



Marcellin Jobard  
Belgian lithographer,  
photographer, inventor  
and journalist. Author of  
the [point d'ironie](#) ☿



See also [agnes b.](#) (1941  
—), Henry Denham (1556-  
1589), Alcanter de Brahm/  
Marcel Bernhardt  
(1868-1942),



— Philos. *Ironie encratique* V. la partie encycl.  
 — Typogr. *Point d'ironie*, Signe particulier, proposé  
 par Alcanter de Brahm, pour indiquer au lec-  
 teur les passages, les phrases ironiques d'un  
 ouvrage, d'un article.  
 — Encycl. Littér. *L'ironie* est, en rhétorique,  
 ou un trope ou une figure de pensée. Elle con-  
 siste, dans l'un et l'autre cas, à dire le contraire  
 de ce qu'on pense, de telle manière que le lec-  
 teur ou l'auditeur comprenne le sens caché sous  
 cette raillerie. « Bon après ! », « L'homme de  
 bien ! », en parlant d'un fripon, voilà la figure  
 de mots. La figure de pensée commence dès  
 que l'ironie se développe en une suite de pro-  
 positions ou de phrases. Tel livre de *Sargantua*, tel pas-  
 sage de la satire *Ménippée*, telle lettre de Voltaire, les

Point  
d'ironie.

What happens if you pay someone for an idea, and later give a small sum of money to do it—what happens to the money as the work is provided to realise the idea (as the work remains ostentatiously unpaid)? Could it be that this bizarre act reveals how the value of *money*, somehow, is *created*?

We could react on this idea as unethical, because this is how we think of *exploitation*. But what if the monetary system—whether *exceptionally* or *ritually*—depends on this sort of *transaction*, in *sustaining* and *containing* the value that we otherwise attribute to money. *Attributive* value creation.

Perhaps we from here could arrive at a broader understanding of how art works in our monetary system, which determines the workings of our economy (at this point, globally). What can be done, in way of artistic research, to deepen, broaden and disseminate this understanding?



Given that humans can work at redeeming their agency from its consequences and care for the consistency of their actions, the weight of their baggage—whether in depth, or in debt—will only increase with the work in time. Their work, if redeemed, will have carry a particular affective load: *value*.

When did the affordance of ‘value’ come about in the evolution of mankind? From the discoveries ancient art-craft in archaeology it seems that it would be the Neanderthals. That is, before the Neolithic revolution, or the emergence of polished tools: before the tasks of tools become more precise.

Let us assume, for a moment, that we have our sense of value from the Neanderthals, and that *money*—though shiny—is an unpolished tool; in the sense that it does not make whether its function is to tax the value of work, prized items or much wanted exchange. In regard of value it is *all purpose*.

At the opposite end of the scale we find the book. All its functions are specific: reading, looking and handling. In older times, library books apparently were used by lender who stole them, as candleholders but we accept this clearly on a humorous note. A book is clearly *not* for this.

But what is the function of money? Consider an initial episode of Mette Edvardsen’s living book project. At the ‘Great Public Sale of Unrealised but Brilliant Ideas’, her idea (and practice) of learning and delivering a selection of books learned by heart was up for bids at the Playground Festival.

Two institutions were bidding on the idea were the STUK art centre i Leuven and the De Appel in Amsterdam. The STUK ended up with the highest bid (€ 1.400). The buyer later contacted Mette Edvardsen and proposed 3 alternatives: **1)** she would do it, **2)** w/someone, **3)** someone else would do it.

This is how she opted for doing the project—an alternative with a small additional fee—and the activity was kicked off: *Time has fallen asleep in the afternoon sunshine*. They were paid a trick sum for the work. We must ask: did the work brought value to the money that they had received? Or, not?

As we interacted on the project in before, during and after the Artistic Research Week at KhiO, she had prepared some cards that she passed on to me after our public appearance together, as a contribution of hers—I think to my idea and practice of producing flyers: it contained the √-sign.

It was contained in a number of her cards, with a solo appearance of the sign—reference to [point d’ironie](#)—on one card. It’s claims overshadowed, or outshone, the rest of the stack. About 18 cards. The same number as the chapters in the book, that I had worked on with random/chance-methods.

It marks a linguistic value: irony. It means an ‘ironic point’—as when exchange occasionally starts to game: alternatively, it means *there is no irony here* √ No pun intended. Indeed, how can something be ironic if it is not dead serious? And this is the way we create value for money. Cash out.