

Textual Configurations

At what point does it become necessary for a text to split off as it were from the subject? Where does the detour begin? In any case ~~to identify a subject~~ for a text is to structure a point, and this point can only be one that is already historical, the text itself having begun prior to the ~~subject~~. This text, possessing none of the qualities of a ~~subject~~ and without approval or knowledge, is a line or rather is tracing a line through notation within itself. The text is tracing a set of notations of itself. The text is notating itself. The text is without ~~subject~~. And, as being *without subject* in every sense of the embedded discourses attached to those two words is to begin reading, it is also to know in advance that reading has been ~~identified as the subject~~ of the text. Yet, this is to overlook that there is a thing being written here and this thing is the *without subject*, and that is what is being written, here (with)-in the text and (with-out)-there in the reading.

And in advance of that here-with is the context, the against the text that is also the *with* of the text, the trick that envelops the text, the fraudulence of the with and the text... And writing that as punctuation (through those points (acting as a punctum in the text misleading the ~~meaning~~ here, in con-cert with the *with*), that is a method (one that signs itself as omission), to invoke a without, (signified here as omission, in this case the *with* outside of the with of this text), is to introduce a *point*. And this ^{glyph}, that signs for absent speech, for '*what could be resolved by ending this?*' for the need for more than a single point, creates an opening for another.... Has this now signed in the act/space/ of/for derivation? Should some

TEXTUAL CONFIGURATIONS

reference now be made to the derivation here-(with), from this outside of the other text/s, the ones derived from outside the con?

But I have deviated here from the subject I am not writing. And at the same time as I am writing the deviation I am not deviating at all, but rather (so as to not be *stitched* into the Law so precipitously with-in this text) forging a detour around the *point*, the perspectival architecture, visual (with)-in the text, visualizing without as the ~~subject~~. The detour unhinges me from that subjective architecture reflected from and contained (structured) in the *point*. The detour reveals the ~~subject~~ as the *petit-point* of architecture.

So to return to derivation is from a detour that leads to it but is always *without* destination.

end of page one

a fold cannot be remembered, rediscovered, reconfigured—

remember the crease can be remembered as the prior-to the fold, remember it can be recalled as a return of the embedded ~~subject~~, remember the crease has not yet become more than itself—

not remembering the fold is knowing that the fold is never symmetrical and can be known only by the rejoinder of another part that is never a sum and can never be complete for lack of presentation

remember dispersal— dispersal is derivation presenting itself to effect

end of page two

Derivation is a temporality measured by omission. Derivation is a signing for, by omission of a signatory.

Visualizing the *without subject* is only possible through the temporality of omission and through invoking the processual space of derivation. The processual space is that of action(ism). The processual space is action(ism) to vandalize the subjective architecture. The processual space does not claim a subject, does not possess a point of reference, does not inhabit a point of reference. The process does not make a point.

end of page three

utopia / alibi
nothing / disguise for origin

extension / alibi
representation / pathos

utopia / extension + 1
solicitation / conduct

same / necessity –
nothing / resemblance

end of page four