Into which the sayable disappears
Dominikus Müller

7 × 5 lines
7 × 4 lines
7 × 3 lines

7 × ex ante
7 × 7 lines
7 × 6 lines

7 × 2 lines
7 × 1 line
7 × ex post

Intent. Experiment: starting point is the jointly made agreement to print the text "Into which the sayable disappears" in 69 segments (or miniatures) in the image section of the book *Masterplan\kino*. The number of segments stems from the number of illustrations printed in the "Plates" section of the book;

the same goes for the decision to place the text on the page opposite each image, hitherto left blank. The 69 segments of the text are divided in turn into blocks of 3, 9 times 7, and again 3 pages – a scansion that stems from the regular placement of ten black-and-white double pages in the image section.

The images printed on ten black-and-white, double-sided pages fall in a different image category than the remaining 69 images in "Plates". A further agreement: the 69 resulting miniatures should not directly reference the images printed on the opposing pages.

The texts should not interpret, regulate or otherwise affect the images in terms of mood. To achieve this, the entire text is written in seven thematic chapters without directly looking at the images. The length of these chapters is determined by number of lines, as shown in the breakdown given at the beginning.

Font size, font and kerning were not determined in advance, so one line in the German text corresponds to the standard line length of 55 characters (including spaces), in other words: a segment that is "7 lines" long does not necessarily appear as seven in the layout, and "1 line" does not necessarily appear as one line in the layout (although it likely will).

The seven chapters of the text are each divided into seven segments of equal length. The resulting 49 segments are mutually entwined. In other words: the first seven-segment block begins with a seven-liner, the last with a one-liner. The first seven-segment block ends with a one-liner; the last with a seven-liner.

The number of lines per page indicates segments that belong together. The "Intent" and "Afterimage" chapters are written without regard to chapter length and distributed in a linear way over the seven available pages for better readability.

Anagrammar. An anagram is a sequence of letters formed from a different sequence of letters through permutation of the letters alone. In other words, nothing is added or replaced; only pre-existing letters are switched. Anagrams express the contingency of meaning; they show what is presented to be one possibility among several, to which they in turn

are related as potentiality. These other possibilities open up the level of latency, that is, the level of what is hidden but not revealed. Latency is also a temporalising concept: that which is concealed in an anagrammatic transcription is already present but has not yet revealed itself; it will appear later. This "promise" of clarification keeps us interested. At the same time, it makes contingency bearable by postponing, shifting to the future, and hence pointing to an elsewhere in which another, new meaning will manifest: you just have to hang in there. Meanwhile an uncertainty is introduced. This uncertainty, in turn, enables a certain room for manoeuvre.

Total anagrams, or the complete transfer of a certain number of elements into a new context, are particularly difficult to recognise as such if they in turn result in meaningful connections, that is, completely dissolve into another state. In this case, one could say, the memory of the original state is actually just as completely

blotted out. In other words: the encryption encrypts even its key. Thus the anagram as such appears lost. Should one want to at least hold the possibility of a second level of meaning in the balance, thereby tapping the specific power of the anagram – the suggestion of what lies behind it, the assumption of a hidden plaintext lurking behind a given cipher text – it becomes appropriate to index the anagrammatic essence of what has manifested, at least to some degree. It is, after all, impossible to recognise a transcription as such beforehand, and it is only then that the anagram finds complete expression as a relationship to another state of the same material, to another meaning in the arrangement of this material, a parallel possible reading (although for that you would need to read through it more than once). Ultimately, the cipher text does not have to be decrypted into plaintext at all. And if it were, who's to say the plain text isn't yet another cipher text, i.e., itself a recoding in turn? Thus an anagram is above all one thing: obstructed access to an always only assumed origin – access that only becomes recognisable by its obstruction.

Parallelisms. The notion that two facts have nothing (meaning: absolutely nothing) to do with each other is possible only in theory. Even parallel lines intersect at some point, if only in infinity. In other words, straight lines are not really straight. Parallel lines merely appear truly parallel to one another only for a section of their length – and for viewers seeing them. In everyday speech, parallels are drawn when a person compares different situations with one other, such as different historical situations, for example, or developments in different societies. The drawing of parallels serves here, as so often, to create meaning and aid in explanation. When speaking of parallelism, emphasis is placed on the relationship between two developments in the sense of a similarity, not the fact of a constant distance between these two elements, as is also the case when speaking of parallelism. Because to say that something runs parallel

is to understand the relationship between two developments as a constant distance across different states. Things happening in parallel must happen independently of each other, otherwise the relationship that links them would be different, a causal one, for example, or one of temporal ordering, precedence or succession. It is only if seen from above – or more generally: from a third perspective – that parallel developments or movements can be recognised in different fields. Excursus: "parallax effect". The parallax effect is the phenomenon that when the viewer changes Position, objects in the foreground seem to move faster than those in the background. Thus parallax effects only appear in three-dimensional vision and require three points of reference: the object in the foreground, the background within which the object is set, and the viewer's changing position. The

movements of the observer, an object in the foreground and the background are understood or imagined as running in parallel, otherwise there would be no parallax effect. Small deviations in the distance between foreground and background can be safely ignored. They are hardly noticeable in practice.

Transparency and opacity. Some things are said directly, others are not. Disclosure does not automatically lead to more transparency. On the contrary, disclosure can just as easily lead to an increase in non-transparency. Often transparency is understood as follows: something behind the visible or immediately evident is exposed. The link between in-front-of and behind is usually understood to be causal: in the moment of creating transparency, the front element appears as something that conceals, obscures; the back element as the "real reason" or the explanation for the front element. And yet this linking – or the classification into "in-front-of" and "behind" – is in turn an explainable-making and meaningful interpretation of two things present simultaneously. Regarded pragmatically, transparency initially refers to the showing of as many elements and levels as possible, without linking them causally, temporally or spatially. Possible links can be as conducive to non-transparency as they are to transparency.

Accordingly, the demand for transparency can also be understood as meaning not only making the relevant elements visible, but also presenting them as contingent in their linkage. Another word for non-transparency would be "opacity". Here it is understood as a counter-concept to non-transparency. Even if both words denote the same circumstance – that is, the absence of transparency – opacity is used in a more normative sense here: as permitting obscurity, the letting-be of the inexact and vague, without this being immediately perceived as obfuscation, thereby already inherently bearing the impulse to "clarify". Opacity, understood thus, would mean a different word for the acceptance of that which is presented and can never be fully elucidated.

Gradual, substantial. There are no substantial differences. There are, however, gradual differences that are labelled substantial after the fact. Hard separations and categorical distinctions are always the result of more or less conscious cuts. If something appears to be substantially different, then it is made substantially different. In other words: substantial differences are deparadoxations of the simultaneous presence of different states. The division into separate entities is indispensable for the introduction of narrative, so it serves a purpose. It also creates identity.

Deparadoxation means: introduction of a selective blindness – whether via distortion correction on the time axis (before-after) or spatial arrangements (inside-outside). You distribute different aggregate states

of one and the same fact and put it into various contexts. These contexts (that is, relationships) suggest fractures where a continuum is actually located. If you switch to the internal perspective, substantial difference appears as a moment of insight into the fact that a certain degree of saturation is gradually achieved in dealing with a certain thing, a saturation that can no longer be described with familiar vocabulary. Anyway: ultimately, the question of substance is one of the describability of differences. Such observations can always only be made ex post.

Flexible stability. In standardology, a sub-discipline of linguistics that deals with standard languages and standard varieties, "flexible stability" refers to a basic requirement for a functional standard variety, that is, a standardised language that is obligatory for a large community of speakers. Standard languages are on the one hand characterised by a high degree of stability, which is to say they are strongly codified and obey a strict set of rules. This set of rules – spelling, grammar, and dictionaries – is used to determine right and wrong usage. A high degree of codification also permits a high degree of abstraction. A large capacity for abstraction in turn permits a greater applicability. Yet at the same time, standard languages are also characterised by a high degree of flexibility, which allows them to remain adaptable and capable of reacting to ever-changing requirements. Stability and flexibility are contradictory only at first glance and of equal importance for the functionality of a standard language.

Hedge expression. The predications known as "hedges" are used to introduce vagueness. Classic example: "A penguin is a kind of bird." Further examples of corresponding adverbs

or graduating particles would be, in English: "actually", "roughly", but also "strictly speaking".

Hedge expressions are a form of protection, as they offer a way to avoid clear classification and introduce

"soft edges". Creating space for interpretation, hedge expressions can be considered an invitation and opening for a possible

conversation partner: that which is presented as uncertain is up for negotiation. What's more, hedge expressions act

as filters, emphasising certain semantic components and allowing others to slip into the background.

Building from the background. One level (surface)

needs many layers. The specific inaccuracies

of each individual layer are cancelled out by

the inaccuracies of other layers. This is the

only way to attain the needed smoothness to enable

speaking from one level. Smoothness is an approximation –

and the smoother something seems, the more complex it is.

Afterimage. This text can be read in more than two directions. It can be understood as a formal experiment as to how text can be "extracted" from a set number of concrete parameters. The writing is then broken down according to the guidelines set out on the first pages, according to which this text was also "built". This perspective corresponds to a conventional reading direction, starting from the beginning.

Yet in its almost symmetrical structure, the text "Into which the sayable disappears" can also be read from the end: this perspective puts the spotlight on what it's all "about" – that which has been said, not the form of the statement, the content, not the formatting. Of course, such a sharply drawn distinction between the two registers can never quite be maintained.

Both levels determine one other, lead to turbulence, introduce inaccuracy, contradict or reinforce one other. Finally, a third reading (and viewing) variant could be named: a skipping back-and-forth that establishes connections between the text and image pages. This level is the ultimate, decisive level here.

Without the decision to place the written text in the image part of the book – and the resulting difficulty of coordinating the text and images in such a way that the text does not directly refer to them (but still runs parallel) – no encryption would have been necessary. Still, it helped to prevent thinking in direct terms as much as possible

without completely leaving the framework of the thematically relevant behind. Thematically relevant questions included those of accuracy/inaccuracy, readability, latency/evidence, autonomy and a resulting bearing capacity, as well as, more generally, the question of reference while respecting the freedom of that to which one refers.

The final decision on the specific topics covered in the seven chapters is – in hindsight – at least slightly open for debate. In some cases, the author had no other reasons than that he had become more or less accidentally aware of something at a certain time, remembered something he had already read or seen,

or had a feeling that this or that could fit "better" than something else. Beyond a certain commitment to a neutral and rather recitational style, there was an additional, rather self-reflexive and somehow diffuse guideline for the contents of the written text according to which, the form should reveal itself in the content, too, albeit to a certain extent indirectly.

Intent
Anagrammar
Parallelisms

Transparency and opacity
Gradual, substantial
Flexible stability

Hedge expression
Building from the background
Afterimage