A potato enters the *meantime*, floored. It is the same as otherwise. The first count is identity (I). Then something is coded as similar (II). Here, a silver-potato.

Analogy may be equipped with a *count* in the meantime, or what is regularly called the *liminal*. The [meantime](#) is the extended liminal, or—if you will—an extended "[doorpost](#)". It has to do with obviating extension in Spinoza's sense. What happens with the *particular count* that I want to discuss here is this: a new named count-as-one, emerges *from* the liminal/meantime. It features a phenomenological problem, since the meantime (according to the middle-out tenets of [anthropo-nomics](#)) is the *horizon*: so the appearance of *a new named count-as-one* is on *that* horizon.

That is, the horizon—as has been previously discussed—in the middle, which in the liminal time-zone (or the meantime) is at the *centre* (which it is otherwise *not*, once it has been disseminated). The meantime is the time of the [mousetrap](#): 'the play within a play'. Its work is to model a new mousetrap and *then* exit. The first step (**I**) is to identify and display an item which is the same as *upstage* and *downstage* of the mousetrap. Essentially the same as in the play surrounding the mousetrap, or within which the mousetrap is placed. The name of this first count is (**I**) *the same*.

The next step (**II**) is to show and establish an element which is *similar* to the first. It has to be *established* because ideally this similarity is *new*: it is established by analogy. The mouse-trap is now revealed as a place of coding. The analogy is established with regard to some criteria that may either be expected to obviate or demand an explanation. But the element of the first count—

We move from the floor to a table. On the table there is a dish. This one is made from ceramics and a Moustier motif. On the plate, the two items—edible and silver potato—are *different*.

as a whole, or as articulated [mereologically](#)—is established as the scale of the second analog element that is introduced in the second count. The name of the second count is (**II**) *the similar*.

Since the two elements now appear to be there on equal terms, we need an element to show that they are not. Which is done by presenting them conjointly, rather than merely juxtaposed. The third step there for is (**III**) difference. The item used to establish the difference constitutes the two as a set: the same and the similar. There is nothing there to identity the item introduced in the third step with the previous ones. Since it is established such that it is obviously different. The name of the third count is (**III**) the *different*.

Then there is the fourth count (**IIII**)—[Jodorowsky and Camoin's notation](#)—takes *off* from the meantime: the passage from being *in limine* to being *in medias res*. Passing the lintel and closing the door behind. Sealing the compound (**I-III**) from the outside. The name of this

count (**IIII**) is: off, exit or *seal*. The transaction between site and situation, in Badiou's terms, is consummated. The two last counts (**III** and **IIII**) move from the *elements* (introduced with steps **I** and **II**) to a dual aspect of the *set.* Aspects of *in limine* and *in medias res* that compute.

That is the *internal* aspect of the set, which is to *differentiate* between the elements (**III**), and the *external* aspect of the set which is to *assimilate* the set and its elements into a (pending) assign-ment (**IIII**). Which means that we have moved from a theory of the *sign* (whether Saussure or Peirce) to a model of *assignment*. Pointing to an ethical theory of value and meaning (Spinoza). A meta model of this general pattern of counting/naming is given by Marcel Duchamp, in many of his double-boxed works, and also by the external box addition that one finds in *archives*.

Here, Janne Camilla Lyster's Choreographic toolbox I is a case in point: in the present meta-model, her choreographic toolbox features the *internal* box—or, set—that serves not only to contain the variety of elements that make up the resources of the tool-box, but to *differentiate* them (the variety of its contents with the box makes up the *kit*). During the acquisition meeting with Arthur Tennøe this (internal) box was contained by another (external) box. This box was a provisional one, pending Janne-Camilla Lyster's signature of the acquisition document.

Which serves to demonstrate a moment of the compound archival artefact as a *mouse-trap*, a play within the play. That is, we do not simply exit from the external box, there is an intermediary external box: a liminal within the liminal. It is after the transaction is sealed (document) that the artefact is sealed (box). The document is constituted and authenticated as such by its being processed and ultimately acquiring its *own* box. That is, its place in the archive. So, the *archive model* iterates the model of the assignment: it is an analogue to the counts of assignment (**I**-**IIII**).

The reason why this model—and its theorising—is proposed as an *alternative* to semiotics and linguistics (whether structural or pragmatic) is that it explains/can account for how the process of *bisociation* is normal part of the developments in value and meaning, that we can at least find culturally inscribed into social processes engaged with learning (what we call *education*): that is, inscribing *creativity* (and *also* destructivity) into broad rather than exceptional cultural processes. Here the *external*/*material* level of meaning bleeds into processes we normally assign to *contents*.

Not taking this level of value and meaning into account (internal and external modes of the set) will result in *idealism* (one way or the other). Overlooking the bisociation taking place *between* the internal *and* the external set: here, bisociation is defined as *a blending of elements drawn from two previously unrelated patterns of thought into a new pattern*. The point being that bisociation can be creative, but *also* destructive. An example of this could be the impostor-syndrome, which results from *isolation*: that is, responding to the impostor syndrome by isolating *someone else*.

That is, basically *passing it on*: passing on, and thereby proliferating, isolation and the impostor syndrome (instead of getting it out in the open and letting it pop by exposure). It has a *viral* logic to it that are found in so-called *memes*, and is perhaps inherent in memes generally (for instances as used in alt-right milieus, where isolation and ostracising are linked). Hence a variety of tactics and repertoires that can hatch from the basic problem that one does *not* want to acknowledge and dismantle a situation with the impostor syndrome.

Here, the two potatoes and plate are covered with a scarf (which was used by my grandfather for walks): a disposable compound.

The creative alternative is accordingly to use the hatching of assignments in the meantime—the steps **I**-**IIII**—to enable and empower in trans-individual processes (such as learning and teaching). Which is also why learning and teaching—that is, the foundation of our *educational culture*—is political in a radical democratic sense: in the education of people to *citizenship*, as people 'who partake of the life in the city' primarily (and secondarily as subjects of a state). This is what art education equipped with the modelling power of the archive *can do*. Our errand with the meantime is to bring liminality *out* of the isolate, and develop a generative model of multiples that we call language, sign systems and art.