



Quite often the synecdoche is seen as a subcategory of the metonym. This handouts proceeds to demonstrate and argue the opposite. The two tropes—synecdoche and metonym—correspond to two different practices of naming. While the synecdoche names by presenting, the metonym names by representing. Hence they are ethically discrete. While representation can lead to violation, presentation is linked to care and to the exercise/development of judgment.

The handout on Hands is a survival-kit, featuring the connection between the hands and naming. But the difference between wording and naming—thereby introduced—has a greater potential of holding a future. Since the durability of names can be dormant or wake: more passive, or more active. Whoever wants to have a future, can simply not be too eager to own it. Having a future comes with a certain counenance: for instance, featuring in working-habits as a driving principle.

Names can be used to call something into presence: to conjure it, bless/curse it and control it. Naming can be used to bind, control and project the shadow. It has been used for this purpose for quite a while. So, it can be violent and charismatic in its application. That is, in the immediate—or, comparatively short—time range. But with the indicated working-habits it can be self-serving in a different sense than simply feeding the human ego. A difference that makes a difference.

The implicit choice being **1)** making the elements that determine the existence of past, present and future work together, or alternatively **2)** tear them apart. Putting in the work to make them work together, is what has been called 'working-habits'. It is connect with an idea of service,



Rosebud—the last utterance of Citizen Kane (Orson Welles) before he expires. Is it a word, a name? If a name, is it a metonym to qualify what his life was about? Eventually, the audience gets to know that the 'rosebud' determines something specific: what led up to it & came of it. A synecdoche.

because it is located at what, since antiquity, has determined ethics: the trans-individual level where what is good for me should be conjugated with what is good for for the collective/common.

In sum, the working-habits—preparing, noting and processing—are a signature, in Giorgio Agamben's/ Enzo Melandri's sense. A sign of signs: something remaining silent (like musical instrument) till played. It is a performative counterpart to good citizenship; defined as democratic political activism with/without the state. This may be of critical importance at a time when the state is being put into question by the alt right winds, that are currently blowing across the planet, by questioning the democratic state.

Meaning that instead of liberating ourselves of democracy—keeping the state (the alt right proposition) we must liberate ourselves of the state as a sufficient condition for democracy, as a necessary condition of democracy is good citizenship. To find an alternative

to the violence we have to determine an idea of *service* (non egocentric *self-service*) *that doesn't eat you up*. The subtext of self-annihilation is an archaic inheritance from the [Axial age](#).

So what is the nature and extent of work we have to put in *to do each our bit* of democratic citizenship? This is the question which we presently need to be asking. And developing, since the question at this point is dormant, or atrophied. Starting with the nature: if [Saul Kripke](#) is right about naming, it needs to be sustained by a [causal vector](#), [communicative interaction](#), or [rituals](#) that *reverberate* the name, under very [different](#) time-local conditions: e.g., historical epochs.

What is the needed work to do our bit to feed and keep the distinction between the name and work—or, naming and wording. The citation of preparing, note-taking and afterwork used to define needed *work-habits* so far, are linked to [desk-work](#). The question then is how these can/are [transposed](#) beyond the desk, in different walks of life (with their arenas, stages or situations). As 24/7 [consumers](#) we are sure to have abandoned this idea of *doing our bit*: at [home](#), or at [work](#).

And also outdoors and in the [streets](#). Should we move away from the [Heideggerian](#) care-in-being, toward a daily care-in-naming: using names to articulate something hitherto dormant, rather than resorting to calling people names (like they were things). Given that we want to determine by naming is specific, precision and uniqueness (rather than “being” in a general/generic sense). We are *not* here to [simulate](#), [substitute](#) and [erase](#) the intellectual working-habits in a desk-sense.

Rather we are interest in how they are integrated, seeking [sensorial cogency](#) as we [screen](#), [intercept](#) and [frame](#) matters at hand: that become *present* to us, in the sense that they are *named* (rather than cited to stand the existential trial of being). So, there is a loving care vs. care for violence we need to be able to [screen](#), [intercept](#) and [frame](#) at this point. And we need to *dock* our working habits to the realities, our current dealing with them, and their presence at the end of the week.

Accordingly, there are [two main directions](#) of naming: one that conjugates with a [causal factor](#) linked to the [event](#) that is named. The other, dropping the causal factor and reducing the name to the function of [rigid determinator](#) (such as invectives). The one operates according to the protocol of the *synecdoche*. The other to the protocol of *metonym*. The field which most readily lends itself to this sort of discussion—based on experimental propositions—has been the *art-field*.

It has a variety of talent at working on such discussion in forms of display where the [struggle](#) for wording and [assimilation](#) through naming, has been [tacitly assumed](#) name of the game. Tacit, because it would seem evident that it otherwise would have caught on much more. That is, if it hasn't it been on account of a reluctance to be associated with *design*. However, there is nothing to prevent design from passing on the torch. Which is the understanding that a *name* is *not* a representation, but a *presentation*. It is *the ontological operator*.



Orson Welles: “Actually, as it turns out, “Rosebud” is the trade name of a cheap little sled on which Kane was playing on the day he was taken away from his home and his mother. In his subconscious it represented the simplicity, the comfort, above all the lack of responsibility in his home, and also it stood for his mother's love which Kane never lost.”

Which means that a true ontology—if at all—has to be centrally concerned with a certain practice of naming, in which a sample of the *causal mesh* (up to, during after the event) is the productive link that connects the part to a whole: that is, the practice of the *synecdoche*. *It produces what it names*: which is why care of naming is presentation. The metonym does not have [nor](#) articulates this link. And so, a representation.

Because of the causal link the relation between content and container—that is of a nature to be worked up through an investigation—the notion of container can be replaced by that of *carriage* ([Bracha Ettinger](#)). The causal link is not a full cause but part of a mesh of causes: a multiple, assemblage, rhizome. Hence the transformation of metonym to synecdoche, is one from representation to presentation: from a rigid to a caring denomination, worthy of our work/attention.