



The function of the map (above) is not only to provide the map of a city, but to show an itinerary from the big to the small pin. The route may require 3 bus changes (f.ex.). The *ornamental function* of the map is to allow the user to intercept, screen and frame the twists and turns of an urban landscape which is a conglomerate of bodies—human and non-human—beyond the body of the user. Today, however, the map often changes with the position.

We can discuss ‘ornamental function’ in ways that may enlighten what it means concretely for readability: a weather app—for instance one on the iPhone called *Weather*—will show you the weather where you are. If you move around a bit, not further than what you can reach on a short bike-trip, you realise that the forecast has changed. Not only for a couple of hours but for the entire day. In the city sunny all day. In the forest outside the city, rain and thunder. Then, one may ask: what is the use of a weather-forecast if it only flashes the place where your body is located at one time?



If the weather is *local*—as in the above example—the meteorological function, which is to make the weather readable, will *not* be functional if confined to the current position of the human body. To be useful it needs to be in the proximal zone: that is, conventionally defined, but limited to what can be reached say by moving walking or bicycling. Human beings are not biologically equipped to know the weather, in the meteorological sense of being readable within the action range available to us through various means of transportation/communication. It is only available to us through systematic observation and recording requiring a certain technical equipment.



What we mean by ‘ornamental function’ is that what is precisely *outside* the current reach of the body—but still within the *causal chain* of daily activity—can be intercepted, screened and framed. That is, assessed through the split perspective of an activity in *progress*, and the *future anterior* tense: what verbally will be expressed as (by that time...) s/he *will* have, *would* have. Two tenses that correspond with Henri Bergson’s notion of *actual* and *virtual* imagery. Which we in practice, stand the practice to *combine*. Which is essentially a game of *interpolation* and *extrapolation* that we do all the time.

Above: the emoji of an app called Weather. Below: the pin indicating your position. The app shows the amount of rain in %: the % of what? How wet the body, or how covered the sun?

The interval between ‘in progress’ and ‘future anterior’—which is constantly shifted and set to different widths—provides an elementary understanding of Saul Kripke’s ‘communicative chains’, in which the causal chains are *assigned*: they are not performed, since they are 1+ steps off, but *neither* can

they be assumed. In semiotic terms the relation between them is indexical. Since they operate in an actual/virtual *ratio*, the aggregate of indexes—as communicative chains—will feature an *ornamental* function: a *function* ascribed to the whole of the chain, allowing us to screen and frame what we intercept. A superposition which comes to joinery in the activity/act.

The notion of function does not articulate the body/hand ergonomic cont(r)act—the interface centred on the human body—but one that determines *and* is determined *by* readability. So, it is *not* first hand; but, in a certain sense, *second* hand. Or, rather second-to-hand (one step off the current perimeter). The function is to hold *in* pattern (which also why this function is specifically ornamental) what otherwise would be hidden in plain sight. An affordance to intercept (screen and frame) bodies *other* than human. Bodies constitute specific ways of being in the world.

That is, according to a set of premises that are embodied otherwise—according to their own resident principles—that we *cannot* appropriate, but still can intercept and read. Interception is an *inverted* form of readability. Because it is *not* about decoding. But features a kind of readability-by-coding in which screening and framing come together. Since screening is always in *progress* and framing is in *future anterior*, the readability by coding (or, interception) it has the same basic structure as the communicative chain. We do not operate it, but give it a second hand.

The affordance created by the ornamental function is manifested in the multiplication of viewpoints. So, the ornamental function is lending hand to the act of viewing, in a sense where acting in a certain way—finding ways and determining objectives—is relevant and supported. The communicative chain provides a sliding affordance to intercept intersections *between* pathfinding *and* goalseeking; entailed by the idea that we can and should act by design rather than by accident. And gathering the loose ends by shifting between immersive and testimonial modes.

That is, shifting between the levels where the chain is in progress, and the vantage points from where an act would/will have been *about* to be completed. The former being actual. The latter being virtual. And then levelling up to a point where the ensemble is readable as a map. Or, as already discussed, a weather-forecast. So, we have now parsimoniously *analysed* the type of relation suggested in the outline of the *concept* ornamental function. Which is to hold *in pattern* what otherwise would escape our attention (since unreadable): even though *there* in plain sight.

Readability by coding: following the joinery of pathfinding and goalseeking, in *communication chains* with shifting ratio in the actual/virtual *feed* that we screen and frame while we are on the job—whether it is work, everyday life or investigations—where are aided by artefacts incorporating the ornamental function: that is, media that have their own purpose, and cultivated with a design of their own, but will have had a second-hand function in situations that exceed them, but in which they can be counted on to give that second hand that yields orientation and readability.



With the chain of communication starting one step off we have an aid lending a second hand. With one pegged do the body we are in the logic of simulation, substitution and reassurance.

So, the functionality in ‘ornamental function’ *abandons* the handyman, DIY and ergonomic understanding of function. Or, the kinaesthetic operative mode of use, based on some form of body-contact. The ornamental function is not about the anthropocentric scope of bodies, but about the *coexistence* of bodies: ones that will hold and claim resident principles, and introduce them into situations where they orient and create site-specific affordances for the greater variety of objects (and products).

Which means that not all objects are bodies. *Contrary* to the basic assumption of physics, where *all* objects are bodies. The claims of astronomy on bodies is somewhat different: since the bodies of astronomy are specific and have names. They are unique in their progress in space. They are singular in their past anterior predication. In sum, we have a way of joining what we could call *reality in progress*, and the *fiction* of the same that will be marked by the real. This is the point and method of the ornamental function, as an agent of change.