Painting by Olav Hansson, 1782, Heddal. Photo: Erling Jensen. In the above painting the central ornamental column holds the the two situations in pattern. To the left, a man enjoying his beer. To the right two men fighting. We cannot know whether the two things happen at the same time—drinking and fighting—or, whether the one leads to the other. A third possibility is that the drinking is in progress, while the fighting is in future anterior. That in some time future/past two will have fought. We cannot know in which relation to beer-drinking, but we are led to think that there is some relation.

The first act of coding is finding an alternative to take physically *a step back*, to contemplate a work in progress: affording a shift of perspective to the future anterior mode. The point in the future/past where something *will have been* about to happen. A fictional take on the *work happening*, that differs from the work *in progress* as we are on the job. Both close up to the now, but not quite. But as they converge on the present, they will either cause a temporal collapse, or joined—the collapse anticipated and postponed—by a *name*: it is redeemed as it is called, which it will!

At some point, however, the relation between these *immersive* and *testimonial* modes is reversed: while, at the *initial* phase, working hands-on is immersive, stepping back then prompts a testimonial mode, the *final* phase of the work is marked by a *turn*. If a painting, the last act of giving the surface a coating of *varnish*, is a testimonial act (vernissage). While the immersive *modus operandi* is taken over by the work, as it takes one step back from the maker (when the work acquires what Walter Benjamin called the *aura*). Between the *initial* and final *phases* there is a *multiplication* of time-phases, and viewpoints.

Which means that the turning at which the one-step-off happens from within the work—and not the body stepping back—occurs through a generative process and is of an emergent nature. That is, of a nature to emerge. It appears *suddenly* as by an instantaneous shift, which is why it is a turn. Yet, there is a process leading up to it, as the work is evolving. This evolution can be documented. And this is what we have *logbooks* for. When and whether the said turn occurs, however, cannot be predicted from this. But it can be held in pattern. This function appears in the form of a special entity: the ornament.

The SWIRL signature expresses the ornamental function: one arc in progress, the other in future anterior. It does not close in on itself, but is open in both ends...

Archival research could be essentially of the same nature. The question left in suspense is not whether the turn will occur, but when: and also the aftermath, or the future, it is pledged to after it has occurred. In sum: does it assign, or does it assume? In this phase the creator will hold an identity by *proxy*: in anticipation and postponement of the said turn. Essentially a pseudonym. So the logbook and the pseudonym are topologically related. Like a fashion student—Margaret Abeshu—who, in this transitional phase, wore a green wig and was called Adriana. She gave no explanation as she was in character.

Here the provisional change of name and character is the way the fictional apparatus responds to what is coming, and in its consequences will be real. The point of resolution appears illusory at this stage: it is a world unto itself and contains its own reality. It appears a *utopian* turn. But when it occurs it features a *heterotopian* turn. At which point the question is whether it is upheld in violence—that is utopia in heterotopia—or, it is a hatching-bed for *assignments*: that the problem that is worked on is clear (or, clarified), invites solutions, and as such invites to move and gather.

When Margaret Abeshu donned her green wig and entered the Zoom session (this was during the pandemic) as Adriana, she did not take the regular step back to look at the work in her logbook as though it belonged to someone else. Instead she invented a *fictional* character that could be part of the action in its *current* state. As her research, design and critical thinking took off, started to live its own life and had traction in its ways, Adriana returned to Margaret. This is the point.

Also that her work with the MA got resolved in such a way she that assumed as little as possible, while being productive of assignments given a open attitude to tasks, occasions and encounters. A problem on journey with new assignments. Industrialism as the problem of colonialism, and its highjacking in techno, rave and futurism. Abandoning the future-without-alternative, for an active and sought indeterminacy between past futures and futures past. So, what happens to *modus operandi* after the turn? Well it continues to exist in the problem generating assignments.

Or, continues on that condition. That is, on condition of assignments notwithstanding whether they are commissioned/not. This is what distinguishes a *vocation* from a profession (which is the difference that makes a difference in our MA). The ways, burdens, tricks and turns of the expanded self is something to be accounted for at this point. Because the expanding of the *self*— what it can hold in pattern—resulting from what we call *education*, comes at a price. And our hope is, of course, that it can be positively assisted if our *knowledge* of it becomes articulate.

It comes from the experience of *mirroring* two chains of communication: one in *progress*, the other in *future anterior*; the one conscious and sustaining but shortsighted, the other expanding and cogenerative but blind. It is when the two are brought in correspondence—e.g. a crossroads —that the self is not only expanded, but articulates in ways with which we may acquire know-ledge through *experience*. Ornaments as varieties of *placemakers* in time ([chronotopes](#)) that set in *correspondence* two communicative chains happening: *in progress* and *future anterior*.

As it is about to *expand* the self will readily constrain itself with *alias*. That is, a character with a pseudonym that is simple to portray: whereby the enactment of the persona is a *character analysis* in performance, that also is an act of *portraiture*. Hence the intermediary, or *liminal* phase, of personal growth—expanding and articulation of the self—is a mode of the *learning theatre*, in which it turns to a distinctly *dramatic* mode. A phase of literary *elopement*, in which the creator becomes involved immersively in a creative process (which *otherwise* can be described and observed in analytic terms).

It is the nature of the self to be self-assigning. It is what we call "to be driven". The ornament is what invites a *fictional* investment in the *real*. It is *not* an isolate: it connects, *wanders* and involves shifting *ontologies* (the moving *ratio* between the virtual and the actual), and passes through the creator at some point, which we have attempted to converse with here. Otherwise, it is features as an affordance, in a pure state: which is that of the *special entity* in Felix Klein's transformational geometry. The function of which is to *preserve* the *properties* of a principle group as it expands. In this way, it holds in pattern as it *now* occurs.

In presenting her second logbook (BlackBook 2)—in the spring of 2021—Margaret Abeshu, chose to appear in her alter ego Adriana, wearing a green wig. As her research, design and critical thinking took off, had a life of its own and a traction in its ways, Adriana returned to Margaret.

It is a *wandering viewpoint* that multiplies in a creative process and that manifests in the logbook of which our BlackBooks are a case in point. These also serve to demonstrate that the expansion and articulation of the self, is an experiential domain. That is, with a fund of experience that becomes *readable* to others, in such a way that they can take it on and add it to their repertoire, though they have *not* done it before, provided that the *work* is put in.