



Metalepsis is regularly misconstrued as something of an *exception*, and the metaphor of the *extreme*: as a metaphoric relation occurs between a given content and the actual fact. A crying baby: *Cursed be the axe that felled the tree from which this cradle was made*. While underplaying its real instances.

Another related trend: professionals claiming expertise in *rhetorics* often underscore the difference between these two *separate* tropes—metonym and synecdoche. However, as they attempt to articulate the difference the synecdoche tends to be classified as a special case of the metonym.

What is presently claimed is that the synecdoche and metonym are conflictual, relative to human *interest* (a difference that makes a difference). In the last instance, metonymy upholds the labelling/branding; the synecdoche is a vehicle generating a wealth of *practice-based semiotic surplus*.



As it *mimes* its topic, the metonym becomes an efficient *labelling* agent. It also *separates* itself from the topic through the work of mimesis. On the other hand, the synecdoche features a *mirroring* mechanism that looks *within* the current context (sequence), and scouts *beyond* it (consequence).

It does *not* proceed by simple cut and paste—which is a mimetic gesture—since the elements transposed are *active*: that is, they contain a *gestural memory* in the repertoire of skills. That is, *patterned* performances that define a gross field of application. Which is how and why they can *move*.

They are interlocked with pattern-*perceptions*—and their chief brain location is likely the *cerebellum*—and together they form an *active model*: that is, the *behavioural* pattern of the performance, and the *pattern* of perception engage in a communicative correspondence: crossing over/splicing.

The crossover is docked to *detail*: the more the *performance* is detailed, the greater the demand on and potential of detail in matching *precepts* (between the the *sequence* and the *consequence*). Once there is a *specific* match of this kind **T₀**, then there are *two* precisations to triangulate.

The first *precision* **T₁** concerns the *sequence*, while the second **T₂** applies to the *consequence*. In both cases, precision *tests* whether the specific match still holds if made *more* precise. **T₁** and **T₂** are asymmetric. Precision does *not* lie in mining for more matching detail, but *different* matches.

That is, reflecting deeper aspects of the *current job* (sequence) with the [resident principles](#) of the alongside *context* (consequence). If specific correspondence is *spontaneous* it is a case of a *regular* synecdoche. If *precision* is brought to the job *and* resident principles, it is *designed*.

It is then readable to a *third party*. If sustained till the contents of the active model is caught up by the events, it is a case of *metalepsis*. Therefore there are two levels of engaging with design: the first level hatches a *3rd party readability*, while the second level hatches a *3rd party use-value*.

The first **T₁** entails that the *synecdoche* can be intercepted by a 3rd party, in her mind. The second **T₂** entails that a 3rd party can *extend* the synecdoche and add to its active lineage, as it were. It appears that Bruno Latour—in [After Lockdown, a Metamorphosis](#)—jumps *directly* to, and recommends, **T₂**.

The difference between anamorphosis (*formed again*) and metamorphosis (changed into *something else*) may lie precisely here: while 3rd party *readability* develops the *substantial* connection—our perspective shifts to the 3rd party, as we are in transit—3rd party *use-value* proceeds in the *first* tense.

S/he is on the job. And thereby has claimed some ownership, contributing and partaking of the *lineage* (Latour): knowing what is *upstream* and *downstream*. 3rd party readability, however, only partakes of the readable fact that someone *else* has been *working*. *Without* claims on ownership and lineage.