



Wittgenstein modelled *polythetic* definitions—of terms that run on a collection of notions combined. Ingold used the same model to trail and understand the communicative interaction of *concommuning*...

The anthroponomic bid on knowledge—with an epistemic claim—comes from an *ensemble* of scientific, philosophical and artistic -propositions in which one of the elements (art, philosophy & science) defines a *datum*: that is, the element with the defining impact on the *ensemble*. In the scope of the present query: art is a datum permitting a philosophical query in a science exhibition.

It is a permission that does not go without saying, since science & philosophy will often make competing claims: featuring that kind of *unilateral duality* Laruelle points out as *one* where one (science) claims no need of the other (philosophy); while the other (philosophy) will claim its complementarity to the first (science). The contentious claims between the two will not cease.

However, the introduction of a *datum* will impact and hit on the creation of an *ensemble* in which there is a place for *both*. The datum is, in this sense, the signature of a first science: not in the sense that art—nor artistic propositions—constitute this first science, but rather that a field in which the makeshift entrepreneurship of art, architecture, archaeology & anthropology appears.

An ebullition of initiatives with partial perspectives on *mattering* the matters at hand: *anthroponomy* is here used to suggest that this *entrepreneurship*, though makeshift and multiple, still may yield some field-properties for the kind of search & query conducted here; in this leaflet series and in the mean-time index. The purpose of this field-query is to *observe, describe & analyse*.

That is, a mission-statement similar to *astronomy*, but applied to epistemic fields on planet earth: anthroponomy. For what purposes would we want to engage in this sort of venture? Well, firstly because the datum—as discussed here—is a *game-changer*, for a more *environmental humanity*. Secondly, because makes it possible to model what it is to lift, to move and to land.

The kind of complex dynamic processes that we regularly *fail* at holding because our insistence on *containing* them—defining a wide range of “containerships”: human (often male) containership, ownership as sovereignty (instead of stewardship), money as the standard container of value. Lock and key: they relieve us from the hardships of defining and holding value.

Therefore anthroponomics must yield a different take on value propositions with a variety of claims that do *not* simply add up, but can/must be garden-ed as an ensemble, to be *sustainable*: caring for bodies, people and claims in receptive ensembles of elements with a profile of sustainability that emerge as they interlock, in intra-operative frontier-relationships of moving & settling.

It is, of course, not enough to “add some art” to make this happen. Not all art-projects are motivated and driven by the ambition of *fidelity* that has been explored here. Not even all artistic research projects. The same being true of architecture, archaeology and anthropology. It must be motivated and driven by question, an epistemic query, the need and desire to know something.

That something that resists being known otherwise: imbued with this X-factor of things that can be known under the immersive and testimonial conditions of *wit(h)nessing*. By themselves, science and philosophy do not depend nor rely on this basic condition. But they will benefit from the *cartographic inscription* brought by the datum: a sequel to Latour’s *terrestrial cartography*.