

elo-Salon session 10 March 2020 9pm GMT

Notes, reflexions, digressions on *Extra-terrestrial rethoric* by Lily Robert-Foley.

Words are always “with”, never opposed, nor equivalent, a universe where everything always changes.--Is this change in the Humpty Dumpty, Lewis Carroll environs where we pay words every Saturday night to mean just what we want them to mean at the time? See

[https://sabian.org/looking\\_glass6.php](https://sabian.org/looking_glass6.php)

a reflexion on translation as a strategy ? a gymnastics, a danse? Or is it a cosmological act, opening up the infinite worlds ? also comprehension seems to need strategy in this text.

"The word “modulation” has been used in Translation Studies since the 1950’s to refer to the change in perspective that can occur during the translation process. However, if we trace this word back to its origin in a musical lexicon, we know that “modulation” is also a change in register and sometimes therefore, in order. One modulates from one key to another." So we are changing registers, we register the meanings. "we live on a sort of twisted braid, **blurring** from one to the other without even knowing it. "

*Rhetoric, in Alm and Kennedy, precedes language, and is considered a kind of “energy”. I am fascinated by this idea.*

If rhetoric is certain kind of "energy", what about language? Why isn't it "energy" either? And why? Isn't it?

I'm understanding the responses made as "translations" of the energy in response to the message sent. (written in the first minutes and translating the crux of the text?)

What energy is this? Is this the mass energy of the language itself, the energy from the speaker/interlocator/in between transactions?

What should I think of when there is talk of animal rhetoric? (excessive singing, roaring?) Is this excess of energy or of an animal nature of passion? "Of course the very notion of “passion” is an interspecies untranslatable—which, at least in this researcher’s humble opinion, is all the more reason to try to translate it. "

for me: "transmission of information"= energy always? or just in the context of this piece? always - when there is a movement, there is energy involved. Translation, modulation, metaphor - this is all about movement and transmission, therefore - energy Agreed.

However, I would like to delve into this a bit more. In the early 19th c., von Humboldt defines language as energy and I feel like this definition is discarded in early 20th c. linguistics, which instead focuses on language as matter. Although matter contains energy, this - well. this is

transferable. Matter can be also seen as extremely dense energy, temporarily calcified. Then it dissolves. Question is - can language be a bridge, a point / moment / node of transduction between matter and energy, back and forth? Yes. I agree. However, I feel like the energy as response to a communication that is discussed in this piece is in some ways outside of language. I'm not entirely sure why I think that. I'm thinking of it as a pre-linguistic energetic response. Agreed, for me it is a borderland, a kind of liminal space - I can understand that this IS a language but I have some problems with grasping how it operates. what it DOES, how it performs, it is kind of foggy. Yes I just calls and responses. Of course, I immediately think it is some kind of esp (extra-sensory perception), but that just may be because when I think of "energy," it is always dematerialized. Me, on the contrary - I think of energy as something tangible and material, as a different register of materiality maybe, different sort of physicality, a borderland again. But it also occurred to me that the musical language, the musical response sounds like the other side of language, the unjust side of language, like what is normally omitted - all the sounds produced by breathing and our respiratory tracts. Before we get into a further discussion of the "just" and "unjust" sides of language, I'd like to think about how each of us defines the encoded message sent from the extraterrestrials. For instance, I read the response as a clue to deciphering their language

or maybe it is language without progress as opposed to terrestrial language so strongly based on the idea of progress and linearity (in most cases) I'm reading and thinking about energy ;). I'm thinking how energy of reading and energy of this text is manifesting through what we're writing here. Yes! I feel like we are engaged in acts of "intercomprehension." Through all the calls and responses here related to those there. Yes! Switching to green mean exclamation! Ecstasy / energy of reading, co-reading and intercomprehension. co-creation?

Are we undoing prejudice? What if you approached every conversation with the belief that you and your interlocutor speak different languages and fundamentally cannot understand one another? Might be a good idea - isn't that often the case in interdisciplinary groups? what is lost if we assume there is no shared text?

That would probably mean that the basics of comprehension would constantly change, so there will probably be no message at all - just the two communicators constantly checking understanding . Yes! Exactly. It's not bad, I think. It is not bad at all - if we're in an exchange, we're already communicating. It is a semantically based meaning that might be escaping but by no means it is necessary for communication as such. Understanding could mean that we have found something too common to learn anything else from each other. So, if we could constantly keep certain misunderstanding without moving too much astray, that would be effective, maybe It now strikes me as odd that in most conversational exchanges there are so few points at which "understanding" or "intercomprehension" is marked explicitly. we mark misunderstanding, instead. Yes!

Does Robert-Foley send messages in response to the Extraterrestrial messages? **Good question! She should try!** Or we could?! (We will probably have to get the Avians involved). But what if we intercepted the messages and became the avians? We could be the aviators of our own extraterrestrial interactions.

Maybe it's about being responded, not responding as such - it's always desperate enough, I'd say, for there is always risk that there will be no response, or that the response will be unexpected, or too expected. "t much - I accidentally deleted significant trunk of my text here :- ( And possibly the other parts too....So there's another partner in this conversation, the digital textuality itself - protocols, code, miscommunications between servers and elements of the software These interrogations prompted our next transmission, in the face of a certain fundamental absurdity—namely, if we can not understand them, what reasons could we have to assume that they can understand us? But as the first message was motivated out of an absurd desperation, we had reason to believe that a second of this nature might likewise be successful, and indeed, it was.

I feel like the series of messages and responses that Robert-Foley records may be helping us trace the outlines of the phenomenon of communication, i.e., all communication is a series of responses attempting to restate or "decode" what it is that has just been said.

Wait? What prejudice? our pre-conceived notions of language or with each other (speaker and interlocutor? I'm quoting : "And if this were but a prejudice woven into the history of traditional linguistic discourse" Prejudice against motherese.

**"if the receiver does nothing, the message has no meaning".** If the receiver DOES nothing or says nothing or does not respond or if the response is not what the sender expected, but a choral response churned up in an intelligence alien and unfathomable to the reader? (not unfit hombre, which is what the spelling correction wanted, and which is funny, but simply not germane to the conversation..)

What language do the Avians speak and write? And are they always in the middle? Those Avians? That's why they are called "middle Avians." "As we know, the Avians claim to have been maintaining successful intercomprehension with the extra-terrestrials since approximately 1,000 BC in the Simian calendar, about 1,000 years after the start of the Avian exodus, exodus that began with the domestication of birds and continued well through the Simian middle ages." So we have a history of assuming inter comprehension and inter-cession.

"Are emotions, passion, matter? Are they as tangible, as "felt", as "real" as things or even as the sounds words? I think the Avains are that liminal translator--that chaos unknown in

the middle between the sender and receiver. ! :) There is this concept of "felt sense," and I can't remember the name of the person who writes about that, but that may be a useful term in talking about the rhetorical energy that precedes language

Language as matter--language as embodying possible worlds themselves: "Languages are already like molecules in a way insofar as each instance of a language, each utterance, each book, each letter written on a scrap of paper, each linguistic unit thought or dreamed of, changes its language imperceptibly, branching off into a new probability strand, creating a new universe. I would remind you that in the history of thinking on translation, language is a substance, and has matter." Thank you!

"The delay in obtaining a response is in part no doubt due to Simian arrogance, as Avian interpreters advised frustrated Simian researchers that scientific and mathematic formulas, such as those contained in the Arecibo message (the numbers 1-10; the atomic numbers of the elements found in DNA etc.) would obtain no response from the extra-terrestrials. " Yet further on, the Avians only respond to passion. I think this language as music or even the more-linguistic energetic response is at a liminal level--at the level of emotion, want, or need---yet is language the same thing as what is being conveyed? Is the symbol the symbolized thing itself?

Language seems to be self-refered, but is it self-conscious? Does it stumble at itself blindly, or does it look for a door of some sort out of certain urge to obtain meaning or recipient?

On a metanote: I see what we are doing here as an embodiment of a Reading Club: *"Thus the Reading Club manifests itself as a facilitator for a diffractive, distributed intelligence on-the-fly, creating text and relational patterns that do not depend on canons. It generates creative and unexpected "outcomes". These are, in my opinion, not so much the texts produced, as the "diffractive moments" experienced by the reariters.*

Which canons are implied? How different are they from relational patterns that are created on the fly? I saw the canons as the works of elit that we teach, that go into the New Media Reader, etc. I saw the on-the-fly as a way of creating text somewhat like we are doing now in the framapad? I wonder if all patterns aren't canonised in a way - even locally. We can start with canon, but can also end with it. Isn't the canon a power instrument? The idea is that canon isn't always out there, we are its source, maybe, due to our own need of comprehension, syntax and narrative. Narrative is a power instrument, I think

On yet another metanote: as we are faced to teach online, perhaps using framapad may be a

way to engage discussion within a classroom--and provide the notes and clay needed for their essays/responses--depending on the class type and aims? I think it is a great idea to use Framapad!

on another metatangent: I love the name "Outranspo" so craftily based on Oulipo...and the are musicians living in between and yet with (in) language...

Making other meanings that come out of the journey, the trans-position trans (e)l lat ion between the potential trans position ou oeuvre, works.

/// remarks during evaluation ///

we see ourselves as language. --language as constant decoding and encoding our feelings.

language is more being, all about shared spaces.

Will can be more important than reality, Science and philosophy ignores the will.

In this writing (framapad rearing), identity is in flux, not an object. This environment encompasses a wider space. We don't have to see things as we want them to be or we are planning to be.

silent jazz writing--it is a shared responsibility. You are not making an image of yourself, you are creating with others. We are riffing on what is going on, let yourself be taken somewhere else.

We can move forwards and backwards in the conversations. Some writing was context specific. We may not be able to reconstruct the actions--rather than the written record.

Does this tool correlate with the material that we are working with--as we are discussing a problematic communication? e.g., Ingmar Bergman, Max Van Soto --what problems can appear in the world where all people understand each other perfectly well? You keep doubting and questioning the line of communication--a constant checking and distending. How different our dialog is from the Foley-Robert text?

Not so different--it is a chorus, and we can not tease out the individual threads of the chorus.

I imagine something less orderly in these responses (the ones in Robert-Foley's text)--when I think about sound, I don't think about overly sound.

TO go back to the experience, it enacted what we hoped we could get in a session, experience in participating in collaborative writing. Excitement--people are interested in things you are interested in--exchanging topics.

this is low tech,, but also surprising, having access to the audio was unexpected.

Something that interweaves the nitty gritty of reading and feels like a revelation  
--sound works beyond the simply visual. These audio tracks are supposed to be read--they are  
out of the verbal world but are drawn into this verbal world. The narrator tries to make them enter  
the world of worlds

Maybe the narrator in the piece could sing instead of writing.  
Try to phonetically structure, to tie the phonemes to the symbols

The record is the intercession of fate.