



Fig. 1—Fermentation in the production of plant-ethanol. Process whereby molecules such as glucose are broken down anaerobically. The technique is at least 10.000 years old.

In [WORKSHOPS](#) I attempted to put forth a *task*-list intended to provide a requisite variety for practitioners of *anaptúxis* to acquire a *model*-understanding of it. By model-understanding I refer to an understanding with an acquired/learned degree of control is added/joined to what you quite spontaneously feel *in your gut*. The model works *with* the gut-feeling to unfold an embodied sense of understanding (which both generates and partakes of *anaptúxis*). As a spontaneous *and* controlled process *anaptúxis* generates from *some* kinds of ‘communicative interaction’, but *not* all.

As a controlled *and* spontaneous process, *anaptúxis* therefore resembles fermentation. In our day and age, *anaptúxis* is being relocated and activated in new areas of the human life-form. Since the Neolithic revolution fermentation was produced and then sealed in containers (first in ceramic pots and later in a variety other containers). In modernity it was relocated unto the *psycho-somatic* realm: minds in ebullition, bodies in a havoc and psychoanalysis as the conjectural science (Lacan) of fermentation. In our day, the disquiet has moved *anthropo-ecologic*: featuring the [anthropocene](#).

The growing emphasis on the sensorial—under the present conditions—indicates that there is a work of reception that needs to be defined (and has been left pending). The work of reception is *not* productive, but *seductive* ([Baudrillard](#)): it harnesses ebullition to fermentation, by removing elements from circulation (rather than adding more of them). All *processes harnessed by cleanliness* are, in this sense, seductive. It *doesn't* mean that it is *not* polluting. It means that *controlled* working with the *spontaneous* elements in complex processes is established, fostering *refined* outcomes ([photogravure](#) could be an example of this). The fuzzy frontier of [industrial edition](#).



Fig. 2— the emergence of [precision fermentation](#) is ambiguous in terms of whether it is an isolating industrial turn, or it belongs to the wider context of agriculture. Like photogravure: was it industrial, or did it belong to the wider context of the arts? This is of some importance for understanding the concept.

The list of related tasks to access and partake of *anaptúxis* was the following: 1. read a book that really challenges you beyond your limit, but with the idea that it eventually will help you *articulate* something you already know; 2. stop working on *x* *before* it is finished, and find something else to work on that makes *x* stand out; 3. let the *truth* of *y* that you are *doing*, play out in something you want to *say*; 4. make sure that the *impact z* of your communication is incorporated, as a *material*, into your work; 5. try to establish the relation of *your* language to *your* name, in resemblance to *your* name in *your* unconscious; 6. try to keep your *blindness* and *paralysis* joined till the opening through which *anaptúxis* can unfold *and* explain conjointly. The list has been edited a little.

So the anthropo-ecologic fermentation has relocated to the *semiotic* and *agentic*. It entails a change in how the real and imaginary are “wired”: since it is not psycho-somatic as it used to, but environmental-embodied. If so, it is nature which is currently in need of therapy (with *anaptúxis* as the human scope in this

relationship). The way that we have reached this point may be confusing, since it is as accidental as it is unintended. Which is the change in how the symbolic *triangulates* with the imaginary and the real (cf, the Borromean knot). It flowers in the *proximal editions* stacking in the social media.

After Lacan's analysis of [cybernetics](#) as a technological appropriation the symbolic in 1955, it has since moved to become increasingly domesticated and eventually personalised: when it became within hands reach with mobile devices, humans did no longer have to go to special places to consult/study (not even walk from one room to the other, or across the floor of the living room). In sum, the symbolic is no longer a remote element in human life-worlds, but a [proximal](#) one which is available at all times: in fact, we do not have to move at all (save our hands and fingers).

But we have not stopped moving, of course: but any *real* destination is 1-n steps *further off* than our symbolic access. Which means that in the triangle between the *imaginary*, *symbolic* and *real*, the real appears in the *remote* zone (and has in this sense taken over one of the previous function of the symbolic... relative to location), imagination in *intimate* zone, and the symbolic has defined in the *proximal* realm. In sum, location has not only become *differently wired*—we have other protocols of locating ourselves/being located—but has become *something else*. We too change.

We are not exactly the same: the *species* is changing. Should we task ourselves to the challenge? At present we are likely in a unique position to consult/study the symbolic in its older forms: in archives, libraries, museums etc. Which in the Lacanian perspective has an almost *magnetic* attraction: given that any archival original—older than digital technology—will necessarily appear as a textbook-example of the relation between the signifier S_1 and the signifier of the signifier S_2 . The original being the *signifier* S_1 and the *signifier of the signifier* S_2 is the digital *replica* ([Eco 1984](#)).

The one S_1 being *remote* and the other S_2 being *proximal*. Which means that *anaptúxis*, in this case, unfolds *and* explains in the relation between the remote (S_1) and the intimate (imaginary) across the abyss of a ([Derrida on Truth in Painting](#)): “[...] would be deprived of that which in it plays with truth-effects. If the phrase ‘the truth in painting’ has the force of ‘truth’ and in its play opens onto the abyss, then perhaps what is at stake in painting is truth, and in truth what is at stake (that idiom) is the abyss.” The abyss that we cannot contain, but without which there is no meaning.

The task-list that I have edited above, is of a kind to settle—or, develop settlements—with *anaptúxis*, and acquire knowledge of a kind where keeping a *logbook* is interesting exactly for the same reasons that studying older generations of the symbolic are interesting, but then defining the realm of *documentation* in which performance becomes the instance of the *intimate* (rather than remote) *real*. That is, establishing a relation between S_1 and S_2 that crosses *through* us and *defines* us: *unfolds* and *explains* us. We [wit\(h\)ness](#) a pendular motion between remote and intimate of *anaptúxis*. It is rather a unique opportunity we have here: to hatch new practices of *industrial edition*.



Fig. 3—domestic fermentation (photo from Bente's fermenting [FB](#)). The popularity of fermentation in the DIY spirit, in people's kitchens, makes it part of the proximal zone (which it shares with mobile phones).

And we are working on it in the *learning theatre*. The tasks hands on with the *digital* mobile—unlike hand *made* logbooks—is inseparable from the occasion: in other words, it serves us the *illusion* that one is in ‘perpetual encounter’. As long as this proposition is a world unto itself that contains its own reality, it is an *illusion*. However, by making a *logbook*, and studying older generations of the symbolic, the illusion is *marked* by the real and is thereby transformed into *fiction* (by the exact procedure defined above). In the *learning theatre* the logbook is defined in terms of *separate* tasks, occasions and encounters. They articulate on the *backdrop* of where they seamlessly *assumed*: the foreground of mobile technologies where they are fused. Which brings up the possibility of new *assignments*.