

Walking in the forest, soon, wild flowers and birds appear. I have no idea about their names. I think that they might be unrecorded species or unpopular things, so I could just put my name to these. However, I just stop by shortly and I let them be themselves. Having a name doesn't mean that they have to be called. Some names just splash around like a flying fish, but few of them are just an hermit in the forest.

I do write an alphabet letter and do try to pronounce it. As it doesn't have any meaning by itself, I repeat its sound endlessly to compensate its vanity. Enunciating things completes their meaning and presence. At the same time it confirms the speaker's knowledge and authority. The culture that is based on phonetic signs activates its language with verbal sounds. As the signs can be accessed by anyone (except "the idiots" which origin comes from Latin and was previously borrowed from Greek conveying "non literate".). It also shows the lack of an essential relationship between sound and letters so their repetitive pronunciation produces their tight and imagined bond. Their meaning and semiotics combined with the varied intonation and accent inherit this rhetoric that relies on a language cultural foundation. To create the world, as everybody knows, God called the universe into existence. Name of God, name of father, the name that inherits the son by incarnation. The son shares his identity with his father. Only those who are excluded by this voice, speak out and declare their own voice as 'we', it becomes a political action.

In ideography language is already exclusive and authoritative. Also embodies its semiotics in their figure, so the language's enunciation is not essential as much as phonetic signs. Only its shape gets emphasized by calligraphy. But a language based on phonemes affirms its presence in its diverse enunciations. What I am pointing out is when the existence is really confirmed its presence. In most of the cases when something is defined with certain names, these names are built by their own elements and traded in their own culture. Naming is constituted within its own elements. It is based on a mixed proportion, mixed with others, casted in time, producing new names as a chemical process like hydration reaction. It settles in history and hardens at the cultural base. Each word from a specific language is 'concrete'. Do group of 'concrete' words produce great meanings across cultures? Don't different languages make people produce different names and different boundaries to describe their experiences in different ways? Are enunciated things always alive and the others extinct? Could I declare their extinction? Does silence mean the absence of sound? It means existence of meaning.