



Bunker on the coast of Cinque Terre, in Liguria.

To what extent can the adding/making of a *cavity* contribute to the excavation of contents, that place high demands on us to be *well* seen and -said— not either or, but *both*; well seen and well said—when the point of our deep rather, and basic, premise is that these contents are *ill* seen and -said?

This is what is explored here, in terms of *assembling* a container, apt or adequate to make life-world contents *hatch*, in an environment they do not initially belong, in such a way that they become *staged* and are performed. Is it possible that even *archaeological* excavations can be seen this way?

That is, if archaeological excavations are not defined by the blunt fact of removing something (earth), but by executing a container—through the designs developed for non-random digs—that, at some point, will communicate materially with the *findings* and their life-world *contents*.



Frederick Kessler — Endless house

A real question which we as yet will have to leave unanswered is whether a *font* could be designed for *worstward ho*, that would make it readable as a novella, and harness the extreme demands on embodiment in this written piece, in which the *body* is the central topic, and thereby make it a *text*?

Even if it cannot be answered it is important to ask the question here, since the alternative is to develop that minimum of staging that makes it possible to transform *worstward ho* into a *piece*: that is, not an art work, but the kind of performance needed to make the novella readable/receivable at all.

A reading that places other demand, at the receiving end, on the recipient, than simply a general reading skill, and the access to an arm-chair. It demands a work of assemblage—a container—to yield its content. Was Samuel Beckett being excessively difficult, or revealing a broader issue?

Or, in other terms, are we confusing the *content* of a text with its linguistic *reference*? If the modern mind was suspended between what was ill seen and ill said, where could we hope to bring the seen and said *together*, other than in some kind of *performance*, in a realm of expression beyond drama?

That is, including drama, but not restricted to the dramatic theatre, but expanded to a broader range of theatre. With the kind of staging—ranging from type design, assemblages and sound—that determine our ability to learn at this level of content: the containers needed to hatch contents.

Consider the presence of 3 suspended ceramic vessels: they can vary in size, but they are all large enough to have acoustic properties with different affordances. One of these ceramic “bells” will be such that the speaker feels that s/he is *isolated*. Another will yield a big sound, but *only* to the speaker.

The crowd will hear the voice *weakly* outside the perimeter of the ceramic bell. Then there is a third bell which is such that it corresponds with the [eigenfrequency](#) of the space around it, and the audience will hear the sound coming from all sides at once (independent of whether it is weak/loud).

How does this variation impinge on the sense that we as speakers can have of being in an environment with a *pressing* content—existential isolation—an environment with a *weak* content—loud to itself, as news-media often are—or alternatively a contained that is *non-obstructive* to the content.

That is, for that in the time of connection and connectivity—that we may call correspondence—we *are* content. The embodiment of the content is resolved with that sense that it could come out staged in just about any environment. Which of course is not true, but it happens e.g. in opera.

Those precious moments in which only some talented singers manage to pick up on the space in which they are—its [eigenfrequency](#)—and deliver the words they sing, in ways which *enhance* the words rather than to quell them and stir our imagination of being present/beholding a primal scene beyond.