of the inexplicable in the light of reason, concur in seriousness a ‘mobilized projection’ as well as associative ‘efforts’,’sentiments’ ‘desires’, ‘interest’, ‘longing’ to the legibility of a deconstructive contemporariness of ‘now’, that in some sense, has always been here. In *Dissemination*, Derrida meditates quite extensively on Pierrot murder of his wife, viewing it as a simulacrum of an ‘expli-citation’, a reference to the law of unknown (writer) origin, the play of anonymous axiom that clearly describe for Derrida Marguriette in Mallarmé fiction. (197) The avenir of this’ floating outwork’ grants a ‘temporal and textual structure’ a conflicting mime-value. A mime-drama restitutes a preface planned and then written after the fact, in the solitude of a mime-program, the written after the fact,” (*Dissemination* 199). What happens in this mime-drama is murder. “Columbine”, the mime’s wife, is dead. The circumstances of her death are more than interesting. The mime tickled her to death. Of course, we are reminded that these are’ deliberations over a crime “yet to be committed”- by Mallarmé.

### Of course, there’s the rope-pull it tight and blam! It’s done! Yes, but then the tongue hanging out, the horrible face. No -the knife? Or a saber, along saber? zap! in the heart...yes, but then the blood flows out in torrents, streaming. - Ugh! what a devil of a... Poison? a little tiny vial, quaff it and then...yes! then the cramps, the runs, the pains, the tortures, ah! how awful (it would be discovered, anyway). Of course, there’s the gun, bam! but bam! would be heard. -Nothing, I can think of nothing. (He paces gravely back and forth, deep in thought, by accident, he trips) Ow! that hurts! (He strokes his foot) Oof! that hurts! it’s not serious, its’s better already. (He keeps on stroking and tickling his foot.) Ha! ha! that’s funny! Ha! Ha! No, it makes me laugh. Ah! (He abruptly let’s go of his foot. He slaps himself on the head.) I’ve got it! (Slyly:) I’ve got it! I’m going to tickle my wife to death. There! (Dissemination 200-201)

Derrida sees Margueritte’s mime-drama as “an epigraph”, “an hors d’oéuvre”, “a seed”, “a seminal infiltration”, speaking less to Mallarmé, and more to the conceptualization of “systematic treatise on the textual graft”. (*Dissemination* 202) Beyond the “principal or capital text” and beside” the author’s proper name and title” there is, Derrida argues, “an epigraph” a space for a “a third proper name” a derivative streaming, if you wish, of Margueritte ‘Mallarméanism’. (*Dissemination* 203) There is, however, no third name as such. Instead, the figure of that denoted third name is in the form of Guatier Pierrot Posthume. (*Dissemination* 203) A shift in focus, perhaps, but one that Derrida sees as necessary for grafting singularity in the miming unfold of a murder. The murder subtitles a critical appreciation reinscribing on blankness a contentious bureau ‘grafted onto the arborescence of another text.” (Dissemination 202)

 Mallarmé, a text ‘marked in -proposition’, a calculable incision, a present epigraph in ‘grafting’. In short “cross references” that addresses the ruminated futility of “bibliographical research”, “source studies” inside the Mallarmé text. (*Dissemination* 205) There is, thereby, as Derrida argues “no more “inside” inferences than can properly be said by Mallarmé.” In Mallamré, as Derrida argues, “the imitator in the last instance has no imitate, the signifier has not signified, the sign having in no instant a referent, their operation is no longer comprehended within the process of truth but on the contrary they comprehend it.” (*Dissemination* 207) The effect of this “specular doubling” on analysis, on “the movement of truth”, “the adequation scales the present and extend the Mallarméan text to the broader limits of a simulacrum. The residual Hegelian /platonic resonances, later re-inscribes in the text of Mimique, the fluidity or the fluency of indented dis -appropriation.

The “cipher of pirouettes prolonged toward another motif” is, like the whole of the text, ciphered to the second power. This is remarked by its cipher in that, while disengaging the dancer’s pirouette as a cipher or hieroglyphic, it also enciphers the sign “pirouette,” which it causes to pirouette or turn upon itself like a top, this time designating the movement of the sign itself. The cipher of pirouette is also a pirouette as a cipher, as the movement of the signifier that refers, through the fiction of this or that visible dancing pirouette, to another pirouetting signifier, another “pirouette. In this way, the pirouette, like the dancer’s pointed toe, is always just about to pierce with a sign, with the sharp bit of nothing, the page of the book or the virginal intimacy of the vellum. (*Dissemination* 240) “

The work of unrealization” as Derrida puts it, concerns time not temporality. (Dissemination 233) Nuanced “supreme spasm” illuminates boundaries points” that dwells on the interrogative site, in auxiliary -monument/ing to the edifices in untimely disregard to the matter in question. (206) What becomes “the internal” de-facto of the mime, Derrida argues, intuitively remorse an unavoidable “internal practice of spacing.” Supplementarity then, is not a Rousseauic “unilateral movement” of inside/out, but as Derrida continues to argue “it is the excess of a signifier …, in its own inside, make up (for) space and repeats the opening.” (Dissemination 235) Mallarméan ‘spacing’ introduces the question of the law governing the theatrical and literature to their respective effects and induces the “i” calligraphing writing prior to any unrealization. Mallarmé “i” s:

That text, which exhibits a modernity that could be judge untimely, puts the dots on the ‘is. With its little suspended dot, the *i* continually pricks and rips through-or almost- the veil, reaches a decision-or almost- about the text, as do so many Mallarméan ‘*i’*s. (*Dissemination* 237)

 In retribution, an “exquisite crisis” in literature, in the unfolds folds over the blankness of the white paper. (Dissemination 237) In the robust of the proper, a ‘crinkling’ sound of dissemination folds into a systematic ‘signing -out’. Best, ‘shrugs from the unfolded blankness, correspondences in utter presumptuousness, apart from the undecidable, in this timid formality is the contour of the undecidable. Mallarmé envisions “an internal reality” within a disseminating structure. This time “at last” happens with the exact “matter -reality.” “mise en scéne”.

Or rather -since this sort of exhibition and the “as such” of phenomena are no longer in the last instance in control here but are rather being maneuvered as inscribed functions and subordinate mechanism - what is in question here, this time at last, finds itself not displayed but given play, not staged but engaged, not demonstrated but mounted. Mounted with confectioner’s skill is some implacable machinery, with consummate prudence and implacable logic. … “This time at last” does not mean that what had always, obscurity until now been sought has finally, in a single blow -a stroke a pen or a throw of the dice-been accomplished. Nothing could be more foreign to eschatology, particularly any eschatology of or by way of literature than the finite -infinite serialization of these numbers. (Dissemination 290-291)

In the present state, the presentence of a state is not an opening but a scission. A scission to epigraph, “a crowning formula, a camouflaging disappearance within the unfolds appearances accompanied by de -totalitarian reading and cemented writing apparatuses. The ideality of structure is necessarily the ideality of an “encasing” approval. (*Dissemination* 307) The presence in “parenthesis”, writing the case in the avenir of presence, is ‘a demystifying’ obligation.

What! Perfects writing rejects even the slightest adventure, so as to delight in its chaste evocation on the tain of memories as drawn by some extraordinary figures... nothing immediate or outward happening, If our external agitation is shocking, on the screen of printed pages, all the more so on the stageboards, a materiality upright in gratuitous obstruction. Yes, the Book or that monograph it becomes of a type (the superimposition of pages as in a Jewel-case, defending an infinite, intimate, trucked-in delivery of
(the) being in itself against brutal space) is sufficient with many a truly new procedure analogous in refraction to the subtlest features of life. in a present that plays (at being) effaced so as to cover some more hybrid underside...materiality upright in gratuitous obstruction. (Dissemination 313)

Ideal structures in his opinion would respond to the poetics of in- spacing. In that cluster of opening, the movement of close-apart-open is not a question of the symptomatic but the symbiotic tie of ‘being with-in’ the ‘outlook’

Mallarmé himself indeed envisioned the internal reality of a poem and the ideal The architecture of the objects the poem must reorder within itself: grottos, diamonds, spiderwebs, rose windows, kiosks, shells, all stand as so many images which translate the search for a total correlation of nature within itself, a perfect equalization of all things…the keystone of this architecture, functioning as the absolute center through which everything communicates, balances out, and is neutralized….Mallarmé’s thematic itself provides us with the technical tools needed for its own elucidation. (*Dissemination* 247)

In the offset of gramma-to-logy, an obelisk continuum, subsumed within a “felicity of expression”, the as such, effortlessly echoes “state equilibrium”. Does the irreducibility of gender inseminate a physiology of writing, engulfed in the simplicity of this evocation as well as the complexity of the effortless presumptuousness of - ‘this’- an -erect- in transcendence? If there is surplus” mark in this polysemy of “blanks” and “folds”, theological in retribution, the latter arguably associates the notion of ‘the precursor’ with a wide spectrum of the ‘overdue’, without, however, being liable to deposited inventory as such. A more scientific comprehension remains shy from partaking the immaculate birth to an overdue, instead, fully exposes the retracts and refractions oblivious to the language in range: terrific, the magnificent, the miraculous. The disciples’ testimonials are at best eyewitness accounts to mystifying boundaries, but of themselves ultimately recourse the disciple in the discipline, the blank in the fold. As “an inexhaustible totality of semantic valences” what exactitude defines the ‘in- bounds’ of this space now? (*Dissemination* 252) The now is always an ‘upright fixity’ to what stand-out in interpellation. Innumerable imperfection, however, in the ‘plu-presence’ irreducible in form, formation, information to the dislodges of de-formation that is transformations based on” no original form and no raw material. (*Dissemination* 314) This inter-sur-face of space, I would argue, is in need for a more articulated notion of birth as such, whereas Derrida would argue for a more meticulous approach to writing in the wake of grammatology , and Hegel perceives the “epigraph”, in interpellated reading , as an itemized ‘raw corpus in the warehouse of philosophical determination, namely an , ‘epigraphic premises’ entrusted to past ir-relevancy, to the past of its irrelevancy.

The very attempt to determine the relationship of Philosophical work to other efforts concerning the same subject introduces an ‘alien and irrelevant’ interest, which obscure precisely that which matters for the reconfiguration of the truth (qtd. In John W. P Philip 15)

Oblivion recounts, the blank folds over”, “the folds fold”, “the fold of the blank” and “closed by the frame” so to speak. The praxis of “illusions”, “errors”, “irrelevancy” are contingent on their disseminations on “the intactness of some absolute opening.” Reading happens by the “red blades of the knife.” “The language whose “gambol” is the taxonomy of “white” polysemic referent ,marks up a principal valence , a reboot to the “ blank paper”, to the “ glacier”, to the “snowy peak”, to the “ swan”, to the “ceiling” in the lateral capacity of particular articulation of the simplicity of the ‘as such’- of the properly conceived. Reciprocity revamps a discipled question hedging “phonic difference” rather than “intuitive presence” on the death of the canonical mother- on the polysemic series of re-inscribing within a sequence no longer arched. (*Dissemination* 235) The mobility is simultaneously immobility, the legibility of no consequence deconstructs in this co-narration, a canonized not necessarily immortalized death of the mother. On that ground of proximity Armour writes:

A failed plentitude gives rise to speech’s supplantation by writing but, in so far a failed plentitude attends speech as well as writing, speech ’s origin lies in writing. (Armour 198)

A formidable text on faltered conceptuality of origin withheld from grammatology’s exergue withholds the question of canonization, Frankenstein. The narrative conceptualizes plentitude as the enigma canonizing the death of a mother extending thereby the “supplementary blank” to the predicament of the theological. The unreadability of the signified, re-mark the blank in the structure of the text. Finitude as Derrida continues to argue in the blank of the hymen and the fold resurge as erasure, disappearances and as the nonsense. To ‘accident’ the occident is vaguely autobiographical.”. Among the configuration “Homage to Wagner” referring perhaps to the singularity of the text, “Homage to the father”, in reference to the divinity of singularization, are in the constellation of blank, the practically empty space, holds no “beneficent figures” next to the nothing of the hymen: next to no hymen, next to no phenomenological affinity with the hymen. Regardless of this complex rehab, these debates, and their contingencies are arbitrary semantic signifiers, themselves within the semiology of “magnetization and production. Logocentric entry in the blank, the shortcoming of analogy and further ambiguities surrounding the notion of supplementation, unfolds into reprehensive metaphysics and logocentrism’s economy of truth. The tropes of the father as Armour argues “figures prominently in relation to writing and beyond in the platonic corpus” (202) Armour insinuates that in the platonic corpus, the value of writing measures the proximity as well as it is the measure of proximity to the father. Gravity falls. *Frankenstein* the modern *Prometheus,* in this context, is at worst a hyperbolic occident’ arguing for the accidentally canonical in so far that Frankenstein, the doctor, does not. Perhaps Frankenstein conceptuality of origin, as an exergue on the exergue is henceforth an inexplicable eschatological denunciation crossing all categories, capacities, and intentions. Suffice it to say, *Of Grammatology* exergue is, possibly in retrospect and in the aftermath, an infinite assurance on the accidental intro-section of origin. “The excavation of writing” as Armour calls it, warns against the danger of “recapitulation. (205) The tradition of disclaiming safeguards and upholds the assumption that there is no monstrosity to a world of written disclaimers. Derrida’s exergue arguably ‘floats -out’ in bewilderment a question of origin by not referring in his exergue on monstrosity neither to *Prometheus* in *Frankenstein* nor *Prometheus.*

Frankenstein inundates an agreement short of being a contract between Marry Shelly and the group of friends she was staying with them at that time: Mary, Percy, Byron Claire and Polidori (Byron’s personal physician). They all had been reading German Ghost stories in French translation when Byron suddenly announced:” we will each write a ghost story”-xvi They all agreed to write ghost stories. Only Mary Shelly wrote *Frankenstein*. This singularity has modestly if not convincingly grappled with the origin of faltered agreements, and the evasiveness of associated causalities. The undifferentiated space between peace and silence, a ‘causality of miming’, conjures not the real in fact but the colliding “cipher”. How does a contingency of explicated writing in faltered irreducibility, write itself into the science of writing outside a transient existentialist cogito of a Prometheus, in mime, in miming mimesis? Prometheus -Frankenstein as argued in the introduction of Mary Shelly *Frankenstein i*s “the product of Mary Shelley’s own intuitive genius even if biographical literary and philosophical factors influencing her outlook were left indelibly fixed in the story. It was her astonishing ability to synthesize these factors into a vital whole that makes the achievement so remarkable.” (Mary Shelley ix) *Frankenstein* a synthesizing exigency, the workout, now, of a singularity harbored in sheer repression the writing conditions to be within the after math of an overdue. In a hasty conclusion, the creation of Frankensteinwritten todisseminate- out primal interest in science, is a monopoly on origin as the origin of disclaimed writings. It is arguable whether what is being disclaimed here is the simple origin of faltered agreements. Grammatology acknowledges in retrospect generality, the risk of monstrosity promising the original birth of disclosed disclaimer. Such risk- acknowledgments, Ferguson argues, in and of themselves, however, are not questions of production-distribution-consumption but rather what points or ‘appoints’ structures, hence, the absence of precision conveys above all “the desire to avoid claiming that one has arrived at truth” (323) Inherent to site- pondering is perhaps a *Prometheus*- inheritance in the debasement of structure. “On that dreary night”, this citation inexplicably declares the first-intended scissions of the red blade knife to be out -of -a question.

Badea N. War-war

On what conditions birth as such, and birth as the effortless effort to address a predicament of origin can be questions put to grammatology as questions of grammatology? Genesis in the space of radical intelligibility contentiously circumscribes, contentiously is circumscribed by metaphysics of radical intelligibility. Let us begin by a hypothesis if not a ‘straightened’ stipulation: It is re-commandment to outlive, to outsource the literal meaning of genesis. The extent to which we can convincingly transcend the question of birth as such, presupposes a form of indeterminations ruffled in the outskirts concerns *Of Grammatology*. The strictly non philosophical measures are unavoidable risks or pitfalls for philosophy. Teleology eccentric exposition, necessarily, though, defines a trustee on restitutions. A numerating disregard in writing dis-associable prior disarray is a biographical and psychological narratives overdue. John W.P. Philip in *Transcendental Difference and Auto-relation* argues repression, deviation and “the degree to which it is an ‘error’ reveals, what Philip quoting Ronse here, recalls the repression of the actual condition of writing” (18) On what matters for restitutions can be read from John W. P Philip reference to Hegel’s status quo, as being nothing short of an enigma in the present of parenthesis:

The very attempt to determine the relationship of philosophical work to other efforts concerning the same subject introduces an alien and irrelevant interest, which obscure precisely that which matter for the reconfiguration of the truth. (qtd in John W.P. Philip 15)

‘Concourse consciousness’ a contention in writing, in the writing- manifest, is heavily invested in philosophical prefigures determining the aporetic notion of ‘a mark infinitely repeatable’, an encryption within ‘in-stilled’ ‘destitution.’ Grammatology conjures up a set of problems that *Of Grammatology* in retrospect, inundates. Philips’s axioms pondering composition, concealed from parenthesized relevance in the overdue of citation. The enigmatic sense of writing John W. P Philip argues” constitutes writing in general within the essentials of a structure.” (17) The specular value of writing disseminates into the present tense and as Philip continues to argue” cannot be the notion of a mark repeatable to infinity.” (17) Christopher Johnson argues that ‘ the conceptualization of genetic codes as a form of script is obviously of capital interest to philosophers interested in language . Conservative and metamorphic code, the idea of DNA as a cybernetic circuit based on the movement of information around a circuit rather on the static storage of information, is a dynamic process of instilled differance -difference. (45-46). Is it a truism to say that genesis is an ontological empiricism? The ontology of adequation, grammatology radicalization of the science of writing is dependent on the ontology of being sexually marked in general. This preliminary association defers the difference between the mark and being sexually marked and hosts numerous questions as a result within the realm of ethical responsibility. There is no value to the mark, the latter remains a writing prerogative ‘a presumption of an order, and a discloser. a systematic representation within Zero value’ -feminism. Cybernetic robotic data, depreciates when the forefronts for the science of writing is grammatology. The question of the technique relating to cybernetic programming, for example, deconstructs not only the irreducibility of Gender/sexual difference, but more ambitiously the symbolic apparatus of the machine. The irreducibility of the machine production to birth can only be radicalized-The effortless furrows, a borrowed viability that writes itself with questions of cybernetic transparency, another disclosure whose generosity of exposition havoc the greatest expectations of all. To speculate on the question of sexual difference as such, Heidegger argues that in the radical absence of difference, the being outside technologies of productions is, however, within the difference of sexual difference, not of sexual difference as it pertains to gender. -in *Ontology and Equivocation* Elizabeth Crosz argues that Heidegger insists that Dasein is a neutral term, a term that must be stripped of its humanist, egoist, anthropomorphic association, and characteristics to be understood in terms of fundamental ontology (87) .There is therefore, in addition to the question of responsibility, a question of procreation redundant with circumstanced circularity, a circum- ‘’pending capacity within contracting jurisdiction and contouring constituency, an implacable formless turn and returns to ontology and birth as such. What then is the fortress of intelligibility in this passage to ontology? The specificity of what Heidegger circumfesses, namely the neutrality of sexual difference cannot in the science of differance, astutely differentiate, even though as Elizabeth Crosz points out neutrality tantamount with “the intrinsic possibility of every concrete factual humanity” foresees ontology’s equivocation. (87) Sexual indifference predicament in difference, is neither neutrality in gender nor gender. A Crossed-out pre-differential’ state of neutrality wavers an intrinsic order. Radical intelligibility is supposedly cybernetic. The notion of programming that defies all limits becomes therefore, a contingency for writing. In that muted space of writing the mutiny of a disclosed writing is a discloser. Suffice is to say that the language addressing the question of language is not cybernetic mutations. For now, the questions of ‘threading out’ what pertains to this question is provocatively more evocative. If composition is a teleological deviation, the question then is parenthesis at the margins of writing. The hymen of a contentious presence in the absence of birth ‘as such’ for grammatology, regroups “the sublimate of an instigated abstraction”, and define “a Hegelian cite-attraction”.

The novel *Le perjure* was titled ‘*Mercure de France’*, interestingly commit the self, under oath, to tell the truth and nothing but the truth. What can survive on this incidental confessional pledging? And moreover, what vantage scope to be foreseeable, unthought, in their indicative horizon? Immediately a contentious sense resounding in perjury, perjurers a crisis. The latter maybe nothing more or less than as , Asfour in *Wrongful Enrichment* (75), argues “ fictitious contractual privity” whereby the plaintiff, in this case, Chalier dispense with the wrong (repent , ask for forgiveness…)and consent to “morphologic compensation” ( Mercure de France is now titled le perjurer”) A constituent-recognition affirms a perspective on “subsidiary part” to be out of acquisition but within the perjury own deprived claim for a proceeding precedent , Chalier. (Wrongful *Enrichment,* 92). Restatement, Asfour continues to argue, “prescribes the laws of restitutions” by sourcing out what is considered indispensable for legal ‘concourse development’ in the United States. (73)

I sincerely promised in the past, but time has passed, precisely, passed surpassed, and he one who promised, long ago or in the past, can remain faithful to his promise, but it is no longer me, I am no longer the same me, I am another, *I* is another, I have changed, everything has changed, the addressees of the promise as well. For example: I was in love, I am in love no longer in the same way, I love someone else, and I am unable to account for that, myself, ask the other who decides this for me”. (*Without alibi*173-174.)

The Charlie ‘sorrow affair’ is an incidental miscellaneous that falls within the irregularities of the anacoluthon and exemplifies what a perjury of promise scrutinize politically. A professor who had cheated on a television quiz show constitutes no threat to inherited entitlement. The audience /student noticed the difference between the return pending on the professor cheating on a tv show and the question of cheating the administration. The investigation of this breach of oath was conducted by the quaker lady who signed the letter convoking him to Washington. This investigation was necessary for the winner of the first fellowship awarded by the Papaios foundation. The problematics of the novelist narration character -witness to the question of perjury is foundational. The space of that maneuvering is literary to the extent that it succeeds in questioning this perjury as the origin of perjury. Boundaries consolidated within performatives confines of Charlier second marriage. Charlier finds himself being charged by his first wife and subject to legal proceeding by the American authorities. This faded incident of writing became in this seriousness of questioning perjury the ciphered space of discussing meta-narratives. Equating , as Asfour argues, Anglo American common law with James Joyce , Finnegan wake or Hercules with the “ empire laws” is an “ongoing enterprise, “ a novel serialization” reflecting a prudent perspective on law , in their own interpretations and applicability, The di -select stemming out from what Asfour sees as “legal contracts and normative uncertainties”, have an infinite, not an abyssal resistance to ‘meta-narrative’ .(71) The story about the writing of the story over there in America circumfess “ a quasi-contract on restitution and wrongful enrichment , as Asfour might argue, but what does it by means of justice make us liable to ? what does it really comprise? What are its boundaries and edge points that can perjure the novel to the certitude of canonical presence? Is it possible to ask such a question without speculating on origin as the origin of perjury? The Christian marriage of politics and repentance ‘espionage’ the noticeably diffused notions and styles of a past in the retrospect of its relevance of incidents choices, characters, and events. These ‘faded’ notions, however, are remarkably extended remarkably extend. Indefiniteness of textuality ‘incident’ the depletion of the reflected in refracting. The predicament of formality structures debasement. Before the I there was you’ has no longer the threading of the S before P only the certainty of Plato before Socrates. This sequentially, promises depth in this fidelity of Platonic-Christian eschatology. Such question would have to hold a prior ‘claim’ on platonic transformation of the myth, namely Christianity, arguing that the elusiveness of an event wavered understanding of the gift remains thereby for Gasché at best obscure.

“Uncanny reversal”, a case study, of the occupy movement in Zuccotti Park, for example, precipitate a form of return to more normative proliferations of elusiveness. “Occupy has come to Oakland”, is more than a slogan and less than a profess that one can intelligibly make in view of academic disciplines. (*Preface to Occupy: three inquiries in Disobedience*, Mitchell, **Critical inquiry, Autumn 2021, volume 39, number 1**, p. 2) (*images, space, revolution. The Arts of occupation*, Mitchell, Critical **inquiry, Autumn 2021, volume 39, number 1**, p.12) An iconic insurgency such as the ballerina standing on the Bull, is ostensibly declarative of her intention not to kill the bull. “Coming alive against the background” is harmonious with the position “not to kill the king” and with that the disappearance of the arrest. A surveillance of the event, “mic-check” resolutely resonates with, as Mitchel continues to argue Rousseau attribute declaration regarding the sound of the human voice in promising an echo-connection to “foundational figure of democracy itself.”( Mitchell, 15,17, 18, 21)Mass-ornamentation is a sovereign momentum extend and retract “empty spaces” monumentally realized in “Tahrir square,”, Occupied parliament square”, Moscow red square”, “Tiananmen Square in Bejing”, “Champs Elysée” is an “exuberant style” shuffled to attending primacy. What is then “civil disobedience” when, as Harcourt argues, “there is nothing to overthrow in America? (p.47) The affirmative of this response is weight in relation to more emerging ideas such as, third space or the fourth left -succession of radical social movements in the United States-, (Harcourt, p.50), but even more interestingly decentralized network echoes the more formative “segnon” of “block- chains” demystifying algorithms. How do we then move in the wake of this “ body of crisis” to engendered speculations on “self-authoring” phenomena in their promo- confrontation? The question stills Le *perjurer* in far more interesting question on treatise tilling ground-furrow of personhood. Tristrapaedia a form of treatise written, as Keenleyside argues for Tristam alone specifying the meaning of civil society, to be in their domestic sphere but with this originating notion of a man, woman, and bull/ox, as identity pertaining more directly to the plight of the ploughman and nourishment. (Keenleyside,p.122). Keenleyside then turns the discussion to Lock and Descartes seeking a more proper philosophical intuitive aspired selfhood-self and consciousness.

I turn to Anscombe because I think she articulates something very close to the model of personhood or self-consciousness that Locke, at times, intimates- and that Sterne fleshes out…. Lockean: self-consciousness means “consciousness of the self”…Anscombe contends that this Lockean form of self-consciousness runs aground in much the same way as the *cogito*: by looking for some thing that is not there, trying ,as Hume puts it, to “catch *myself.*” Properly understood, Anscombe argues, the hyphen in “self -consciousness” does not function to split subject from object (as she thinks it does in Locke). Instead, the hyphen serves to disrupt the usual logic of predication and denominate the curious phenomenon of speaking in the first person. To illustrate the use of “I “she is after, Anscombe cites the example of a man who has lost his memory and no longer knows that he is “Smith, a man of such-and -such a background.” Anscombe points out that he may not know that he is such-and-such a man, but “he has neither lost the use of ‘I,’ nor is he usually at a loss what to point to as his body, or as the person he is” (*The First-Person Form of Life*, Keenleyside, **Critical Inquiry, Autumn 2012, Volume 39, Number 1,** p. 129)

The usurpation of this canonical imperative, in *Le perjure*, for example, “The hills of Bohemia Andalusia, Crete, everything attracted him, except the country whose accent he found so ugly’ (176-177) is a formidable problematic in fullness and plentitude. Paul de Man confided to Derrida that what holds fragmented fiction, Hölderin in America, prior to its inclusion to the publication of *Mercure de France*, conveyed to an extent part of de Man’s life. “If you wanted to know part of my life, read Hölderlin”. (*Without Alibi* 175) It is to be argued discursively that the effortless viability – is a sentiment so enticing for interpretive readings. There is nothing Stephane Charlier desired more than being less in America. A stunned silence, Taussig, envisions to the “clickety -Clack of an Apollonian Zuccotti peddling and ethnographic magic. (*I’m so Angry I Made a Sign*, Taussig, **Critical Inquiry, Autumn 2012, Volume 39, Number 1,** pp. 57,79,88) Anxiously dichotomized gender, *Pussy Panic* first response to the fiction maintained, highlights the feminist predicament in the woman we follow, as the “primatology “we follow in dissociative -three-readings. (*Pussy Panic versus Liking Animals: Tracking Gender in Animals Studies*, Susan Fairman, **Critical Inquiry, Autumn 2012, Volume 39, Number 1,** pp. 89,115**)**

There are at least three ways of reading and interpreting it, three ways of situating its thematic referent, but each of the three haunts the others. Each of the three raises the number of titles (3+n), to be sure, but each also make apparent the title’s intrinsic multiplicity. Each recall as well its divisibility, without possible end, its essential disassociation, its internal interruption. (*Without alibi* 177)

These reading names the performative in the three grammars of the future. the three performatives in the grammar of three futures. Three commitments or three promises to be kept in the now of beginnings these three performatives are not just anyone they are carries now by verbs such as ‘to be’ ‘to go’ ‘to know’ I will be there, I will go, I will know. (*Without Alibi* 176) Will "he’ not be Hölderlin in America! If there is a singularity to perjuring perjury, is it Hölderlin? There is a heritage to this question that coincide perhaps in haste immediately with sublimation of mourning and in the foreseeable future with the project disclaiming in responsibility the divine heritage of Athens and Rome. From this standpoint we can understand Gasché claim that” essential Christianity is an acknowledged emergence of responsibility in the face of everydayness and sacredness.” In sublimation as Cixous argues what arrives happens.

Are Philia and Alethia at the table with me and with Jacques Derrida and Jean- Luc Nancy? No? Yes? In truth, we share the need to share. to eat at the same time, to taste what the others like to eat, to feast... But I know I am preaching to friends who share my experience, at least philosophically, so I will stop. (Cixous 398)

 “A split in the all-inclusive terms of restitutions’ as Asfour puts it, is a cordial structure not only reminiscent but affirmative of a proper anacoluthon exposed to its signified impact. This grammatical possible playfully appropriates. A legal congeniality in the foregrounds of writings contingently debrief its own entangled complexities and playfulness of present writing. This enormous adventure in appropriation Will ‘he’ not become Hölderlin in America is a rhetorical question that merits a sober consciousness and withstands the automaton” I cannot adequately respond to such self -denying gift.” (Gasché 298). Is this automated paternity, within the tradition or heritage of “the gift”, a question to beginnings in any beginning? Origins contest beginnings! There is a casual perhaps unusual satisfaction in the sacrificial threshold of this here and this now. The ‘giving in’, ‘the giving away’ by grave recollection, no matter how it is contemplated or eulogized respectfully aspires the continuity of ‘logical mining’ in the tradition of the promise. Substituted presence, an ex- post to an established case as Asfour sees it, an ex- post grammatical mishap, now, names the anacoluthon “executive body” forged in no satirical undertakings but perhaps is forged in legendary grounds. (71, 2) Having said that, can we then be sacrificed in this “disgorgement” here and now? In retrospect, emphatically this is a question.

The ideal singularity as Gasché would argue cannot compromise a connection to Christianity. Heidegger notion of the ‘exemplar’ and by de facto the Heideggerian’s Dasein weaves a textual understanding of difference in the text marked extensions: from Rousseau to Levi Claude Strauss. Christianity Heretical, redundant interest in renewed crossing (Rousseau, Strauss), “these Textual extensions” must be crossed with Christianity’s broader wavering textuality. Strauss in *Of grammatology* intervals an anthropologist, but in keeping with neutrality difference of intervals a Nambikwara, and if you wish Rousseau’s by standing apprentice. The disciples real and borrowed “Textual extensions”, the intelligibility of seamless transiency, engenders here, the comprehension of difference. The vagueness of the umbilical extension, the question of birth ‘as such’, risks, at this point, no ambiguity. The presumed Heideggerian neutrality, truism ‘as such’ is no more or less than applicable neutrality in waivered textuality. The neutrality of the exemplary, such as the one described above, is phenomenal not necessarily phenomenological. However, a political critique of the force of law, for example, as Fraser argues” would be able to show how an apparatus of legal judgment can be a vehicle for the cooperation of masked structural violence when it is constrained by constitutional principle to protect private property in the means of production. (160) In the discharge of Fraser insight, one must conclude that an event only contingently a legal precedence of a masked constituency anticipated in the transiency of commencement. What is problematically co-gendered in these notion of production within the general problematics of sexual difference, suggests that any horizons to the ‘envoi’, if exists, are dispelled in greater affinities with the predicament of ‘birth’.

Heidegger topology, elucidates the internal possibility of the multiplication from which Dasein own body represents an organizing factor-element, however, is not offered, based on hyperbolic saturation. (393) Re-figuring the subject more precisely in Heidegger’s analytical tradition of sexual difference is a debate above all on the assessment of the problem of ‘engendering’ To recognize a problem, and to recognize the problem in the configuration or re-figuration of sexual difference engenders feminism within values, foundations, and systems of infinite multitude. ‘Sexual difference is more topical than ever, and in the context of the European community”, apparent philosophical scheme in the mishap of writing, form the de-voids of gender’. (Braidotti 146) In the play-off of foundational presence Braidotti asks if we are sufficiently present. “The nomadism of our texts and belongings in the wake of the European de unionization and the nuclearization of daily normative life re-figuring the subject matter of Virginia wolf, is presence. (253) in hastiness this post- script’ subscribes Virginia Wolf nomadism to “a latter” Coca-Cola situation of prescribed “irradiation” in relation to their expanded notion of “global village” and “cultural forms.” “Technologies of the self”, “politics of the self”, “acquisition of subjectivity”, rhizomes out of effective foundations. The radicalization in the ‘here and now’ inundates a different temperament, an urgent temporality are not crisis, but matters of re-configuration in the philosophical logos.

.

*Dasein*, in its neutrality, must not be confused with existent. Dasein only exist in factual concretion, to be sure, but this very existence has its originary source (*Urquell*) an internal possibility in *Dasein* as neutrality. The analytic of this origin does not deal with existence itself. Precisely because it precedes them, such an analytic cannot be confused with a philosophy of existence, with a wisdom (which could be established only within the “structure of metaphysics”), or with a sermonizing that would teach this or that “world view.” it is therefore not at all a “philosophy of life.” Which is to say that a discourse on sexuality of this order (wisdom, knowledge, metaphysics, philosophy of life or of existence) falls short of every requirement of an analytic of *Dasein* in its very neutrality. (Geschlecht 389)

 The asexuality of “the being there “, Geschlechslosigkeit is not a tribute to transcendence, but rather what fissures leaping within harmonious structures gendered physiology of loopholes. Spivak in In *French feminism in an international frame*, argues, fracture knowing (epistemology), being (ontology), doing (practice), history, politics, economics, institutions as such”, are customized structures whose origins and ends are necessarily provisional and absent. (Spivak 147) female sexual pleasure independent from the need of production” (Spivak 151). Apparent neutrality induces question of sexual difference to the neutrality of conduct. Neutrality is a function of production. It remains to be argued that sexual difference contingencies are reducible to Heidegger’s contingency of the Dasein. The radical offsets of ‘event context signature’ delimit the signifying power to what Spivak argues *in French feminist in an international frame* “indeterminate suggestions rather than determinate references that could overwhelm and sabotage the signifying conventions” (Spivak 142.) There ought to be therefore, and this is perhaps what I have been trying to argue for some time now a binding emerging or emergency constitutionality to the neutrality when the question questions differance. Whether it is Heideggerian, feminine, theological, structuralist or simply deconstruction, the question of the ‘uniqueness’ in the neutrality of exemplified being ciphers in the philosophical milieu a political condemnation” to the detriment of speech. I am Plato. I am in the history of the error the truth.

The Platonic inheritance promising the truth is unquestionably extensive. The truth can only be contemplated in the duality of error-truth. In these old fashions tentative an issue. The venture primes logocentrism to the non-dialectical motion in the production of an ideality. Is it, therefore, outrageous to assume that platonic irreducibility constitutes the writing of the history of error? Platonism of arrivals foregrounded in itineraries. Plato must arrive. It is arguable whether it is the history of error that deliberate Plato to his presence or further exploration to what, in Plato’s terms, has not arrived at Christianity or by means of Christianity. The question of the ‘as such’ presents itself therefore here in this style of deliberation. The contrary, the counterfeit, the other in the absoluteness are contested by a much grander European project of urbanization fathomable only in responsibility. The heirs of European discourses, Hegel, Heidegger, Husserl to name few as Gasche´ indicates they “address Europe from the perspective of its end as the end (in the sense of telos) (291). Is it an issue in constitution to name this history of error and conjure up an itinerary of arrival? What does this linguistic- attentiveness (urbanization) grounds?

Platonism hinges truth- contingencies on perspective-arrivals. There is no conceived irreducibility to this Platonism, in mentioning Plato. The ‘as such’, I would argue, articulates an ‘arrival’ in hyperbolic saturation confiding nothing more than the indeterminacy of Plato’s notion of the ‘envoi’. Unfolding and decorum are obvious propositions, pointing to historicity in the yields of the line, conducive to the historical sacredness of irreducible mobility, a synonymous arrival substantially reconfigure the thinking of ‘arrival’, but not the ‘arrivé’ of Plato. The seriousness of the hyperbolic accusation is profound. The horizon of ‘no more’ is structurally bound up, with that of economy, technics, and ideology. An “empirically coarse” and convoluted extremity of crimes against humanity, a morbid speech, de-canonize, safeguarding “the public national and international truth” in the canon. (*Without alibi* 46) The hyperbolic, the excessiveness of lies and promises, prompt, at this point, no juridical response. Useful lies in” distributed emphasis” are obligating serviceable errors. (Without alibi 43) The hyperbolic saturation is, therefore, speculative. Juridical initiations regrets to regards the exemplary historical manifold on Nazism to be, Eichmann. The latter as Hannah Arendt argues, is a hyperbolic abstention within a historical juridical system that remains ambitiously historical in reviewing disseminating chronology.

Two examples taken from European politics restage lies of the modern type. The actors in this restaging are de Gaulle and Aderauer. The former claimed, and almost succeeded in making citizens believe, that “France belongs among the victors of the last war”; the latter “that the barbarism of National Socialism had affected only a relatively small percentage of the country”. (TP,252) These examples are framed by formulas that opposes once again in the *traditional* political lie to the *modern* rewriting of history. (*Without alibi* 41)

A flagged origin, an egoïstic identification by untimely knowledge can only be an ‘immaculate’ threat in judgment De -Gaulle interrogations construe to an extent what typifies the philosophical question of debasement. This chief revelation would bear on De Gaulle consumerism rather than on his ministerial leadership. The consumer, as Barth argues in *Mythologies*, en- direct route to the subjectivity of substance, insubstantially is an accomplice to liberation rather than the mere beneficiary of a result. An abrasive modification of matter in the absoluteness, defines ‘In *Mythologies*, an immaculate molecular order The matter here, as Barth continues to argue, endows consumerism with “value-bearing states.” an obscurity in subject heading an establishment that strongly resonates with residual displacement. (37). In sourcing out obscurity and errors, science is inseparable from a white paper consumerism”- (Chlorine, ammon, soap -powders detergent) - Prestige on the evidence of a result, are ‘dated-urgencies’ comparable in proficiency only to ‘the detergency’ of whiteness. (36-38). The substance of any contention, as Ferguson points out, “problematizes the inability to register all that we perceive by the constructive device that we developed to endorse or overcome that partiality” Jacques.” (320) What can sufficiently be entrusted to the de-Gaulle hyperbolic French history, exemplifies the transient horizons rummaged in being impossible. The question of the performative capacity to contemplate, reinstate, as well as explicate, however, transcends the mobility of involuntary stooged ‘staging’ on the epiphany of stage continuum’.

Francois Mitterrand in the periphery of affiliative acknowledgment’. “The French republic” had nothing to confess; it did not have to assume the culpability of a period in which it had been put out of action. (49) The truth aggregating the counter truth, the failing on the juridical ground, a slippage in consequence neither of the lie nor with the error, irrespective of the irreducible to the irreducibility of the “as such”. The inconclusiveness at best, animates ‘the geography of zero proximity’. The whereabouts of Francois Mitterrand, the grounding of this statement, evaluates “the real in fact” in the conjuring of this inter -terrestrial spacing. The irreducibility of that statement to search - engine, Mitterrand, is an echo-écoute to -my- irreducibility to the matter of the irreducible in de-act.

 Restituting the truth in pointing, a playful jouissance irreducible to painting, without necessary circumstancing pointing, at for example, Mitterrand. Perhaps there is more sedimented reality to painting in pointing. Derrida discussion on Van Gogh Painting of shoes, restitutes the shoes to their rightful owner, indefinitely discharge a ghostly debt, the hypokeimenon ‘as such’ of shoes, pointing and painting. Grounding remains the grandiose desire of a specific interest in he use value of a surplus, the absence of the ground BodenLosigkeit of western thought fissure us into anew era. This groundless loss of translating is baseless exaggeration. To say that ‘I was in search for you ‘Mitterrand’ in the other side of the Galaxy’ for example., is reclusively inclusive. The desire to find your feet again in grounding, this foundational experience is egoistic in so far that it complicates us in the question of ground-less value. Whatever is lost is supposedly found in that ground zero restitution. The point in pointing points to Van Gogh painting. To what foreseeable we choose to dwell on this point by choice? The spectrum of this spectatorial presence is, therefore, a question of the apprehensiveness in comprehension. My comprehension apprehends.

the ground of the Greek experience is, he says, lacking in this “translation.” “What I have just too hastily called “metaphor” concentrates all the difficulties to come: does one speak “metaphorically” of the ground for just anything? And of walking shoes (clothing, the tool, the institution, even investiture) for thought, language, writing, painting and the rest.

What does Heidegger say? This: As soon as one no longer apprehend the thing as the Greek did, in other words as hypokeimenon but instead as substantia the grounds falls away. (*Restitution of the Truth in pointing* 306-307)

The exchange between Heidegger and Schapiro regarding the painting of Van Gogh restitutes the desire to restitute correspondences, most immediately between Heidegger and Schapiro. Van Gogh painting of shoes entraps the ground in thinking the groundless, no doubt. But does it point the ‘as such’, ‘” the thing in it-self,” in the Greek tradition, the hypokeimenon? The question of the Hypokeimenon ‘the thing in it-self’, in complete regard to the matter in fact, is nothing more than a fleeting instance in Derrida’s text. It emphasizes perhaps a truism. What we do fail to complicate in the instant of origin, cannot omit a subjective interpellation. There is no ‘as such’ as such, except in this mediated apparition of the thing to it-self. Perhaps the ‘as such’ of this ‘thus far’, the thing to itself, is what, nonetheless, arrive to Derrida. The Greek hypokeimenon therefore, appropriates a disputed entrapment in proper inheritance, within the epistemological stretch of copyrights. We can trauma-write the ejection to combustible possibilities. What is then the question of the ‘as such’ that presents itself to Derrida’s consciousness in this trajectory? It is undoubtedly in inheritance. To what extent Derrida in dismissal, Derrida’s dismissal, precondition the erasure irreducible to the Greek conception of inheritance? An epistemology promises Derrida, premises the comprehension of ‘as such’ on the Greek understanding, positively in that fleeting instant identifying an exchange on hypokeimenon. ground Does this inheritance inherently inherent? If it does, what does it inherit? It is inherently what? Epistemological copyrights? Can the Greek hypokeimenon ‘the thing in itself’ theorize the epistemological copyrights? The possibility for this question opens with the Judaic betrayal, and money exchange? Did Judas betray Christ for money? How do we begin to contemplate such a possibility? How does theology account for this transient proposition? We can proffer the ‘as such’ of betrayal to Christianity, a narrative describing transcendence as an event to his arrivé. The ‘as such’ saved by the Greek comprehension of the ‘as such’ hypokeimenon risks, therefore, its own betrayal. Is it possible to betray Judas Askeryoti’s betrayal? Not biblically. There must be therefore a history of responsibility and a presence to the in -plug that has no history, but, nonetheless, writes us into writing- innocence. Can this history of imperative accountability, a state pending responsibility be circumscribed within the general distinction between money and counterfeit money? Can this contention sufficiently address the Christian origin of betrayal as the fidelity rather than infidelity along those lines and in that respect? The Rousseauist experience on this subject is arguably an order of this order. The rhetorical, here, permeates an extension in Christian temperament coinciding within their theological evocation.

The question of money in Rousseau is contested in delirium and as such there is no wider entry point in grounding Rousseau’s confession simply demonstrates a peculiar undertaking to money short of value appreciation, the demarcation of solicited presence conveyed by currency and exchange. The now in three tenses of ‘a novel presence’ constructs a privilege outlook, an aimable decay, thereby peculiar to value in the fidelity coining currency.

I should involve myself in the most boring details were I to continue the subject of my money and its spending-by me or by other people - and to relate all the embarrassment and shame, the repugnance and discomfort and repulsion I have always felt regarding it. But as the reader learns more of my life, he will get to know my disposition and feel all this for himself without my needing to tell him. (*Confessions* 45)

His repugnance is well described in a fleeting gesture of inundation. There is no attempt to conceal, his inner thoughts on these matters of engraved value, but nor there is an attempt to indulge in explanation. His future disposition on the matter is not immediately in question. It is difficult to imagine from this confession that Rousseau is a matter of currency, value, or money or for that matter translation Infidelity ‘in itself’ is not a subject for Rousseau, confession but money as an abstraction is in question here. The whereabouts of the counterfeit discloses utter disinterest in future ambiguity. Are prefaces confessional to an-other acknowledgments? Is there a merit to this question? Rousseau taxonomy exonerates from further staggering involvement in the counterfeit and ushers us into a less delirium modernity receptive of this disengaged Mitterrand ‘political real’. This sentiment intuitively suggests that what is out of temperament in Rousseau, however, liaisons -risk Rousseau, less by the desire to “coined -reality” to say nothing about the counterfeit walkathon.

The absolute of a contemporariness, questions further ambiguities surrounding the being in disjointed modernity. The notion of “citadinity” refers to “city squares” in relation to “idealized ideology” with special interest in the mosque as a space existing in the overload of melodic space. Reasoning “an indigenous self-expression” to be within the latter asserted insertion of Israeli statehood”, indefinitely reclaims the mundane socio economic

“Politique real”. (*The Arab Revolution takes back the public space.* Nasser Rabbat, **critical inquiry Autumn 2012, Volume 39, Number 1**,203) Is it counterproductive to address postmodernity from a disengaged perspective, recalling what is out of joint? The question of fidelity of repetition in so far that it recalls Rousseau’s hypothetical absolute, risk only the re -possession of recollection. From the perspective of the biblical absolute of betrayal, however, the sim-factor remains a reduced impact in a monopolized meddling, mediating Rousseau to the disseminated presence of betrayal. To what extent we can dwell on this travesty is another question.

I was engraving medals of a sort to serve me and my fellows as the insignia of an order of chivalry when I was caught by my master at this illegal pursuit and severely beaten. He accused me of teaching myself to forge money, for these medals of ours bore the arms of the Republic. I can freely swear that I had no idea of false money, and very little of true coin, and knew more about the making of Roman denarii than of our three sou bits. (*Confessions* 39-40)

Perhaps there is nothing more incriminating to voluntary confessions than the concealment of the truth. There is no confession that does not confess its desire to confess the involuntary. Such engraving desire models by meddling the absolute in Rousseau: “I had no idea of fake money I

knew more about Roman denarii”. (39) The Greek Hypokeimenon grants, the thing in and of itself on a foreseeable exchange in terminated difference. If we must speak falsely, the truth regardless is here in reinstating, perhaps the truth. The absoluteness of that engraving is substitutional in a besieged scope. The ‘as such’ of the Greek inheritance lease-out a fleeting instant, to regain itself. The frontiers of the undecidable confronts us: Isaac was sacrificed in the undecidable, Isaac was sacrificed in the boundaries of the undecidable, Isaac must not be sacrificed. The performative manifestation of a lie promises reinstatement in the Abrahamic truth. The uncompromisable cannot be sacrificed’ at the riverbank. An itinerary to no scheduled arrival is Abrahamic in scope, in truth. To what sacrificial origin are we being referred in addressing ‘the irreplaceable Isaac to ‘the threshold’ of the sacrifice? This radicalism of no radicalization commences the sexually gendered in the nowhere of botany. The differentiated but itself subject to gender indifference is supposedly botanical. There is no sexual difference that knows how to intelligibly address the foregrounds of botanical production. There is no tradition of substantiating such restitution. The outstanding thing about the question of reproduction is that it can withstand sacrificing the sourcing of Ibrahim sacrificial threshold. There is no productive technology as such that does not have a deep interested in the ‘as such’ of sourcing sacrificial origin. Intelligibility, in the tradition of the sacrifice, sacrilege the arguably autobiographical: thy shall not sacrifice thee, though, presumes. The truth ‘Circumstancing’ the lie comprehends the name Jacques Derrida to be without s- equal.

If I have insisted on a massive fact, namely, that this unrefined, square, solid, decidable, in a word *frank* definition of the lie delimits a prevalent concept in our culture it is first because no ethics, no law or right, no politics could long withstand, precisely in our culture, its pure and simple disappearance. (*Without Alibi* 37)

 What intelligibility this unrefined decidable solid square refers to? Infinity as such withstands a structure of deliberation, further elaboration, and cannot transcend signifying the sacrificial, finds itself bizarrely in the semiosis sacrilege of yet another synchronously dominated rehabs. Essentially initiated horizons camouflage in their own sacrificial threshold. The sacrifice is unfathomable in abbreviation. Does the sacrificial comprise a sacrificed ‘bio’ and to that measurable extent Abrahamic in teleological contention and visibility? How do we then contemplate the question of the solidly square? How do we deliberate withstanding significance intelligibly? In this turbulent jouissance there is a faint recognition that derailed autobiography cannot risk the autographic sacrifice. A signified imperceptibility, as Ferguson argues *in Derrida and the Geometrical Mode,* individuates a cultural threshold passing and/or surpassing the mono of that individuation in effect questions the determination of discontinuities. The botanical individual as she calls it, is a form of manifestation that interrogates a presumed autographic manifesto of species in precipitated reclines. There is no manifest -order seeking the prohibition ‘thy shall not sacrifice thee’. The irreplaceable jeopardized by botanical individualization or otherwise, does not replace Isaac in playfulness. A broader sense of logical investigations can contemplate typified “absurdities “in formal procedures”, recognize, nonetheless, aptness determining logical geometrical space within unmediated awareness pure and simple. A cubic vantage point manifests a squarely subsidiary taxonomy in evidencing, to use Mitchell term a “Quantum cloud” contention in relation to the differentiated character of the sign. (Image*, space, Revolution: The Art of occupation*, W.J.T Mitchell **Critical Inquiry**, **Autumn 2012, Volume 39, Number 1,** p 27) A re-called “point of closures” well resides the system deep structure. Irreplaceability such as ontologized sacrifice fathoms the irreplaceable Isaac to be on ‘the threshold’ of the sacrifice as the sacrifice. Meaning in a” predicative form” or as Derrida puts it” forms of possible reference to an object”-circumfess not only their sense of error but more importantly an “aberration” by being “of course”, swayed a way as if in the whorl of persuasion. “A supra empirical generality” cannot categorically be indicative of comparable form and content without such “conventional designations”. (*Speech and Phenomenon*. 29-30) The truly temporal is a predicament revealing as Derrida proceeds to argue “a temporality inorganic with wavering allegory or satire. More perplexing still, allegory as it were, from beyond the graves, (jackal, cats, lleopard…), conceptualizes, no supremacy. Within-jurisdiction, an impressing juridical judgment.

After closing the pharmacy Plato went to retire, to get out of the sun. He took few steps in the darkness toward the back of his reserve, found himself leaning over the *Pharmakon*, decided to analyze...The night passes. In the morning, knocks are heard at the door. They seem to be coming from outside., this time.

Two knocks…four…

-But maybe it’s just a residue, a dream, a bit of dream left over an echo of the night…that other theatre, those knocks from without… (*Dissemination,* 169- 171)

In *ALlô Allô*, Melville argues that “the hermeneutics in a contemporary scope barely hermeneutics at all” and, at some point, their diachronic “horizon collapsed into apparently the simpler figure of the chain.” (336) Discursive subjectivity networks, translates Pinchevski, argues, “writing down systems” in an ultimate appeal for communicative intent correlating, in a nutshell, the discovery of the unconscious with technical formality, screening outward “data and noise” vis-à -vis the literal historiography of actual holocaust testimonial . (The Audio-Visual Unconscious: Media and Trauma in the Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, *Critical inquiry Autumn* *2012, Volume 39, Number1, 142-3*) “Modernity” now specifically hedges reproduction or what Pinchevski refers to as the “mechanism for the inscription of traces” on the contemporariness of zooming out “the mechanization of non-sense’ from, for example, botanical economy in this indiscriminatory manner of ‘re-indifference’. (Pinchevski, 142-3) Hyperbolic saturation, quintessential productivity, arguably ‘sacrificially introduce’, what Pinchevski presupposes is “monopoly script”, a literature pertaining to the story about writing the story, in a study that brings together the new world, over there in America, with landing. (Pinchevski,142-3) Prophetic paternity subpoenas literature addressable to intelligibility, and remains a crouching knowledge, if you wish, that typifies profound transformative “symbolic mediation”. (Pinchevski,142-3)

Kamuf, in *Composition and Displacement* argues that the nature of composition is not in decomposition, but rather in displacement. Compositional techniques she notes “are disconcerting in the use of the singular first person in general, rather than particular sense which is often a way of testing or extending an argument trying it out within the grammatical guise of an I, any I” (163). The question of “double temporality, As Pinchevski suggests, Auschwitz, and now ellipses “ reversable continuity ” in the “ audio visual archive” is a paradigmatic holding but foreign to the externalization of medium-intention . (Pinchevski, 155) “The réquisitoire” to ‘‘composer avec” are the diacritical principle of samploké. “ If truth is the presence of the eidos, it must always come to terms with (composer avec) relation, non-presence, and thus with non -truth (170-71). An ‘assented’ commencement, a dialogue speaking to the Egyptian a myth, the invention of writing, explicating a valuable and presiding juridical steering commandment on, now, Plato’s Pharmacy. The reversibility’- of oppositional forces in a court scene setting- are accelerate-attributes safeguarding “contaminated repetition in pure ideality’ ideally, re-name the Pharmakon. A reversal of declared intention, A broader scope on interpretive methods set violent as they may be on geopolitical pre-established grounds , considering no comparable hyphenated Moses Jewish identity, is a manifold of “a host nation” cemented in the act of sec-territory -realized Zionism. *Phaedrus* as a dialogue molded in the general apprehensiveness from the state of being rigorously contemporary. ‘On that topic of re-naming presence Kamuf writes that “Platonism must come to terms with the general space of writing that it does not command, oversee, regulate, and more importantly cannot put under ban. the place of “exterior mastery” are arguable within the parameters of parricidal réquistioire, dismissal of ‘the composition avec’. In *Composition and Displacement,* the threshold of duality Kamuf points, are ‘in -yields’ of the imperceptible “parricide.” (*Composition Displacement* 172) The “composer avec” surrogate disregard to metaphoric actuality, however, portrays a coviding -out situation in the wake traumatic- holocaust- legacy, a psychological principle to the effect of a germ germinating” normalcy. (*Composition displacement* 169) From a more imperative perspective, this indispensability argues for as Pinchevski puts it, an immanent regard to a metaphorical order not in crisis. (Pinchevski, 163)

I summoned the first part of this writing with my proper name in absolute obliviousness to what is “biodegradable” in signature by means of the proper name. (*Signature Derrida*, Derrida **preface, Critical inquiry book**  ix) Audacious hardly describes my naivety here is assuming that I in conclusion, admit to particular amnesia in signing a proper name to this exerguing monstrosity. But so is the case in the “time of the King” a formulated delirium on amnesia, forgetfulness, and all that can be appropriated to the raspatory signature. Speak of anything except the gift. This is perhaps how writing writes out monstrosity. The destiny for departure, signature, commands, the partition, the gift, homesickness, nostalgia, the invisibility of the circle, the particular, the commendable, the indispensable, the unassigned, the apprehension, the shock and Ah and all associated forgetfulness. There is no ontological horizon without the absoluteness of the now. This “quadridimensionality” implies the circle, employed by the circle. superstitiously ordered, as Derrida argues, by Heidegger. this meta- ethnological”, forgetting the state of being forgetful, pretext the annulled signature to “signature”, an old fashion sign of a disengaged signature. (*Signature Derrida*, Derrida **Given Time, The Time of The** **King,** Critical **inquiry book** Pp. 259,263)
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