



The Urim (lights) and the Thummim (perfections). In panel-reading: the initial and final time-dimensions.

If the [QUAD](#) is hypothetically received as a diagrammed *architecture of the real* then its performance is a *homomorphism*, in the sense that the architecture is *applied on itself* as it is *iterated* in movement. The movement hatches the *semiotics*: Beckett observed that the [black & white version](#) was slower.

The initial entry is vectored toward the **medial** coordinate zone and is **light** (*Urim*). While the final exit is vectored off from the mediate coordinate zone and **completes** it (*Thummim*). The *Urim* and *Thummim* are the *positions* of white and black stones, in the casting of lots evoked in the Pentateuch.

All we know is that the *Urim* and the *Thummim* were in the breast-plate (*Hoshen Mishpat* = Breastplate of Law). And that the breast-plate in turn was worn with the *Ephod* (a poncho of linen). So, whichever lots were cast in the breastplate, the results were pledged to be worn as a garb (or, *assumed*).



The Hoshen Mishpat w/the stones of the 12 tribes—it has 22 neighboring positions for the Urim and Thummim—8 diagonal and 14 adjacent—and 8 positions that are separate/disparate. Medial zone.

If description, analysis and synthesis are considered as phases of hatching what we call *observation*, they become productive agents when conjoint to the architecture of the real [recto]: here we need neither to rely on esoteric truths nor occult precepts. We can simply be present to what is evidenced.

When we read the sober and critical voices stating that little or nothing is known on the throwing of lots—as described in the Pentateuch—or, we read all the bogus of less sober and critically inclined people, we are really in exactly in the same place. Neglecting that the lots, board and garb were *one*.

They were one means: they were *not* separate. When King David requests the *Ephod*, he wishes to consult the *Urim* and *Thummim*. The *Urim* and *Thummim* are linked to a white and black stone. But they are in plural. So, the *Urim* indicate the *positions* of the white stone, and the *Thummim* of the black stone.

There can be no positions unless there is a board (or, grid). We know that there are two relations of **assumption**: we know that the lots were in the breastplate (*Hoshen Mishpat*)—and in this way **assumed**—as we know that the *Hoshen* worm with the linen poncho (*Ephod*); and accordingly **assumed**.

In sum, it is like a patch (N. *et røfte*) in the sense of a small surface—part of a whole but tended separately, as a garden plot—and in the sense of an element of a garment, or costume. The 22 neighbouring positions featuring the *Urim* and *Thummim* on the *Hoshen Mishpat*, are the Hebrew letters.

In Hebrew, letters are called *signs* (*Otiot*): not characters, letters nor type; but signs. In the first account of creation the name of G-d is mentioned 22 times. Which is the basis for the proposition that G-d created the world from 22 signs. The Hebrew alphabet is also composed of 22 signs, or elements.

According to Nachmanides (1194-1270 c.e.), the Torah—which is written with these Hebrew signs/elements—can therefore be seen as G-d's name in its *evolving* aspect. Here the first and last sign of the Hebrew alphabet—**Alef-Tav**, pronounced ET—are part of a word without meaning: *what is yet to be*.

It indicates the world and everything that is in it. The point being is that there is *no* underlying mystery to this: like a code to be hacked, cracked or solved. A paradigm of signs will *never* yield more than this. And then the point is *to know when and where to stop*. That is, how to make decisions/resolves.

If we accept, as a theory of semiotics, that signs only give this much up to a point where a decision is made. When the decision is part of the semiotics—which it is with the *Hoshen Mishpat*, the *Urim & Thummim* and the *Ephod*—then semiotics becomes *entangled* with the architecture of the *real/QUAD*.

Which means that the real and semiotics will *superpose* (to yield timescapes), and will *intra-act* (to alter subject-object relations). The point being that *it will not do more than this*: but which is already a great deal. Bourdieu's [doxosophes](#) will not allow this, either stopping *before* it or driving mad *beyond* it.