

If we assume that the <u>wardrobe</u> and the <u>cabinet</u> are <u>not</u> worlds apart, but rather are <u>superimposed</u> we can inquire into the <u>unilateral</u> causation that keeps them <u>separate</u>, at one level, and <u>connected</u> at another. As the one can only occur as an <u>application</u> of the other, that can claim <u>unreliance</u>.

This *unilateral* dependency, or -complementarity, can *either* be ignored (and so lead to *ignorance*), or can be acknowledged as a *blind spot*. The proper of the 'blind spot' resides precisely in this: it is *blind*. If acknowledged, it will account for the *discrete* embodiments of the <u>carver and the scribe</u>.

Because it is *superimposed* it will also be intra-active. On account of their *proximal* engagement they will (blindly) *entangle*, which will *connect* them even as they are moved apart. In sum, the blind spot is *substance*: the *third mover* that engages *superposition*, *intra-action*, *entanglement*. Quantum.



Once *returned* to the scribe, the linguistic *task* comes with the inheritance from the carver. Which means that it has to be *direct*, or else loose that connection and fail. The language of *mallet* and *iron* does *not* look left nor right, but applies *directly* to the *task*: since the path *itself* is wayward.

But the groove of the text is *not* the same as the carving. Language, as evoked above, does *not* deliver a labour at the cusp of material and form, though it draws on it as an inheritance. Rather, it is the language of *substance*. This is unavailable to the carver because s/he stands in that space.

S/he can only do so much to check the *Riemenschneider effect*: the craft extending the commission—if reflected in the relation between the affordances of the material—is *mimetic* in that aspect. But as the authenitification of the idea *surfaces* during the work, it also affords some artistic *integrity*.

The *designer*, then, is the professional personification of a *surge* to *push* that limit. And the idea of *signing works*, which came about during the Renaissance, is in reality a design idea. Design in the Italian reception: *disegno* means *drawing* and *purpose*. Here gathered in the *signature*.

Generally speaking, writing needs *not* to be drawn. But the drawn *aspects* of the signature is what makes it *unique*. The purpose is to *appropriate* the work, at some level, even as—in the Renaissance—the bulk of art-work was *commissioned*. The signature therefore is *substantial*: it tends to substance.

But it *cannot* make claims on substance, it is only *vectored* towards it. However, what the *written language* of the scriptorium can achieve—once it has become *direct* rather than directive—is to prompt the signature *specifically*: a sign within the sign that brings *agency* to the semiotic entourage.

That is, a sign that is of *substance* insofar it performs and brings *agency* to a semiotic entourage of cultural signs: *they start to signify*. In the work of Riemenschneider with the furry Magdalen, the precedence of cultural representations of the *Wildermann* will summoned to signify in this sense.

Hence the Riemenschneider effect is *both* prospective *and* retroactive. But, as *received* and *processed* at the scriptorium, beyond the identification of the *specificity* of the signature—i.e., the *surge* of nature in the *motifs* of cultural representation, in the *woodparent* carving—there is nothing broad.

There is *no* general theory of the signature *beyond* the identification of its *specific* instances. Beyond that point, it can only be made *more* precise. In this aspect, the work of the scriptorium is the work of *precisation*. It involves the protocol of *doxa*: 1) finding [specific]; 2) composition and 3) assumption.

So, finding/identifying is a specific *instance* of a signature. Then working out a *composition* bringing its agency/performativity to *evidence*. Finally, *raising* it to the point of assumption. Composition and assumption are *precisations*. This shows that *assumption* and *opinion* simply *cannot* be conflated.