



The contrast between creative and dismal *natura* features in Spinoza's idea of *natura naturans* vs. *natura naturata*. We query the makeshift thrust of nature from *two* ends: the *surge* of assumption, the *trauma* of demise. And from *two* vantage points: the *cultural entrepreneur* and the *natural historian*.

While the role of the cultural entrepreneur is taken on by the *wood-carver* (Jørund Blikstad), the role of the natural historian is taken on by the *scribe* (Theodor Barth). These two theorising practices are linked to *disconnected* aspects of a *chest*: as a *wardrobe* (Jørund) and a *cabinet* (Theodor).

Across this *chasm*, they draw out some unattended aspects of *doxa*—i.e., the realm of *assumption* and *opinion*: common sense, knowledge, critique & common practice. They will also tease out the potential of the audience as a *third mover*, by engaging the attendance in tetra-groups with *simple* tasks.



Pawning the *craft* for the concerns of *political correctness*, while the resulting work carries the signature of the *artist*, has an *effect* on the order of the *finite* and the *infinite* under the seal of *language*: this *haunting effect* has been named after Renaissance artist [Tilman Riemenschneider](#).

The piece we have in mind is the assumption of [Mary Magdalen](#): a female figure—with the long hair one may read about in the New Testament—but also carved *furry*; and surrounded by seven angels w/*scales*. This surge of nature, or *animality*, occurred in the context of *cultural images* of the time.

There is no biblical references to explain the *fur* on Mary Magdalen's shape. However, there is a source of *lesser writing*—an edict and document from a scriptorium in Münnerstadt—*instructing* and *documenting* the *commission* from the city to Riemenschneider to carve the image *exactly* like this.

The woodparent carving of the *corpus*—uncovered by pigment—defines the *surge* of nature in the sculptural *material* itself: the surge of the cultural motif that features both in [earlier artworks](#) and [popular representations](#) in the *commission*, is thereby replicated by/*transposed* to the sculptural process.

That is, the craftsman thereby is brought to *authenticate* an idea that is *not* selected by himself. An artistic research PhD fellow—Jørund Blikstad—has examined the *craft* of woodcarving at the brink of *artwork*, from the position of a *designer*. A designer carving unto research, commissioned by the arts.

His work to carve the *feathering* of a peacock's rail is conceptually in dialogue with Tilman's *woodparent fur*. At the centre of the tail a conspicuous *hole*, which—held by the feathering—sticks out like a *protrusion*. What brings the feathering together, its *unity*, thereby is defined as an *absence*.

A *new layer* of this query, surges both in Tilman's and Jørund's work, as the hierarchy of the commission is turned *topsy-turvy* by conceiving art as a *first science* ([Laruelle](#)) and thereby in position to query the commission and the documents: the commission is—as it were—*returned* to the scriptorium.

By this we mean that *theoria*—in the etymological sense of an initiatory [journey](#)—is returned by the *theoros* (the traveller) to the scribe. In this *deconstructive* strategy the role of the scribe is to be *on the watch*, to remain *wakeful* and *receptive*. This role is Theodor Barth's in Jørund's project.

In this *reframing* of the theoretical enterprise—and practice—the roles of the carver and the scribe are *by no means* collaborative. They are divided by a *chasm*. To the carver the making-process is a *wardrobe* of possibilities, a cultural stock. To the scribe the making is a *cabinet* with an expanded field.

At a conference, the carver (Jørund) is cast as a *cultural entrepreneur* and the scribe (Theodor) as a *natural historian*. We would proceed to *define* and *enact* the *Riemenschneider effect*. Will expand the query by involving the attendance in simple exercises, involve it as a *third mover* and *conclude*.