



Ida Falck (screenshot)

Could we imagine a kind of *lettering*—whether manuscript or typographic—in which the appearance of certain signs would be initial, finals and medials allowing for a depth of reading tangential to the *unconscious*: or, what we might call the *agent intellect*, according to Aristotle, “caught in the act”.

This insight, that there are transpositions *between* the unconscious *and* language—i.e. the interception of the agent intellect, as we are in the act—could be of great importance to identify practice in theory: with consequences for *situations* we deal with and *positions* we later adopt, if we keep a *diary*.

So, here I return to Ida Falck’s question from our artistic research day at the design department. If we manage to come up with a credible bid on signs as *bundles* in which the *contingent*, *speculative* and *agentic* become significant, then their transposition is the instance where they become a *sign*.



Ida Falck (screenshot)

Writing is where sign and language *meet* and transpositions from sign to language is invited: this is what we call *readability*, and it is also a definition that works in a broader/expanded sense. The transposition from language to sign is not invited, because it is *coded*. But it can be *invented*.

Pertaining to Ida Falck's question on the value and potential of keeping a diary for a reflective output that is relevant on a public arena as the *viva voce*—where artistic research is transposed unto discussions with an audience—the *phygital* may yield the needed type of *working-problem*.

Indeed, how can the *digital* trail we leave behind as we move—as a type of *parcours*—transpose unto an *arena* where discursive commitments are at stake. How does the situational logic of the *parcours*, transpose unto the positions explored and developed through *discours*? Do they feed *back*?

This problem is needed in the sense that a different vantage point on the invention of language in sign, which contrasts to the issues of readability explored earlier in this series (#01-03). *Invention* is considered here (Eco) as *the transposition unto a material that is not yet segmented for our purpose*.

The success at doing so—and its social acceptance—is what is meant by sign-production, or *semiosis*. Let us suppose that invention will include temporal aspects that are current, present and completed: that is, if we consider *invention* as a *generative process in communicative interaction*.

We can then derive that **invention** has a *contingent*, a *speculative* and an *agentic* layer. Which means that it is possible to *transpose* *parcours* unto *discours* by the operation of a *synecdoche*: the *bundle* of the agentic-speculative-contingent as a *sign* in [transposition](#) from the one to the other.

The *synecdoche* is a transposable *part-whole* (mereological) relation whereby a *repertoire* developed in a *parcours* (*one part*) can hatch a *new repertoire* in a *discours* (*another part*). Such inventiveness is creative in the sense that what appear *trivial* in the *parcours*, is *not so* in the *discours*.

This is the essential genealogy of surprise expressed by Ida when she asked her question: the puzzle of how trivia can become significant, which might be the motto of diary-keeping (*things don't happen because they are important, they are important because they happen*). Environmental code.

Of course, this means that the passage *from* *parcours* *to* *discours* is *not* limited to occasional and big events, but occur more *regularly* (entering our our record as process data). This accounts for how the transposition *from* *parcours* *to* *discours*—through the *synecdoche*—feeds *back* to *parcours*.

In this sense, the diary becomes a *travelogue* of our journey on the *border* between *parcours* and *discours*. With the discursive inclusion of *digital audio-visual remedia* (e.g. *viva voce*) *parcours* and *discours* *cannot* really be considered as separate domains, but two faces of a *phygital semiosis*.