ABSTRACT

The text is developed round the word 'speechsong' which I picked up with JJ Rousseau soon after writing a previous essay (apéritive time).

The subsequent search took me into metaphysics and brought along the observation that traditionally 'the animate' and 'language' don't go well together. A thing with philosophy it seems.

This explicitly counts for 'spoken' language. It turns out to be a productive ground for modern literature : One can imagine the effort to get around the problem - and it takes some animo to do so - inventing new kinds of 'extended' or 'in between' categories : 'imagespeech', 'writtenspeech' next to 'speechsong' which then can only exist in the denial of oral speech, that is, of its primacy in the world.

Speech comes first, speech is a basic camp, is what you learn with E Husserl. It's a line that J Derrida will take over later by saying that writing comes first.

There is, always and unavoidably, the 'hanging' issue of 'closedness', or of 'being' or of 'seeing' in traditional thought. (More technically we speak about the dialectics between 'open' and 'closed', 'life' and 'death', the 'I' and the 'other'). In another essay (back home) that focussed on G Bachelard's 'The Poetics of Space', we could already reconstruct metaphor - in the Dutch sense - as imagespeech, while speculating along the way about its openness or closedness. At best it can be said that metaphor is the first of can-openers. Our suspicion is large that metaphor may not be enough to make a difference while metaphysics is always too much, too much of the Same. As we pick up Derrida's study on Husserl (Speech and Phenomena) this topic gets then an extra headline : Metaphor stands in a certain relationship to metaphysics. It is build upon metaphysical residues.

There is 'friction' there (which is the general tone in the text), 'something', 'an accident' has happened and this can even be historically dated. This friction can't be reduced to a simple game, to simple dualism and it allows us to slip in these words as writtenspeech and speechsong.

Something happened (1)

E Husserl rejects metaphysics in order to save language and closedness. Post- : phenomenology, existentialism, psychology, deconstruction can build up there case exactly on these rejections (can we speak of a double rejection therefore, how vague does this sound ?).

Something happened (2)

The man 'inside' is however H Bergson. How can it be, by the way, that Husserl (1859-1938) and his contemporary Bergson (1859-1941) didn't know each other ? Bergson may have a better grasp of how, over a few centuries and more quicker to the end, truths within metaphysics are turned on their head. In vain he tries to make a distinction between ancient and modern metaphysicists and in this way to reconnect the ends together again.

Many contradictions remain to be solved. Here's one example (I'll repeat over and again in many versions).

One can go back with the animate (metaphysics) to vitalism that made a difference between active or living matter that 'resides' outside the closed and static laws of nature, and that is imbued with constant fight in order to ward off decay and death. The difference between active and passive, inside and outside, matter and form, originates here.

But something happened : The static laws themselves are put under pressure, the machine is running hot, motion becomes change, static becomes statistics, active becomes abstract, life from that moment on 'incorporates' loss, forgetting and death - and questions rise as 'where does this leave God ?'.

In philosophy however the reflex stays unvariably the same : it's language that has to be kept alive and that can be only done within a closed environment. The return to the language and the land of origin is primordial. All what stands outside is regression, depiction, false; words that Derrida has been developing into differance with an 'a' (difference folds back too much on dialects).

The question that remains is 'how to rhyme this all.

In this text it is for the most part Bergson's tail that we are following in an effort to 'work out' the non-linear[1] coexistence between 'inverse' and 'extension'.

For the time being we let two texts exist next to each other. A preface which is called 'false start' and a main body of texts that are called 'what matters?'.

In the 'false start' part, language is a given thing that is critized by the young Derrida and what is developed in some kind of open end with 'metaphor' in the leading role. For us this development is already sufficient. In the main text 'language' is the medium searched for - but can it be found, considering the resistance to language in metaphysics ? It's the line along which we get in touch with speechsong.

Suspense is build up between J Derrida, G Deleuze, S Mallarmé and JJ Rousseau.

What is in there finally for architecture ? We could write of course an article on Zaha Hadid's Phaeno building in Wolfsburg and lay a link with new vagueness. But on second thought is it necessary to be so explicit ?

Words that jump up in this text are mime, anima. The next thing I can think of is miasma : architecture lies hidden in the holes and pores of these pages, any text ..... what more can one expect [from writing] ?

---

[1] A thing to do maybe is switch to 'non-linearity' to overcome the problems of 'dialectics'.

FALSE START

Metaphysics - Metaphor

Edward Husserl is the first to open the path to phenomenology by critisizing metaphysics and by willing to return to a 'first philosophy'.[1]

Metaphysics within his scope is bound to pre-suppositions, indictions, whether now they come out of psychology, out of natural sciences or come falling out of the sky; and that's far too much to be good.

Husserl aims therefore on something 'pure' (be it twofold); 'the fact of language' and he puts all pre-suppositons out of play. But as the young Derrida in 'Speech and Phenomena' observes, won't this dogmatism once again amount in a new kind of naïve metaphysics ? [2]

Blindness[3] : In his adherence to Ideality or to that 'what is', or to an Idea, by aiming his eye on the 'perversion' and the 'degeneration' of that what he wants to restore - Husserl does not see - that the motives he describes to un-mask this perversion, degeneration (all these mistakes, distortions, repeated over a multiplicity of domains, themes and arguments) lead to something beyond, and quite opposite of his expectations : the onset of phenomenology, existentialism, deconstructivism.[4 & 5]

<u>Speech and its phenonological voice</u>

One has speech as an expression (outwards) but one also has speech as a psychic experience (inwards) in the situation where no sense or meaning is uttered.[6]

Husserl 'believes' in this pre-linguistical stratum and whenever it is expressed speech has to make 'sense' and its grammatics has to be 'logical'. But who says that falsifications and the absurdity of contradictions makes speech less intelligible ? Derrida's conclusion is that those who put up a meta-language don't exhaust the whole 'extension' of linguistical possibilities.[7]

<u>Body and soul</u>

Before you speak, there is an intention to speak that reacts on a sign, on an open face; a gesture of the other.[8] It's the theory of the subject that animates the sign. These indictions, signals, that are limited to bodily

---

[1] 'first philosphy' p.107, 'opening a path' p.3.
Jacques Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, and other Essays on Husserls's theory of Signs (Evanston : Northwestern University Press, 1973). Speech and Phenomena was originally published in French under the title 'La Voix et le Phénomène' (Presses Universitaires de France,1967).

[2] Husserl puts out of play all constituted knowledge. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.4

[3] Blindness. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.6

[4] perversion, degeneration. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.5

[5] metaphysics, phenomenology and suspension. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.107

[6] on speech and its psyche. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.31

[7] language and exhaustion. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.8

[8] gestures. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.36

interaction (the word is incorporeal) should be accounted for. Ghostly : on the very lowest level such a sign doesn't take more than a breath, a draft[9] that gives 'Geistigheit', spirit. [10]

And so we are to believe with Derrida that the reduction of language to 'speech and its own psyche' cannot be simply attained. But again it is Husserl's faith that the 'I' has a primordial intuition, imprint of this exposure. Husserl thus puts a spell on the animate, he puts a double reduction on language, making sure that logo-centrism is preserved.[11]

> Husserl : "Expression follows upon impression ..... expression carries on what is already thought". It's the situation whereby Derrida looks in a mirror[12], and thinks about 'writing' instead.[13] He breaths on it, writes a name, breaths again on it. He thinks 'mort' with every quotation of 'primordial' and about the literal death of self-presence. It allows 'followers' to speculate about white page, wonderblock, virginal state or slate.[14]

'That' metaphorical character of speech.

Husserl's perception starts shaking, uneasiness sneaks in when he is tempted to write metaphor into his text. It turns out that 'imagespeech' introduces a strange competition within his theory on speech[15]. Speech, Husserl puts, is sometimes accompagnied by image (Bild) so that one has to start thinking about imagination (Einbildung) in such manner that logos is seen as an 'unproductive' matter - and this placed against expression (Abbildung) what is known as the 'productive' matter of copying, representation, figuration, painting ...

---

[9] Draft in Dutch is 'tocht' (≈thought)

[10] subject animating the sign. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.33

[11] primordial intuition. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.38

[12] 'Spiegel-psyche' is one of these things that escape the attention of Husserl. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.116

[13] mirrored writing, p.116; mute writing, p.117. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena

[14] palimpsest. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.117
With Bachelard it sounds 'open up the drawers filled with fresh white linnen'. The Poetics of Space, p.81 & p.75, Bachelard on the 'drawer metaphor'.
Here is what I found :
- A writer standing in front of his library one time re-classifying, the other time going through 'Creative Evolution' of Bergson. The text blackened by excessive underlining and comments.
- The PhD student unable to choose between Venturi-Scott Brown and Eisenman; two architects that represent the opposite side of the architectural spectrum in the US.
- A photo taken in Palm Springs 1996 : Ronchamp of Le Corbusier ? No, Bank of America ! (see photo beneath)

- The critic lamenting that these structures of words pulled up by the architect around his build structures don't hold (a building must stand on its own); giving away a leitmotiv without realizing it.
- The senior architect who says he has spend half a life time fighting the accusation of being [called] a metaphysisist. The last words that echo back in the lecture hall - tremblant - did it really matter so much ?

[15] uneasiness and indecisiveness, Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p119

'Ein-bildung' against 'ab-bildung', building-up against building-down. We're caught in Husserl's elliptic thoughts once more.[16] Against the productivity of expression stands the unproductivity of thought. Construction - Destruction.[17]

Assume that we would be able to eliminate 'image' (Bild) 'just like that', Derrida reasons further, then, in the same token the contradiction between in and out, up and down, would implode. So : Eliminate 'image' ! Cross out that arch ! [18]

E ≠ A

In the story that follows the book 'Speech and Phenomena' takes on the form of a lecture whereby Derrida addresses the society of French philosophers :[19] As I speak to you, you cannot understand me, you cannot hear me pronouncing the difference between the 'e' and the 'a' in the words 'difference' and 'differance', nor can you hear the spacings, punctuations, and all the non-phonetic things that are so ill described in the theories of language. According to Derrida differance is not a name but a chain.[20] It assembes difference, errance, to differ, all being articulations of change, interval, mistake and delay; while the ending '-ance' points in the direction of being undiscisive.[21]

Complex : There doesn't exist either a simple translation of the Greek 'diapherein' to the Latin word 'diferre'. The latter meaning is less primordial philosophical and carries along an element of time; being this of 'temporality' and 'resort'.[22]

Space-time, wave-particle, we can no longer decide anymore what is cause or effect, what is active or passive and thus Derrida continues, we go on searching for the middle voice, for a trance, a trace ....[23]

---

[16] Husserl - elliptic - lips and not yet. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.123

[17] on 'deconstruction' : a strange concurrence between building up and down. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.119

[18] a proto-writing without an arch. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.146

[19] "How am I to speak of the a in differance ?". Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.134

[20] Graph instead of an arch. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena. p.135

[21] the ending '-ance', as in parlance. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.137

[22] Latin-late. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.136

[23] prototracing, protowriting in space-time. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, p.141-p.143

WHAT MATTERS ?

"I often catch myself confusing ratio with objectivity : Think rational ! Be objective ! Till recently I didn't see any difference between an other world and an open world and quite often I mistake image for form.
Are these confusions of speech legitimate ?"
[*minute thoughts[1]*]

Entropy

The title 'What matters ?' is an aberration on the more philosphically inspired 'What is there?' and wants to take a closer look on 'Western' metaphysics.

It is probably too simply put that metaphysics is the mother of animated architecture. One can easily claim the opposite in the sense that animate is anti-meta, since metaphysics used to be involved with macroscopic research and with closed systems while the animate (as we know it in architecture) focusses on a microscopic scale (chemistry, biology) and on the kind of 'openness' that these new fields have put to the fore.

And thus, to begin with : what is metaphysics ? Where is it standing for ? It connects two aspects : the processory and the equilibrium thought.[2] H Bergson, who rang in the end of metaphysical thought, pushed it to its most extreme form; this of generating an unbridled creativity in one continuum, in one positive world conception : "All is flow, all is presence" [3 & 4]

There are two notions that matter, two axioms :

One : a feedback loop between negative and positive, what then Bergson entitles as 'inversion'. Inversion stands for the possibility to pull 'things' out of oneself and to put something positive against something negative, something negative against something positive. Examples in architecture are legio : an upside-down tower of Babel, an inverse panopticon ...[5]

This action-reaction system that allows for a movement without a beginning or an end point, can in essence be grasped as a variation on the more philosophically inspired body-mind system and the inherent problematic associated with it of 'what comes first', 'what is there?'. Metaphysics, in its condition of being time instead of place related, avoids these problems, but at the same time metaphysics remains something of 'cumulation in the same' or 'in the present'.

In the Kantian perception of metaphysics the movement between positive and negative is bogged down by the preoccupation with 'intuition' and with 'everything is already given'.[6 & 7] The critique that Bergson gives on E Kant is not the least : Kant 'is' critique, and he illustrates that further with the eloquent sentence that 'Kant does not believe that the mind overflows the intellect'[8]. It's then again Bergson (who has it from GW von Leibnitz, who has it in turn from B de Spinoza) who swears with a second feedback loop or cycle.

Two : Next to 'inverse' Bergson also speaks about 'extension'. In fact he pronounces both words in one breath, couples them with a hyphen. It is only afterwards, in related literature that these two notions are used seperately, at times confused with each other.[9]

Extension, accordingly to Bergson is rather an evolution that runs between early and late. The associations made with extension are 'un-winding' (of a clock), 'decompression' (of a kettle), re-laxation [10]. With extension being part of the picture, the pendulum movement starts to swing between three or more points instead of two.[11]

How then can we visualize or comprehend these loops inverse and extension; from one in a more complex loop ? Noughts and crosses ? 'and/or' ? node and paranode ? orthodox-paradox ?

In religion every ortodoxy begins in a paradox : 1 God and a manifold : 'In the name of the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit.[12]

In architecture one gets a movement between early-high and late (or pre- and post-) that should make a difference. How much further does the metaphysical worldpicture reach ?

What's the matter ? - Metaphysics, physics and Boltzmann's crisis[13]
What has made metaphysics so successful and enduring is that it had the same aspirations as physics, from which it had lend the name, from which it deduced scientific law in order to philosophize further on those 'in abstraction' without the necessity of proof, unhindered by matter. Bergson talks freely about the sensori-motors of animals, the jet-stream of life, quatum-like, flow-like, the algorithmical look on things is quickly exchangable with allegory.[14]

> But how paradoxal does it sound already to announce that 'entropy' is the summum of metaphysics while at the same time, it pushed physics into a deep crisis. In retrospect it is easily said but there is definitely something loose with Bergson's enthousiastic encounter with thermodynamics.[15]

Typical for physics is that it was calculating and reasoning about a machine that was running within a 'closed' environment or 'ideal' circumstances whereby matter is 'inert' and the laws of dynamics are 'simple and reversible'.
Along came the 'élan vital', the vitalist version of metaphysics. Known is that a group of mainly French thinkers couldn't lay themselves down any more with a vision about life that is dominated, dictated by the static laws of nature. Life is a special state 'outside' the laws of nature, they argued, from which it can't escape and to which it is doomed to fight against ...[16]
Metaphysics called itself supra-natural and saw its mission in philosophizing further about the 'formalities' that physics brought forward without being slowed down by proof, matter. Out of it rose the 'form versus matter' dilemma.

Where metaphysics originally took off as a kind of greater description, it gets along the way the swing of an autonomous vision that starts to react against physics.[17]
With the shift in research of large physical entities (from wheel to planetary motions) to small and invisible entities in chemistry and biology the world perception changed and - accordingly to Bergson - metaphysics gets more wind in the sails.
The simple reversible laws are no longer attainable. The cessation of the machine through friction-motion and loss of energy to heat became the big obstacle, the second law of thermodynamics becomes the rule. 'Dissipation' and 'damp' become the terminology of the small. Entropy is the measure of this loss.

> Bergson's word is overflow. Our uneasiness with his interpretation of entropy is that the metaphysical machine appears to move quite faster with the loss of energy/matter to heat. His idea to re-orient metaphysics into a process of immanent dematerialization[18] gives way to a 'through-start' with the focus on the small, while nothing is falling still. Such is a bit hard to understand for an existential soul, although admittingly the rise of nano-techniques, superconduction, the software boom or bubble, all appear to reassure Bergson in his beliefs.[19]

What can we pose against it ? That entropy is all about matter and cessation ?
A nuance that we have to keep an eye upon is that thermodynamics much more thoroughly reshook the pack of cards than Bergson could expect in the early days.

Instead of inertia one gets uncertainty, flow, chance as the basis actors of life. Life is no longer a special state 'outside' matter that is imbued with fight against inertia. Matter is already all and one movement to begin with and rather it comes down to learn to recognize the stabilizing forces in life : what matters.

Life as a state outside the laws of nature becomes life is an improbable state far away from equilibrium. It's here where it all begins : in this existential niche or dip and through symmetry breaking of which metaphysics is unsufficiently aware. Inversion - extension : what is [in] an existential niche ?[20]

Suspense - Language [tale] is late

One could expect that H Bergson would lay a link between 'inverse' and 'verse' and 'poetry'. But not so directly.

That Stéphane Mallarmé wrote some 15 to 20 years earlier a few essays such as 'crise de vers', 'mimique', 'or' (there was also the English version 'downpouring or critique') had problably some effect on Bergson's use of words or terminology[21] and probably on the development of some crucial thoughts of him, such as there are 'inverse-extension'; but the focus remains unvariably fixed on movement.

What one on the contrary gets with Bergson is the customary [a]version for language. Exclamations as 'words turn against ideas' and 'the spirit is killed by the letter'[22], makes one roll with the eyes a bit, stir up mixed feelings. One is then rather tempted to question what is [in] these sentences and -with Bergson- what is in term-in-ology to begin with.

How far can one go with language on the turned in path of metaphysics ? There is no nothing [o] but something [a]. Note it down what sounds through in entropy is 'poetry'.

The only place where Bergson is giving it away and brings poetry (or language) into relationship with entropy is there where he goes on about dreaming ... a wet dream ? [23 & 24]

But anyway one looks upon it, language with Bergson remains under- or unarticulated : 'Tale is late' and we have to wait on Derrida's elaborations on Mallarmé's texts to see language prosper as a thing in itself.[25]

The key lies, if we may believe Derrida, in that mysterious booklet in the hand of Stéphane Mallarmé : which version is it ?

Mallarmé's 'mime' and Derrida's 'writing' [26]

With Derrida being part of the plot it becomes possible to put language in the balance with more recent developments around animate matter. Are there signs of similarity and/or deviance ?

If one looks upon language from the corner of 'pantomime' one becomes aware of the high level of animation. In the archetype 'Pierrot' one recognizes the theatrical reincarnation of D Diderot's 'even a stone has feelings!' (une pierre is French for a stone). It reminds us of 'vitalism' that maintained a difference between active (living) and passive (dead) matter.

Mime is at the same time light and swift, being a body language that runs on syntax rather than content. Pantomime is phantomlike what leads to Derrida's observation that Pierrot's face is made up as an unwritten page. Pantomime has connotations with palimpsest so that seamless attention is deviated to writing : next to Mallarmé's 'mime' appears Derrida's 'writing'.

Thus, it becomes possible to misspell 'mimical' as 'inimical' and what depends on that one little leg, that suspended 'i'. It makes believe [also] that writing (more than mime) and brought in position by Bergson's 'inverse' is something negative - something that breaks away from the big Gesture, of the overarticulation of Prescence, of Being, of Weight.[27]

What else. Mime is also suspense with an air of violence. Pierrot who murders his wife by tickling her to death. Suspense is the mime that is mirroring oneself in the face of somebody else [I=i].

Brussels pages.

Suspense[28] is increased the more one focusses on Derrida's writing instead of Mallarmé's mimique. Incidently Derrida brings writing into relationship with mime by fantasizing (or speculating) about that mysterious booklet, in the hands of Mallarmé: "No question about it that it is Mimique. But which [written] version is it ?"

> We are probably dealing here with the second version printed in Brussels which on that very moment was not carrying yet the title 'mimique' and of which the introduction contained two extra paragraphs which then disappeared in the third Paris edition ...[29]

This is of course Derrida's favourite game to play; the impossible juggle with small numbers, figures, letters and words (every word counts) in order to fill a hole. And sure there is no haste to find the original pages or ... hold on for a minute, lets recollect ... where again did I hear that storyline before ?

What other (or similar) tales can be weaved around and through the words 'mysterious', 'hand' and 'writing' (if not mime) ? It becomes possible to re-construct [hors livre], choose for and, or compare with other versions that couple back, couple forward for the better or the worse.

First there is a passage in the library where one can suspect 'mime' in the grotesk and mysterious arm- and hand movements, whereby the author (JP Sartre)[30] is insinuating on the kinship between writing (the library ...[31]) and masturbation (or is a finger pointing, yellow and hairy too real to be associated with mime ?). There is an older passage on 'writing and masturbation', brought up by JJ Rousseau under the common denominator of the 'supplement'.[32] In fact JJ Rousseau seems to be a key figure in this.

What triggers[33] me in all is whatever kept Derrida from expressing what is so obviously there in writing. It's impossible that he does not know about Rousseau. So what is his game ?[34] Is Derrida chasing away what he sees as his own trap [also]. I'm just reverting Derrida's own sentence here. [35] & [36]

Mime, writing and suspense in Derrida's book - 'Dissemination' : a suspended title and a suspended introduction

Something what the English translator of 'Dessimination' eagerly tries to bring under attention in his introductory text is J Derrida's tributary to JJ Rousseau from whom Derrida has nota bene lend the title 'Dissemination' but then forgets. This is odd, the more you know that Derrida's work thrives on the re-discovery of forgotten and lost stories.

The only place (and quite under the subtitle 'the supplement') where Derrida brings Rousseau to the attention is where he is sneering at the Trinity of Being : 'Plato - De Saussure - Rousseau' in order to move on allegdly with Mallarmé.[37] Put otherwise, Derrida's articulation on mime begins in a critique on the address of Rousseau, at least that is what is left us to 'suspect'.[38] Against Rousseau's notion of 'plenitude' (trop) that never leaves the present Derrida places 'mime'. Mime is a negative, inimical, invers. Mime is trope, being a figure of speech, but, is that enough ... or [39] ?

Suspense   **Suspendere**   **Supersede**

In the movie 'The Edge' (a chase in the wildernis)[40]&[41] the main character (played by A Hopkins) explains to his challenger (A Baldwin - the man he suspects of attempting to murder him and take his place), what a diagram is : "A diagram is a decision tree for those (he speaks mainly for himself) who lack imagination."

True or false, what strikes is that 'having no imagination' is posed here as an advantage rather than a disadvantage. It gives one 'a head start' to put it with a Deleuzian slang.

Every one who reads G Deleuze in extension of Bergson comes quickly under the impression of the large array of technicalities; 'Machines' that are remodelled to the broader socio-cultural scope (social appartus). Invention follows upon invention. The technical data that are accompagnying these machines are analysed, generalized and literalized in beautiful assemblages.

A favourite example is the synthesizer : "Music is forgotten where it comes from, as a result of the immense coifficient of variables it got endowed with. Music has become an abstract machine"[42]. These constructs we are talking about have long past the notion of imagination, imagespeech or metaphor (trope). It costs Deleuze more effort to explain that we aren't dealing with 'Gestalten' either, that also manifest themselves below the visible in the knowable regions of human thought. He believes he can do that by getting rid of the too simple 'biases of dialectics' as there are, the body-mind problem, matter-brain, matter-form, subject-object, signifier-signified, black-white, open-closed dualisms... only to create here and there a new one; image - form. [43 &44]

The diagram is his superseding of dialectics.[45] What at least can be said is that the diagram puts a spell on imagination and vision[46] and this Deleuze pushes to the extreme. Dreams are not lies, these things are for real.

<u>Two's and three's ...</u>

I've been searching for mime with Deleuze but I didn't get further than a few mindsplitting indications[47] :

1) One can suspect mime in the complex geometrical behaviour that bees express but accordingly to Deleuze this is not language. Language needs to be indirect between a second and a third party that haven't 'seen'. Imagespeech, trope is not enough.[48] Next Deleuze continues about many bees, troops, pops, props, packs, bonds, annusses - with a tail at the very end.[49] Language : or it is slang (snake, tail) or it comes always to late !

2) One can associate mime with 'order-words' in the sense of an index finger pointing ....

3) One can descry mime especially pantomime, find residu's of it, in Deleuze's writing on 'faciality'.[50] The face is a screen or a scream. The face is no more than a white wall with black holes pushed in it. 'O's in white and in black. Remember also Pierrot[51], the face is either a rock or a flower. [52 &53 &54]

It's clear what to do : 'Break away from the uneasy biases of dialectics, break through the white wall of the signified (and the too long attention that christo-humanism has payed to the face)[55]. Pour out the barrels of subjectivity[56] and with it Freudian psychoanalysis that has payed too much attention to the paternial.[57]

Suspense-superseed. The same words are at work with Deleuze but seen from another perspective than Derrida does. If Derrida refers to that other theater called 'echo' instead of mime - but of which he remains silent furthermore - do we know from now on where to look ?[58]

Imagespeech   **?**   **Speechsong**[59]

<u>Constants</u>

In search for language one hits within Deleuze's book onto a few constants in the flow of things. One of those is the trinity 'syntax, phonetics, semantics'. They are the classic forms of expression and meaning that couple back to structure (N Chomsky ....)[60] and that Deleuze, wants to supersede by putting up a post-linguistical machine.[61]

This superseding can be done by atomization/automatization of language.[62] Next Deleuze arrives at the aspect of a-tonization.[63] Deleuze remarks that these 'trees' can be opened up (instead of coupling them back to structure, to common denominators) into multiple layers, depending of 'who talks to who'. A man against his boss, a man against his wife, a man against his mistress, or a man against his kid. And this is only a beginning - this machine carries further that the classical psychoanalysis.[64]

Past earth and heaven, past trees that grow on top, Deleuze sees a 'horizon/rhizome' that always stays at a distance, that always stays silent, and that is there from the beginning. A-Tonization therefore is also that cosmic background noise.

Constants : 'or' is ornithology.

A lot of attention goes to 'songbirds'. If one cannot place 'poetry' either as trope (what isn't enough) or trop (what is too much) than one may find oneself amongst birds. For Deleuze 'poetry' is [in] a songbird.[65] And/or.

'Or' : you are coupling back to nature, which implies ornitology.

And : you are coupling forward to man-made machines, social apparatus; androgen, android, and ... and ... and ... dna ... dna .... dna.[66]

Constants : order - words.

With Deleuze one finds oneself poised between order-words (other words?) and in-direct language. It's clear that Deleuze wants to achieve at some length JJ Rousseau's wet dream : Find a language of im-mediate signs.[67] Who wants still language if things can be exchanged through bodily fluids ?

Indirect language requires a certain easygoingness, complaisance. There against stands that order-words substract their meaning from the vitalist jargon : 'speech is active matter, nature always acts against itself'.[68]

The body is a transmitter (far away from a transcendent being). I'am already several bodies, within me many bodies are at work simply because I eat (munch) continuously other bodies. Passion is a body, writing is a body ...

Language : order-words are send; data, passwords switch on and off and at the other side of the line it sounds as following - how do I spell it - 'happeniness', 'mysterritories', 'scizo-conciousness', rhizo-chomsky.[69]

Against indirect language that is always late, you've got that thing inside [in] language, the song that always maintains a tone in the tone. Incorporeal is in the first place real and not imaginary.[70] That language is not communicative in the sense we give to it as reading in the newspaper, studying on the school bench, meeting on the workfloor - passing through information in the strict meaning of the word.[71]

Order-words work by overflow. This little language sits everywhere (slang; ς-langue) and says on forehand what to think.[72]

Dial : 'I call myself [moi]' is the credo then leaving behind by far 'I think therefor I am'[73]. Deleuze makes the comparison with the seance table[74]. Everything is already there. I'm myself an order-word. This something inside travels at speeds beyond the normal tresholds of perception (Song : 'Its this one thing you said, that made me trippin'). The words that sit in your head allegdly come from somewhere else and its your own illusion/delude to believe that you thought them first. The power of forgetting exists just in that.

Writing.

Writing is a line, next to the line of life, the line of luck or misfortune, next to favourite lines, unforgettable lines, lines of heroïsm[75], supple lines, shaky lines, weighting things, counting words, absorbed in the flux of quanta.[76]

Character.

Particularities exist but then as borderliners, the exceptionalist in the pack.

In-vers is a word that comes to the fore in the compagny of in-volution, in-tense, in-flow, in-form and aims on the countermovement that is set in[77]. It's the movement of the abnormals [the anomalies] in the group, being creative exegetes, ghostwriters (the writer "I" being dissolved 'ghostly' in all).[78]

Imagespeech   **Written speech**   **Speechsong**

Can we believe that we have come around with two analyses that don't need each other, or can get along without each other ? Are we sure that we won't fall flat again on all too spatial descriptions[79] of two variations of transcendence : a dialectical one and an aesthetisized one. Both these 'philosophies' can be described as 'operations' :

- The one 'between' bodies, not being slowed down by any preoccupation with the form that these bodies may take on here and there

- The other [within] the space of the body itself whereby it takes to its service certain notions of perception; sensori-mechanism, neuro-motoric diagrams.

'Transposing' (Diès' word ...) is then a comparable term to transcendence, which Derrida has adopted in order to wrench himself away from the dialectical variant.[80]

'Transforming' is then again Deleuzes favourite; away from the aesthetical 'style' variant. Will these matters work to all our contention ?[81]

Entropy-poetry

How far do we have to travel still to reach the notion of entropy?

A medium, an ether (either way) neutral, neuter, background noise. This is as far as it gets with H Bergson. The sole reference on entropy embroids upon the uniform distribution of heat (as a consequence of friction-motion) whereby forms become less precise, independent of convention. This convection toward uniformity, Bergson addresses as the most 'meta' of all physical processes because it gives direction (sense, sin) to (our) lifes without inter-posed symbols on one hand, without artificial tools of measurement on the other.[82]

Entropy is the way to diffusion, delution, invisibility, homogeinity on which again new elements, probes, contingencies, of relative stability can be built. Entropy is a distribution toward uniformity that takes place before sense perception, expression, impression and the problem of many scientists is then [again] where to a-locate any notion of beginning, direction, of geometry, of logic or what else that carries a name.

Point remains is that entropy as seen from a closed (meta) physical history is badly understood. It has a name : Boltzmann's crisis, but I won't take it much further than that.

Echo & writtenspeech

What is then this language that says nothing (neither good or bad) is never silent and is called literature ?[83]

On Nietzsche's question 'who is speaking?', Mallarmé is stammering : 'the word itself'. What matters is a slow coming around to something that begins by making a slim material black line or a trace of ink on paper.[84]

I have encountered two Brussels pages under way.

photo 1 : King Sknorb being suspended from his job. King Sknorb who cannot remember/ pronounce his own name.

photo 2 : Diligent page in search for the king's pouse

Round-up of a linguistic yourney through metaphysics.

O   doesn't stand for 'nothing' but for something

A   doesn't stand for abscence[86], annihilition but for a presence, a 'P'. Think hereby about an operation whereby 'psyche' follows out of 'physics' and 'physics' out of 'psyche'.[87] There are 'things' indeed that not yet exist but the road of no-things leads without detour to all things

NO   It's hereby very <u>un</u>likely, an illusion even that destruction strikes and that 'nothing' is thrown back on it's mere word : [noting].[88]

I   At the very least the 'object A' is not so much an 'O' ansich but an 'I' : a pure idea, a probable state.

O   Thoughts make a circle

O   The world is moved from above (on second thought in how far is that movement?) The world is moved from beneath. It is at the same time pushed to extremes (zero and all) and reduced to structure. In which case can one speak about 'attraction' ? In which case can one speak about 'im- or re-pulsion' ?[89] In which case can one speak about quantifiable or qualifiable 'matters'?[90]

         The Ancients and the Moderns take in here a different point of view.

         Hence and forth and so goes on.

What is above (the Moderns ...) is the thing that visualizes, that materializes in concepts. What is below (the Moderns ...) : All that is invisible, the small, the fluid, the quantitative.

What is above (the Ancients ...) : God, the Heavens, Gold Coins, the Motionless mover.[91] What is below (the Ancients ...) : the sublunar, small change, the real, changing phenomena.[92 & 93]

What is behind, what sits in front ? Behind sits according to ancient metaphysics an eternity of immutability that, in front, unwinds in a perpetuity of mobility.[94]

Behind is (or sits) for modern metaphysics a sort of 'vision' that is always virtual, never ever realized by the consicous self.[95] Behind here is, metaphorically spoken, the pouring out of the immutable platonic solids[96].

What is 'between' (above becomes between) : degrees, intervals (fall), all the descending degrees of being from 'all to nothing'.

AN   Between is the difference between one cycle and the many cycli that imitate[97], 'between' is the difference between the Golden Piece and all the small change[98]. A=An

         ANIMA

<u>Stop halfway !</u> [99]

Stop halfway and give up that method of construction and piling up storeys (stories) of a magnificent building. That's the work of all these philosophers that want to run in front.[100]

Give up also the method of de- or re-struction; the puzzling with fragments that only leave a door open for imitation of a whole that will never be reached. That's the work of philosophers that run at the rear, behind the facts.[101]

So don't take one half, but take two halves.[102] Run upwards (ascent) run downwards (descend)[103]. It takes two halves to be able to understand that the one is a translation of the other. Before, with the Ancients, this scission wasn't yet entirely made.[104]

In one language different sentences express different things, although the sound will always be related to one another. In this 'not yet' context it was our second nature to think 'invers'.[105] With the Moderns one gets a reverse reasoning. As soon as one gets two or more languages; two sentences may mean the same but their sounds will differ radically.[106]

Rather than to think on 'inversion' within a context of entities that are not entirely cut loose of each other, we arrive here in a situation where translations are made in an atmosphere of scizophrenia'[107]. This is what one gets with 'extension'.

So stop half way where nothing lasts, except the sound of its word. Ascent or descent (to utopia or to hetereotopia if you want).

'Up', where the soundwave is vibrating[108], 'down' where our consciousness is scattered and cracked into tiny sound bits. Background noice.

ONOMATOPOEIA.[109]

[1] Minute thoughts is a series of unpublished 'poetic' thoughts that have sprung from a first : "Nietzsche, nichts, niche, nights ... Read in the evening, write in the morning, the night works than as a necessary interruptor, interrogator, condensor'.

[2] J.Derrida : 'metaphysics is no concept, no theme but a chain and there is no such thing a a meta-name'. Jacques Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, and other Essays on Husserls's theory of Signs (Evanston : Northwestern University Press, 1973). Speech and Phenomena was originally published in French under the title 'La Voix et le Phénomène' (Presses Universitaires de France,1967).

[3] Bergson marks the end of metaphysics, p.245.
Michel Foucault, The Order of Things - An archaeology of the human sciences (London : Tavistock Publications Limited, 1985). Originally published in French under the title 'Les mosts et les choses' (France : Editions Gallimard, 1966).

[4] flow & presence p.295.
Henri Bergson, Creative Evolution (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983). Originally published in 1911 by Henry Holt and Company.

[5] Rem Koolhaas' rethoric.

[6] S Zizek about Kant's Vorstellungs - Repreasentanz and the backside of things, p.84 : One can turn this 'everything is given' upside down right away in 'nothing is in its whole knowable'.
Slavoj Zizek, Tarrying with the Negative - Kant, Hegel, and the Critique of Ideology (Durham : Duke University Press, 1993).

[7] Kant is not-known but pregnant of self-knowledge. Foucault, The Order of Things, p.323

[8] Kant versus overflow. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p 206

[9] for instance B Hillier and J Hanson 'inverted genotype' instead of 'extended genotype'.... p.44.
Bill Hillier and Julienne Hanson, The Social Logic of Space (London : Cambridge University Press, 1984)

[10] detension, p.220; extension, relaxation, laxative and apéritive, p.209. Bergson, Creative Evolution.

[11] pendulum movement. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.319.

[12] 'De Morgen', newspaper, interview with Karen Armstrong, 8oct2003.

[13] Boltzmann&improbability. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.244

[14] sensori-motors, p.246; jet-stream, p.247. Bergson, Creative Evolution.

[15] and his soliquy intermezzo on entropy. Bergson Creative Evolution, p243

[16] 'La Condition Française' upheld till today in politics and culture, after Jacques Chirac.

[17] 'Hegel, meta and illigimate'

[18] see further last section, about the 'inbetween' instead of the 'above'.

[19] also Derrida 'the unity of metaphysics, technology and well computed binarism' p.167.
Jacques Derrida, Disseminatioin (Chicago :The University of Chicago Press, 1981). First published in French under the title La Dissémination (Paris : Editions du Seuil, 1972).

[20] Eventually this article is also a vehicle to learn to speak out entropy in various ways : poetry, between trope and trop ...

[21] These words were simply in the air.

[22] letters that kill, words turn against ideas. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.127

[23] dream & entropy : 'I go further in the direction of the dream [...mort] sentences are scattered in words, words scanned in syllables. Letters come loose and begin -almost- to dance hand in hand on a sort of fantastic leaf of paper .... admire that procession, that complexity, all quite negative but evolving also in the direction of relaxation. Nothing positive but a deficiency of free will. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.209

24 and not on that famous p.243 ... or it must be that you want to count in Bergson's allusion on JJ Rousseau's dream of an im-mediate language - without interposed symbols. Bergson, Creative Evolution

25 'Writing mechanically'. Derrida, Dissemination, p.11

26 Writing can only mime. Derrida, Dissemination, p.107

27 'Writing linked with the putting in question of truth'. Derrida, Dissemination, p.107

28 'Suspension of the title' initiated by Mallarmé. Derrida, Dissemination, p.177, p179, p120

29 - the second edition & the rare booklet
- mimique & effacement
- we read mimique ie. white pages etc etc
Derrida, Dissemination, p.196, 197,198

30 Jean-Paul Sartre, Nausea (London : Penguin Books, 1965), p.233-234. Originally published in French under the title 'la Nausée (Paris : Librairie Gallimard, 1938).

31 related 'postoffices' : sexuality, pornography, scatology : 'body posture is like inverse suspense', p194. Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus -Capitalism & Schizophrenia (London : The Athlone Press, 1988). Originally published as Mille Plateaux, volume 2 of Capitalisme et Schizophrénie (Paris : Les Editions de Minuit, 1980).

32' translator's introduction' : supplément, reads in french both as addition (writing...) and substitute (masturbation ...). Derrida, Dissemination, p.XIII

33 supplement, triggers : suspended titels. Derrida, Dissemination.

34 texts of Derrida on Rousseau. Derrida, De la Grammatologie.

35 no masturbation in front of les 'gamins' : 'no games'. Derrida, Dissemination.

36 'This game', indicting writing in writing that is upheld through Western literature must end. (It seems that diction can only fold back on it's being, on truth, by opposing it to scription) . The supplement just does that, it blurs what before got seperated. Derrida, Dissemination, p.158,159 & p.169

37 'What Plato dreams of is a memory with no sign'. Derrida, Dissemination, p.109

38 In Paul de Man's 'Blindness and Insight' two figures stand almost side to side or face to face; namely Mallarmé and Rousseau.
Due to his seminal work 'de la grammatologie' Derrida becomes onesightedly linked to Rousseau. Nothing in the Man's book binds him to Mallarmé.
Derrida (it is argued) takes Rousseau on his own words : 4 elements of critique can be descried, 4 laments.
1 Plenitude p.119
Rousseau's reason of writing is to find a fictional recovery of plenitude (trop...) ie. a unity of being which he could never realize in his personal life. (On plenitude & Rousseau's rejection of differance).
2 Supplement p.116
While it is well accepted that ...
... the saturation of speech by writing ....
.... the process of significantly misinterpreting of texts in order to shed light on that what remains unperceived by the author and his followers ...
... in short that the double valorization or articulation, double reading of texts is a revolutionary matter that breaks away from clean or clear metaphysical dualism;
with Rousseau himself this game get's quickly stuck in a form of 'tampering' on both sides. Rousseau is compelled to write the reverse of what he wants to say.
3 Delude p.122
Rousseau's use of a vocabulary of 'Being' (and to explode this vocabulary) in order to describe what he believes in as a downward journey of life and history.
(On delude and deconstruction & being trapped)
4 (Pre-linguistic) desire p.112
Rousseau's hang for intimacy (cf. his book 'confessions') which stands in contrast to Mallarmé's articulation on alienation, the impersonality of language and on writing as a thing in itself.
(on logocentrism : the primacy of speech and the unmediated presence of the self and its own voice as opposed to the reflective distance that seperates the self form written words - p.114)

[39] Is that enough ... or?

or [1] :   Mime is not a figure of speech. Try to understand the difference between mneme and mime. Mime is imitating nothing. It is writing gestures; a new beginning. Derrida, Dissemination, p.194

or [2] :   "Music does not imitate / it can imitate the most inward, invisible, inaudible of feelings ..." (is another remarkable line of Rousseau that Derrida forgets). About Rousseau and speechsong, de Man p130,131

Paul de Man, Blindness and Insight - Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism (Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1971).

[40] The Edge (1997), directed by Lee Tamahari

[41] could figure also 'the famous escape & trapped'. Deleuze, A Thousand Plateaus, on Fitzgerald's book 'The crack-up', p.199.

[42] synthesizer. making music loops in 'the moog' ie. the first synthesizer ('De Standaard' newspaper article), p.96

[43] 'difficulties inherent to dialectics' . Deleuze&Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p89

[44] signified, signifier & happiness : content is a 'superseding' of the signifier, expression is a 'superseding' of the signified. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.112

[45] dialectics/dualist/read further ... dial number ...

[46] on the imperceptable. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.252

[47] one can read about liminal yes, but not mime. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus

[48] bees&tropes. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.77

[49] 'queque-quanta'. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.239 & p.249

[50] the face is a surface. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.170

[51] the face is a mask & inhumanity. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.181

[52] mask/mime primitive. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.191

[53] Who remembers the song of Nick Cave and his Bad Seeds here : 'he called me a roôose'.

[54] p.187 : becoming flower or rock; p.173 : mime/mask/& Don Quixote/amnesia. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus.

[55] 'white man'. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.182

[56] outpouring. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.190

[57] the face, what a horror, with its pores, pour out the holes & defacialization. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.190

[58] p.117 'echo'; p.218 'echo'; p.279 'Each cry possesses an echo', in Mallarmé's 'crise de vers'. Derrida, Dissemination.

[59] Constants and crossed language. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.82.
Roussseau & speechsong " Sprech Gesang", the voice-music relationship proposed by JJ Rousseau. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus , p.97.

[60] p.91 : Chomsky's aborescent model; & p.82 : constants & closed language. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus.

[61] non-linguistic factors. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.91

[62] atomization. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.96

[63] atonization. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.95

[64] overstepping 'Labov'. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.94

[65] the 'brown stagemaker' (scenopoeetes dentirostris) lays down landmarks each morning by dropping leaves, picked from the tree and to turn them with the paler side up songbirds & inversion. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.315

[66] 'the creative stammering' & chroma/sone, half-tone. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.97-98
DNA≈BWO(body without organs) & everything is already there. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.206

[67] Foucault, The Order of Things, p.117

[68] speech act & intervening (venereal). Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.86
process of contagation. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.242

[69] p112 : happeniness&signified/signifier; p.192 : what happened ? Deleuze 'three novellas'; p.207 (title). Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus

[70] Foucault, The Order of Things, p.117.

[71] about order-words, implicit presuppositons & overflow ≈ redundancy. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.79

[72] sum up : secret languages, slangs, jargons, professional languages, nursery rhymes, merchant cries. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.96

[73] instead of dialectics/dualist& uneasiness, dial ... Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus

[74] seance table. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.208

[75] speed of drugs & deterritorialization ... desorientation. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p.283

[76] p.195 : 'quanta; p.87 : becoming animal through writing; p.203 : 'between' lines and writing : rhizome, cartography. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus

[77] intension&dimension of depth. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus p.321, p.238, p.242

[78] p.84 : ghostwriter; p.245 : Borderliners. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus.
Exegetes. Foucault, Order of Things, p.303

[79] Foucault's critique, The Order of Things, p.319.

[80] transposing. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.356.
On diès 'La transposition platonicienne. Derrida, Dissemination, p.112.

[81] p81- 82 : incorporeal, transforming, intermingling; p.252 'no' transformations in theology. Deleuze & Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus.

[82] And his soleque intermezzo on entropy. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.243

[83] 'Noting'. Foucault, The Order of Things, p.305

[84] Mallarmé's impersonality of language. de Man, Blindness and Insight, p.9.
Mallarmé's stammering & trace of ink. Foucault, The Order of Things, p.305.

[85] Sknorb Event on the Bronks Yougth Theatre site Brussels, May 22, 2005

[86] Abscent and zero. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.143

[87] psyche/physics. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.202

[88] Illusion reworked. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.298

[89] Attraction repulsion. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.323

[90] Quanta. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.328

[91] Motionless Mover. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.325

[92] Phenomena. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.328

[93] The troposphere and phenomenology

[94] immutability. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.328

[95] 'virtual' . Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.322

[96] 'outpouring'. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.322

[97] 'between' the members of an equation. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.325

[98] Gold Piece & change. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.328;
and also in Derrida's 'Speech and Phenomena', p.138 : 'the classical idea of sign, money, letter' and counting the goods.

[99] 'half'; p.355 : 'stop half way'. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.362

[100] 'stories'. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.363

[101] Spencerian method of puzzling. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.364

[102] two halfs. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.349

[103] ascend/descent. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.369

[104] scission. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.350

[105] invers & not yet. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.355

[106] 'sound'. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.346

[107] extension & scizophrenic god. Bergson, Creative Evolution, p.350;
p.106 : minor and major mode constitute oneimeta-language, capable of accounting for double direction;
p.99 : tensor : second half of the sentence acting back on the first; & p.99 'half' 'both directions', in Deleuze
& Guattari, Thousand Plateaus.

[108] on Hitchcock's birds. Deleuze & Guattari, Thousand Plateaus, p.305

[109] onomatopoeia. Derrida, Dissemination, p.279