

16 Oct

Iconic shape

The shape of an artifact is the sum total of its predicates (attributes, materials, sizes, functions, analogies, etc). It is a resultant shape. It is an expressive shape; expressive of its attributes.

The alternative is to subordinate that to some other overall plan of shape; in which case it becomes "iconographic" (eg. woodworm disk)

The two can overlap in various degrees. In fact they always do; eg. the size is always that of the artifact, not of the animal model. The artifact always impose attributes on the sculpture, which is never made absolutely realistically. In fact there is no conceivable function for an exactly realistic sculpture.

So the iconography is always "applied". The iconography is always a predicate of the ^{artifact} object, which is the subject.

Reduced to 2 dimensions (Raven Screen), the artifact is somehow neutralized, so that the icon (Raven) becomes "subject" which can then have predicates. The further development grows on the 2d design (and can be transferred to some degree to 3d --- to those aspects of 3d which are parallel to 2d: line, ^{size} proportion etc.)

Reducing to 2d somehow allows the growth of a new level. The icon, no longer a predicate, can become a subject, which can take predicates of its own. The predicates are analogic. Analogue of what? not of

form (it is already taken care of), so of behavior. The shape of behavior. The idea that the shape of behavior can be drawn.

Two ways of drawing behavior:

- 1) path of action, relationships of parts
- 2) time-lapse, steps of development

Can show (1) and (2) in same 2d drawing (Raven screen), and 3d (Raven rattle), by having them as "parts" of the whole or of a new whole made up of a number of sequent parts.

Writing is always a 2d enterprise; never 3d. Letters or characters are always subjects which can take predicates (such as mutual interrelations).

What analogic argumentation can a 3d thing carry?