

Dear Don,

I want to express my fascination with your article. There are many things that I cannot fully grasp, but your writing stimulates my curiosity. It is amazing that how deeply we are on the same page about what I call it the two-sided sign system and you in many different ways including the Parralax problem.

As I read your article , various thoughts and associations come to mind, and I find myself constantly drawn in by the innovative ideas you present in each paragraph. Thank you for sharing your insights. I a happy to find someone that can relate so easily the issues that seem to lay far from each other. My interest is sparking.

Here are some of my associations:

1- Chase/Chastity

First of all I would like to draw your attention to my own dissertation (pp. 34 ff.), which I sent to you. Here is its link again : <https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/21528/>

There, I discussed that it is unimportant to consider whether the words are etymologically of the same origin or not. Regardless of whether they have related or unrelated roots, it should be sufficient if they can make sense to a native speaker's ear. However there might be two words that are etymologically connected and can serve to be a proper substitute for chase and chastity. Here we go:

(German: Rein/Reinlichkeit); Pour/Pure:

I suggest considering the relationship between "pour" and "pure" in English more seriously, in search of a root word to connect "hearing" with "pouring [from within]" I found that purity and to strove or to enter into something are of the same root **Rein/Reinlichkeit; the same is true for pour and pure::**

Pour (v.)

"To cause (liquid or granular substance) to flow or stream either out of a vessel or into one," c. 1300, of unknown origin. Not in Old English; perhaps from Old French (Flanders dialect) purer "to sift (grain), **pour out (water),**" **from Latin purare "to purify,"** from purus "pure" (see pure). Replaced Old English geotan. Intransitive sense of "to flow, issue forth in a stream" is from 1530s. Related: Poured; pouring; pourable. As a noun from 1790, "a pouring stream." (Harper, D. (n.d.). Etymology of pour. Online Etymology Dictionary. Retrieved February 20, 2023.)

[https://www.etymonline.com/word/pour#:~:text=pour%20\(v.\),pure%22%20\(see%20p ure\).](https://www.etymonline.com/word/pour#:~:text=pour%20(v.),pure%22%20(see%20p ure).)

The object of the voice, which passes through the opening in the body and there become created by the curtain of the ear, can be seen as a reflection of the complex relationship between Word and Flesh. The body is shaped by cultural practices, beliefs, and symbols that have found their way through the ear. Additionally, the voice is something that enters,

penetrates, and violates: "Nur wer rein ist, darf [r]eintreten" ("Only those who are pure are allowed to enter.")

In relation to the theory of purity (Mary Douglas), the concept of the voice, which passes through the opening in the body created by the ear, can be understood as a means of understanding the complex relationship between purity and impurity. In many cultures, the body is seen as a *porous* entity that selectively allows certain objects or experiences to enter.

This relationship is best manifested in Hamlet: a dead father; a ghost; a *pure voice* that *pours* himself into his son's ear and ignites the fire of revenge in his soul. Revenge is an act that very recursively involves *pouring* poison (gift; pharamakon) into his ear. A poison that, according to his words, has spread to every pore of his flesh.

"Nur das Reine kommt herein, denn Reinlichkeit ist das Eintrittszeichen." ("Only the pure come in, for purity is the sign of entry.") The words "cum" and "come" are often used as synonyms for sexual climax or orgasm. The same is true for the word 'Amadan' (آمدن) in Persian.

Hamlet is really an interesting case, both in the sense of how these two words appear until the fifth scene and in other instances where their meanings are replaced by other words. For example, when Hamlet says to Ophelia, "*Get thee to a nunnery, why wouldst thou be a breeder of sinners?*," "nunnery" could be interpreted as "purity," while "breeder" could be interpreted as "pour," indicating the idea of contamination and sin and more importantly moving and diffusing comparable to the "chase" in your argumentation.

The way he (Hamlet) avenges his uncle by staging what his uncle had once staged before his eyes as somewhat that was his own desire (killing his father and marrying his mother) is really interesting. Hamlet brings theater onto the stage and waits in a *logical time* to recognize the "truth value" of his uncle, and this is his freedom as revenge. That's my idea: he didn't kill him at the altar because he didn't want to send him to paradise while he was praying and so on. He couldn't because he had already avenged him. This time the revenge as the chase is over because the symmetry of the act (killing the father as the pure voice) is already assured.

2- The relation between the circle and tangent and relating it to flee and fall was genial. To me it is the main idea behind the death and sex drive in Freud's "beyond the pleasure principle" especially when he is talking about biology, nirvana principle, momentum, etc. I myself come to the most summarizing conclusion of that that Freud himself did not mention and it is the German pair of words: Sterben and Streben (Death and Seek). It sits pretty well to your notions I think, isn't it?

3- Your read of rebus in the form of audioactive was amazing. I had seen the video of John Connay in Numerophile but did not come to inner similarity between this and the rebus. It is amazing to see the numbers once as flesh and once as word (number). Yes it is a sort of rebus. Good job!

4- Read the story of shadow by Hans Christian Anderson if you didn't. It is a very short story. I have a video essay on "shadow" but it is unfortunately in German.

5-Beauty and the Beast: This stirs in my mind after reading your notion an de-monsteration. The story is as if the beautiful kisses the beast and it turns into a prince. My idea is totally different. The monster remains monster but something of anamorphic nature happens in the Beautiful to see a prince in the monster. This is de-monstration. De-monstrations happened through a kiss which is Real because it is literally out of speak: We simply cannot speak when we are kissing.

There is more to say but it is more than enough for today.

I am happy of finding a cosmic friend.

Bliss!