

The transdisciplinary paradigm of the intermedial grammatology

[Orta düzey dilbilgisi alanlarötesi örnekler dizisi]

[Le paradigme transdisciplinaire de la grammatologie intermédiaire]

Sung Do KIM*

Geliş Tarihi (Received): 09.02.2024 -**Kabul Tarihi (Accepted):** 14.02.2024-**Yayın Tarihi (Published):** 30.04.2024 **Makale Türü:** Araştırma makalesi - **Article Type:** Research article - **Type de l'article:** l'article de recherche

Abstract

The study presents a comprehensive exploration of the transdisciplinary paradigm of intermedial grammatology. It critically examines the contribution of anthro-semiotic grammatology to our understanding of writing and graphic design, advocating for a methodological and epistemological pluralism. The work navigates through four main issues: establishing the methodological, epistemological, and ontological foundations of anthro-semiotic grammatology; exploring the practice of writing in the Far Eastern context, particularly through calligraphy; investigating the visual and graphic dimensions of Saussurean discourse; and addressing recent developments in digital writing. This exploration encompasses a diverse range of perspectives, including semiotics, linguistics, anthropology, and media studies. The paper challenges conventional notions of writing and introduces a non-anthropocentric concept of writing, highlighting the impact of digital technologies and AI on the practice and understanding of writing. Ultimately, it offers a novel approach to grammatology, emphasizing the importance of intermediality and cultural diversity in the study of written language.

Keywords: Transdisciplinary, intermediality, grammatology, semiotics, media studies

Özet

Bu çalışma, orta düzey dilbilgisi alanlar ötesi örnekler dizisinin kapsamlı bir incelemesini sunmaktadır. Yöntembilimsel ve bilgikuramsal çoğulculuğu savunarak insanbilim-göstergebilimsel dilbilgisi yazma ve grafik tasarım anlayışımıza katkısını eleştirel bir şekilde incelemektedir. Çalışma dört ana konu üzerinden ilerlemektedir: insanbilim-göstergebilimsel dilbilgisi yazmanın yöntembilimi, bilgikuramı ve varlıkbilim temellerini oluşturmak; Uzakdoğu bağlamında, özellikle güzelyazı yoluyla yazma pratiğini araştırmak; Saussurecü söylemin görsel ve grafik boyutlarının araştırılması ile dijital yazımdaki son gelişmelerin ele alınması. Bu araştırma; göstergebilim, dilbilim, insanbilim ve iletişim araçları çalışmaları da dahil olmak üzere çok çeşitli alanları kapsamaktadır. Makale, geleneksel yazma kavramlarına meydan okumakta ve dijital teknolojilerin ve yapay zekânın (AI) yazma pratiği ve anlayışı üzerindeki etkisini vurgulayarak, insan merkezli olmayan bir yazma kavramı ortaya koymaktadır. Sonuç olarak yazı dili çalışmalarında ortamlararasılığın ve kültürel çeşitliliğin önemini vurgulayarak dilbilgisi yazımına yeni bir yaklaşım sunuyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Alanlar ötesilik, ortamlar arasılık, dilbilgisi yazımı, gramatoloji, göstergebilim, media çalışmaları

Résumé

* **Corresponding Author:** Sung Do KIM, Korea University, College of Liberal Arts, Department of Linguistics, Korea, dodo@korea.ac.kr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4109-2218>.

L'étude présente une exploration complète du paradigme transdisciplinaire de la grammatologie intermédiaire. Elle examine de manière critique la contribution de la grammatologie anthropo-sémiotique à notre compréhension de l'écriture et du graphisme, en plaidant pour un pluralisme méthodologique et épistémologique. L'ouvrage s'articule autour de quatre axes principaux : établir les fondements méthodologiques, épistémologiques et ontologiques de la grammatologie anthropo-sémiotique ; explorer la pratique de l'écriture dans le contexte extrême-oriental, en particulier à travers la calligraphie ; étudier les dimensions visuelles et graphiques du discours saussurien ; et aborder les développements récents de l'écriture numérique. Cette exploration englobe un large éventail de perspectives, notamment la sémiotique, la linguistique, l'anthropologie et l'étude des médias. L'article remet en question les notions conventionnelles d'écriture et introduit un concept non anthropocentrique de l'écriture, en soulignant l'impact des technologies numériques et de l'IA sur la pratique et la compréhension de l'écriture. Enfin, il propose une nouvelle approche de la grammatologie, en soulignant l'importance de l'intermédialité et de la diversité culturelle dans l'étude de la langue écrite.

Mots-clés : Transdisciplinaire, intermédialité, grammatologie, sémiotique, études des medias

1. Introduction

The question immediately arises: what contribution can anthropo-semiotic grammarology make to the study of writing? My previous works set out to show what anthroposemiotics applied to the field of writing and graphic design can contribute in terms of the methodological and epistemological aspects of grammarology. In view of these objectives, my works are linked by four issues. Firstly, the aim is to build the methodological, epistemological, and ontological foundations of anthropo-semiotic grammarology by opting for a posture of graphic and scriptural pluralism to enrich fundamental knowledge of writing and to accommodate relatively neglected and recently emerging phenomena. Pluralism is used as an epistemological-ontological position for individual works whose readership will assess their scientific scope or power according to their critical reading girth, while the paradigm of intermediality or hypermediality can be seen as a methodological guideline.

What is the new research programmed in anthropo-semiotic grammarology to be carried out on the productions and practices of writing and graphics from a pluralist point of view? What is the methodological relevance of the intermediality paradigm for illuminating the metamorphoses of written language and its complex relationships with other media? The first category of my works addresses this fundamental task, while at the same time focusing on the critique of the conventional concept of writing and the conceptual renewal of this object, which is too often determined by a series of presuppositions firmly rooted in the phonocentric, ethnocentric and evolutionary visions that have marked or underpinned modern grammarology.

Secondly, the practice of writing in the Far Eastern context, by choosing calligraphy as a key area of this civilization to endow Western scholars of writing not only with an aesthetic sensitivity but above all with a spiritual, if not metaphysical, awareness of this major art, which corresponds to the quintessence of a civilization that had given primacy to writing since its distant origins.

In this new anthropological and even metaphysical perspective on writing, we would like to place two works devoted to the iconicity of Korean writing and to the highly varied graphic expressions of an illustrated book supposed to transmit Confucian doctrines to illiterate peoples by assuming a function complementary to written language. It should be stressed in passing that the paradigm of intermediality is an essential guiding principle for gaining a better understanding of the cultural and medial characteristics that run through these four studies dealing with the three main areas of East Asian grammarology: writing, calligraphy, and graphics. These works also suggest that the notions and categories of analysis developed in the semiotics of writing are effectively exploitable for a certain number of aspects - as is the case for the hypoiconicity of the morphological structure of Korean writing - but risk being inappropriate for grasping the cultural and metaphysical underpinnings of the scriptural action of this grammarological civilization in contrast with the West, which had given priority to the spoken word.

Thirdly, the aim is to shed new light on the visual and graphic dimensions of Saussurean discourse, as manifested in his pedagogical presentations and his personal and private reflections on the development of a general theory of language. Although these problematic risks appearing to deviate somewhat from the major axes of anthropo-semiotic grammarology, this section can be justified as an exemplary case of the interaction and complementarity of written and graphic language in the theoretical construction of scientific discourse, taking the visual discursiveness of Saussurean language as a remarkable example from the modern history of the language sciences. These three studies are the result of both qualitative and quantitative observations carried out on the Saussurean corpus. In this respect, the Peircian notion of hypoiconicity can be effectively

employed with relevance to reveal the power of metaphors and visual and diagrammatic images, which contribute to the poetic fertility of the didactic and theoretical discourse of the Genevan master. From this perspective, this work presents a grid for analyzing the cognitive support of diagrams and metaphors and the approach used in the theoretical construction of human language.

Fourthly, my grammatological adventure takes a forward-looking view by dealing with recent aspects of digital writing, and thus provides elements of epistemology and anthropology that are quite novel and radical. As the title of the section suggests, we have aimed to present a new ecology of this writing, which is causing positive but sometimes worrying upheavals on all scales. The first article, which focuses on the links between the new intelligent and augmented urban space and the adaptation of digital writing, sets out to develop a little-explored area that could be called the environmental history of writing and written information. In this respect, the notion of urban writing - public or exposed according to certain sociolinguists and paleographers - needs to be explored in greater depth. The second article, which discusses the disadvantages and counter-effects of digital technology, points to a crucial anthropological problem characterized by an unbalanced dynamic of memory and forgetting.

The Web is a mega-machine that cannot forget. By underlining the anthropological, political, and societal functions of forgetting, this article has sketched out a potential individual and collective drama arising from a society marked by a hyperpower and omnipotence of memory and a mechanical halt to forgetting, where it is hardly permissible for a more recondite community to forgive or be forgiven, insofar as forgiveness requires a specific form of forgetting. The scope and epistemological-ontological implications of the third article seem to be no less radical in the renewed field of contemporary grammatology, in that it attempts to deconstruct one of the presuppositions that all the disciplines of the human sciences share: that Man is a unique being capable of producing written traces. In fact, this article attempts to construct a non-anthropocentric concept of writing by recalling the emergence of typewriters and robot poets. In so doing, it touches on a thorny and controversial issue, that of the agency of writing performed by machines and algorithms.

2. The transdisciplinary paradigm of the intermedial grammatology

In presenting a summary of the central issues, the author of these lines has sought to make an explanatory assessment of each of the works, to specify the links that connect them to each other, and to suggest points for further study. We hope that this approach will give the book a unity that is not only thematic but above all epistemological. For more than twenty years, we have worked tirelessly, translated, and published on writing in general and on the cultural and intermediary specificities of writing in East Asia. It is worth recalling that during this period, the author of these lines completed the Korean translation of philosopher Jacques Derrida's monumental work, [De la grammatologie] (1967). Through these works, we wanted to bring about a change or a radical broadening of conceptions about writing in a comparative cultural perspective of the Far West and the Far East, and that of the intermediality of writing that this collection of his works is supposed to see being born, clarified, and then refined.

The title of this book includes two terms which, for reasons of understanding, need to be explained in advance. They are 'grammatology' and 'intermediality'. We think it would be useful to trace, albeit very briefly, an archaeology of this complex paradigm and notion, which encompasses a history of the various disciplines involved and the differentiated concepts of the two.

Grammatology is defined as the science of writing in general. The term was first formulated by the assyriologist Ignace Gelb in 1952, to postulate as its major object the scientific study of writing systems or characters. It includes the typology of characters, the analysis of the structural properties of characters, and the relationship between written and spoken language. In a general sense, some specialists also include the study of literacy in grammatology and, in fact, the impact of writing on philosophy, religion, science, administration and other aspects of the organization of society. In our view, it is worth mentioning at least eight disciplines or approaches that have helped to consolidate this paradigm. These are the disciplines devoted to the study of the universal characteristics of writing: philosophy, anthropology, literary criticism, mediology, semiotics, linguistics, history, and palaeographie. You will forgive us for giving an overview of this vast scientific landscape, whose agents do not recognize each other for the qualities and directions of their neighbors.

In the first place, it was Jacques Derrida (1967) who problematized this object in a new light, recontextualizing it as part of an immense project of deconstruction that he himself promulgated in his 1967 work *De la grammatologie*. Through a critique of Western phonocentrism, he reveals that the function of writing is not confined to reproducing the spoken word, but that the modalities of writing affect our ways of knowing the

world. From a grammatological point of view, in the Derridean sense, metaphysics is taken as a system of classification and categorization consigned to the invention of alphabetic writing. However, it is worth emphasizing the ambivalence of Saussure's conception of writing, as Testenoire points out in the following terms: From a grammatological point of view, in the Derridean sense, metaphysics is taken as a system of classification and categorization consigned to the invention of alphabetic writing. More specifically, Derrida severely criticizes the Saussurian position, which affirms the primacy of phonetic writing. In his view, the Genevan master belongs to the logocentric tradition that takes the written signifier as a derivative, as a second representation of a technical nature.

Modern anthropology, for its part, has made important contributions to clarifying the relationship between writing and ways of thinking. We need only mention three key terms from British and French anthropology: Jack Goody's graphic reason (1979), Claude Lévi-Strauss's writing lesson (1984), and André Leroi-Gourhan's graphics in general (1964). In his seminal work, Leroi-Gourhan presented the hypothesis of a mythologram independent of speech, as observed in prehistoric signs and Chinese ideograms. For Lévi-Strauss, access to writing implies domination by a class or caste - as he believes was felt by the Nambikwara chief whose "writing lesson" is recounted in his book *Tristes Tropiques*.

Jacques Derrida categorically criticises the Levi Straussian theory of enslavement through writing. Admittedly, the power of writing is linked to political *différance* (the hierarchisation of society). But political differentiation itself is linked to differentiation in general, i.e., to *archi-writing*, which is irreducible to class relations. Lévi-Strauss deliberately confuses law and oppression. Like Derrida, he relies on the myth of an originally good or innocent word that would suffer the perfidy of writing: concepts and values associated with a metaphysical theology. English anthropologists have endeavored to measure the impact of literacy on the understanding of social psychology phenomena, and to identify the specific role of writing - in comparison with orality - in human reasoning and logic in contemporary societies. In this anthropological approach, the famous work *L'Écriture et la psychologie des peuples* (Writing and the psychology of peoples) is exemplary in that the authors have attempted to establish a link between scriptural structures and the mentalities and ways of thinking of a people who have limited themselves to using a specific script over a long diachronic period. Semioticians have also taken part in this grammatological turn. The work of Christin (1995), Roy Harris (2001), Jacques Bertin (2005), Klinkenberg (1996) and Battesini (1997) should be mentioned in this paradigm of semiotic grammatology, which consists of redefining the written sign by making the scriptural autonomous. Christin's literary work can be placed in this field of the semiotics of the written word.

First, it should be noted that this discipline is closely linked to the linguistics of written language. For example, the work of a remarkable procurator, J. Anis (1983), combines these two approaches. He set out to develop a theory of writing by adopting both a semiological and linguistic perspective on the written word, and by reifying the visual and figurative aspects of writing. In this way, his work can be compared with the more radical theses of graphic representation promulgated by Christian and Harris, which consist in clarifying the development of thought through a construction of grammatological and visible space. Nevertheless, its aim is to rethink the relationship between oral and written language and the written representation of languages in the field of linguistics by postulating the existence of an autonomous grapheme. The fundamental difference between the semiology of writing and the linguistics of writing basically concerns the degree of autonomy of writing.

The work of R. Harris is based on this autonomist vision of writing in an integrative semiology which consists of encompassing this relatively neglected object in semiology and rethinking the profound reasons for its power. The ideographic thesis put forward by Christin, which points to the birth of writing in the image and asserts that its grammatological efficacy is at work thanks to the image. The autonomy of writing is further emphasized by other semioticians such as Klinkenberg and African script specialist S. Battestini, who assert that writing and script must be clarified in their relationship with the image beyond the confinement of their relationship to language. As for Klinkenberg, who defends a broader pan-semiotic vision in opposition to the stricter logocentric one, he joins this autonomist current by granting writing its own semiotic function and thus urging that it be freed from a representative vision of writing. According to his main thesis, this autonomy of writing is legitimized by taking its source in spatiality. He recently outlined his project for scriptology within this vision. Our first article in this volume is a synthesis of the fundamental debates in contemporary grammatology inspired by semiotics.

In this vein, it is also important to remember that one of the methodological and epistemological foundations

is Peirce's theory of signs. His famous trichotomy of the icon, the index and the symbol has been used very effectively to shed light on the semiological and typological structure of writing. Our study in this volume, which deals with the iconic features of Korean writing with reference to Peirce's notion of *hypoiconicity*, is a case in point. As for structural linguistics, in his most recent courses Benveniste approached the question of writing from the point of view of the linguist, but with anthropological insights, to examine the act of writing and the procedures for converting language into the image of language. In this way, he constructed a new linguistic problematic of writing, while rejecting the usual notions of writing as representing speech and being subordinate to it. Contrary to the Saussurian phonocentric conception, which postulates that writing is a system subordinate to language, he asserts that "the act of writing does not proceed from the spoken word".

However, Benveniste's project (1966) must be distinguished from the autonomous semiology of writing insofar as he specifies that his aim concerns the primordial link between language and writing. To identify the act of writing, Benveniste examines the different modes of graphic representation, going back to the origins of writing. His main interest here is in the procedures of conversion and transposition, given that the language-writing relationship is one of reciprocal conversion. Benveniste's statement that "language is suddenly converted into an image of language" confirms his semiological, or more concretely iconistic, position on writing in relation to inner language, not to the chain of discourse, which cannot be reduced to its glossical functions. In other words, Benveniste pointed out a semiotic parallelism between the representation of the iconic sign linking thought to its graphic materialization and that of the linguistic sign linking thought to its phonic realisation.

The question arises: was Benveniste inspired by Derrida's *grammatology*? Although he opted for a linguistic methodology, his reflections fall under the orders of epistemology, semiotics, and anthropology. When he questions the identity of language as 'a possibility founded in the general possibility of writing', the answer is affirmative, in our view as an assiduous reader of Derrida's work. Moreover, he has tried to shed light on the semiotisation of language through writing. Benveniste makes a change of episteme: writing semiotises language; language semiotises everything and semiotises itself through writing. There is no exteriority, but the structural visibility of writing gives voice and voice to the structure of language. But in this field, we must not forget the work on graphemics and orthography that has been accumulating over the last half-century. In this category, the work of N. Catach (1988) represents the phonographism movement, which considers written language to be a structural representation of spoken language by developing a coherent categorization of morphograms. It should be noted that these two approaches, semiotics, and linguistics, are intimately linked and it is exceedingly difficult to draw a dividing line.

We would say that this distinction is based on a difference of degree and not one of nature. Nevertheless, the history of *grammatology* must include the diverse approaches of Canadian mediologists such as Walter Ong (*Orality and Literacy*, 2014) and McLuhan (*La Gaxaxie Gutenberg*, 1962), and the most prominent media theorists of the digital era such as Flusser (2004), Kittler (1992), David Bolter (2010), Katherine Hayles (1999), Pierre Lévy (1990). These media theorists are all directly or indirectly part of this *grammatological* movement since media theory is primarily a theory of writing and its machines for these thinkers. McLuhan's thought, with its singular writing style, was one of the first scriptural theories. To appreciate the radical nature of Ong's approach in *Orality et écriture*, we need to look at one of the theses (Ong calls them 'theorems') put forward at the end of the book. According to which, thanks to writing "(...) it (the human mind) makes use of a deeply internalized technology, incorporated right into the mechanisms of thought. The mind interacts with the material world around it in a deeper and more creative way than we had previously imagined". In other words, this high-level thinking activity such as philosophy and logic requires external help such as this technology as part of the functioning of the mind, which has entered a completely new operating regime, represented by In other words, this high-level activity of thinking, such as philosophy and logic, requires external help such as this technology as part of the functioning of the mind, which has entered a whole new regime of functioning, represented by the invention of writing, the "technology of speech".

As for the eminent American scholar K. Hayles, who had spotted the mutation of literary and hypertextual writing in terms of the supports with which we write or the way we write, from the perspective of the digital impact on literature and the cognitive ecology of the media, she noted the material, corporeal and cognitive dimensions intimately linked to the material techniques of the text by playing on the form of her writing in the manner of McLuhan, and thus embodied her following thesis by inscribing it in the materiality of her own texts. Materiality of the artefact can no longer be positioned as a subspecialty within literary studies; it must be central, for without it we have little hope of forging a robust and nuanced account of how literature is

changing under the impact of information technologies.

It is worth pointing out the differences between her ecological position and those of other mediologists (such as Bolter, Grusin, Kittler, 1991) in their understanding of the nature of the medium. First, she rejects the determinism between technology and the body in favour of a cognitive assemblage of the body, the written word and technology, in representations, their meanings, and the possibilities of perceiving and acting. In her famous book *How We Became Posthuman*, which suggests a mutation of humanity towards a post-humanity, she asserted that our representation of the body is a production of the technology of the written word. Another great American specialist in hypertext, D. Bolter, has developed his theory of the remediation and transformation of writing space. According to this theory, a new medium incorporates the forms or technical modalities of pre-existing media without a radical break. He thus asserted that: "Hypertext in all its electronic forms - the World Wide Web as well as the many autonomous systems - is the remediation of print".

Bolter and his collaborator Grusin consider remediation to be a universal trait that could function and be observed in all types of mediation. On the other hand, he outlined several connections between literature and the digital and subsequently established semiotic and grammatological links between digital hypertext and hypertextual reading, noting that the digital is a new form of writing by constructing new spaces for expression and inscription of hypermedial traces (written text, visual images, sounds). Pierre Lévy joins this idea of Bolter by proposing his concept of dynamic ideography and a fundamental reflection on the iconic effectiveness of digital writing by exploring a neglected area of ideograms and bringing out all the symbolic resources of the icon. According to him, far from a periphery and a regression, this figuration is a projection of the hypertextual or spatial form of meaning in general in contrast to linear sequences. It thus suggests a link of co-presence and co-signification between the thinking trace (the brain) and the written trace (the palimpsest).

By going back through the history of human writing, he identifies the return of this iconic and ideographic writing as a crucial transformation of digital language which has produced various emerging modes of writing, and overwhelming interfaces and cognitive behaviors. Long before these theorists of digital language, the great cosmopolitan scholar V. Flusser was one of the first thinkers to take stock of the enormous anthropological implications of the digitalization of the world.

Indeed, he is a pioneer and a visionary in the thought of medialities, who succeeded in developing a synthetic and prophetic thought of the evolution of what McLuhan called "media" in the early 1960s. His essay, "Does writing have a future?" (1987) dazzlingly examined around twenty forms (inscription, notation, instruction, printing, deciphering, scripts, etc.) to help us follow the way in which alphabetical writing began by informing the interior of our civilizations, before to mutate into coding of programs which have been disrupting the very foundations of our institutions and our forms of life for several decades among the established folds that he identified, that of writing, by which he mainly designates the effort made for centuries to try to account for causal phenomena through the one-dimensional tracing of characters assembled according to an order linear. Writing establishes a "historical" regime by requiring our multi-dimensional and multi-causal experience to pass through the thread of a linear enunciation. This thesis reminds us of that of André Leroi-Gourhan according to which alphabetical writing which requires linearization, abstraction and phonocentrism has made a radical break with the multi-dimensional nature of the image Flusser recalls that this traditional mode to write seems to have no future since the information is now transmitted by other codes. Since the middle of the 20th century, the development of more efficient and ubiquitous computing devices has brought another profound withdrawal within programs associating the imaginative power of subjective images with the analog power of techno-images as well as analytical power linear writing. This prediction is similar to Pierre Lévy's theory of dynamic ideography. Friedrich Kittler, in his monumental work in contemporary mediology, analyzed how the appearance of new techniques for recording and reproducing reality put an end to the monopoly of printed writing, and thus brought about a reconfiguration of the grammatological ecology (its status, its objects, its practices, and its reception) at the end of the 19th century and the 20th century. For him, the investigation of literary practice amounts to rethinking writing as a particular medium, rearranged in a more complex and hypermediatic media system. In the genealogy of modern grammatology, belonging to the lineage of media theory founded by McLuhan, he analyzed how the generalization of the typewriter led in a shocking way the rhythm of the act of writing and its meaning with its technical devices. Consequently, Kittler identified the effects on thought of mutations in the inscription of thought by resorting to post-printed writing.

Finally, by affirming that human writing has become an electrical inscription engraved in the silicon of computers in the digital age, he foresees the end of writing and thus suggests the death of the author: "(...) even

if we don't want to admit it, no human being writes anymore". It would be incomplete if we did not recall the excellent achievements of the historians who have marked modern grammatology. I am content to mention four names: Roger Chartier (1986, 1996, 2001, 2009), Henri-Jean Martin (1988), Eric Havelock (1982, 1986), Philippe Artières (2013a, 2013b). In this historical discipline the positivistic and empirical works which have contributed to illuminating the history of writings and their origins up to their modern outcomes with a methodological-epistemological pluralism (epigraphic and phylogenetic, systematic, and typological, sociolinguistic).

Furthermore, in this line of the historical approach, we must mention the sociological and culturalist perspectives which aimed at the study of technologies linked to writing and reading, and they thus clarified the emergence of a consciousness written collective. It should be remembered in passing that these works of culturalist-inspired historians have been distanced or even separated from philosophical and sociolinguistic perspectives, by their sources, data, and methodologies of a different nature. Let us say that philosophy, anthropology, semio-linguistics, history have looked at their object in a different direction from each despite the common nomination that is writing Grammatology therefore has as its object the historical examination of the invention of a device throughout the spectrum of its manifestations: technology, institutional practices, and identity behaviors. We have combined Derridean intuition with these different approaches to writing to develop a more inclusive and plural perspective of the interaction between writing and our visions of the world. In this interdisciplinary paradigm, it is essential to recall the discipline of paleography which is the oldest field which has dealt with the most varied aspects of writing. Indeed, the first book whose title (*La Palaeographia graeca*) includes this term dates to the 17th and 18th centuries. It was signed by a great Benedictine scholar active between Bernard de Montfaucon in Paris in 1708, granting a new name to a science already known but still lacking its own definition. This is a prehistory of paleography. Bernard de Montfaucon (1655 – 1741) is a true pioneer in the study of Greek manuscripts. His methodological work, the "*Palaeographia Graeca*" (Paris, 1708), remains today a reference treatise for learning to read and date manuscripts. It also shows the historical approach that Montfaucon had towards books. In his exhibition *Printing and the Mind of Men*, a great scholar of this century, the typographer and typography historian Stanley Morison, presented Montfaucon's book as one of the greatest masterpieces of the 18th century.

It is obviously a task beyond the question to present the complete history of this technical discipline, textual and historical at the same time. We simply specify that it is a discipline which has allowed scholars to better understand the literary, documentary, and epigraphic texts of past centuries. It will suffice for us to recall that after the rigid constructions of the 18th century, the positivist science of the second half of the 19th century claimed to be able to provide very solid bases and well-defined tasks for our work of deciphering, analyzing, dating and location. Paleography is a historical discipline which studies the history of writing, particularly by hand, in its different phases: the techniques adopted for writing, the processes of production of written testimonies, its protagonists, its users, its products in their totality: books, documents, accounts, registers, letters, inscriptions, graffiti, et cetera. But palaeography is above all - or should be again - a historical discipline in its own right, which asks - or should ask - the fundamental questions specific to a true history of written culture, concerning the relationship between society and writing, between writers and readers, and the others, the illiterates, the role of cultural mediation specific to the semi-literate, the diversified functions of writing and the written word : in short, knowing who writes and why ; or again who can or must write and who cannot learn to do so; why were these texts written and not those; why do we write according to these models and with these techniques; know the geographical and quantitative extension of literacy and the socio-cultural characteristics of the writers, etc. In our opinion, the work of Corbeille is an example par excellence.

In the field of literary criticism of the post-structuralist movement, Roland Barthes (1953) must be considered an important contributor to this grammatological movement through a double contribution: his penetrating reflections on the nature of literary writing and his practice of random writing. and singular contrasted with his methodical and systematic semiotic work. His famous words degree zero suggest emptiness, absence, defect, lack. It should be noted that he borrows these terms from structural linguistics and Romance philology. Yet despite this borrowing, the concept of writing takes on a poetic and imaginative semantics by transporting it into a new topos. Barthesian writing has as its epistemological base the dimensions linked to writing such as morality and social production by criticizing the sacral, sacred, ritual orders and closure attached to writing: "(...) writing is therefore essentially the morality of the form, it is the choice of the social area within which the writer decides to situate the nature of his language". In short, the zero degree of writing in Barthes literary grammatology means the absence of this sacred order of written signs, which is to say all the established signs,

which determine literary writing. In his conception, it is a place where the distinction between the subjective and the objective is erased. In this semantics there is also a psychoanalytic idea such as the following remark: “Only writing can break the theological image imposed by science, refuse the paternal terror spread by the abusive truth of contents and reasoning (...)”. The famous “death of the author” proclaimed by Barthes suggests the death of the Father which he comments as follows: “What I reject in the author is the place of a property, the inheritance, the filiation, the law”. On the other hand, Barthesian grammatology joins that of Derridean which, while criticizing Saussurian phonocentrism, poses the hypothesis of the trace according to which the imprint is primary, it is a written trace, a signifier. Indeed, the grammatologist Barthes takes the same critical attitude to the logocentrism and ethnocentrism emanating from the alphabetical model by revealing an ideographic and corporeal dimension of writing. Here is a remarkable extract: “In truth, if we refuse the ideogram, it is because we are constantly trying, in our West, to substitute the reign of speech for that of gesture; for reasons which relate to a truly monumental history, it is in our interest to believe, to support, to scientifically affirm that writing is only the << transcription >> of articulated language: the instrument of an instrument; chain throughout which it is the body that disappears”. We find in this perspective a fundamental element to identify one of the essential features of Far Eastern calligraphy. The second section of this work is devoted to the spiritual and bodily dimensions of this major art practiced for more than three thousand years, which marks the quintessence of this civilization. In relation to this longevity of Asian calligraphy, it is interesting to note a chronological delay in the introduction of this art in its terminology and in its semantic scope. The word calligraphy was proposed by Henri Estienne in his *Treatise on the Conformity of the French Language with Greek*, published in 1569, with the following definition: “the art of properly forming writing characters”.

There is no need to present a conceptual genealogy of calligraphy in the West. It is nevertheless necessary to indicate a fundamental difference between these two civilizations. In the concept of East Asian calligraphy, the aesthetic and technical dimensions are in the background. The counter-writings traced by Barthes, in other words, these scribbles which correspond to the graphic, if not calligraphic, realization of the concept of trace. In any case, Barthes teaches us that calligraphy is writing. From this Barthesian break between the graphic line and the textuality, and the autonomy of calligraphy as a line in relation to writing as a representation of speech, it becomes possible to establish a parallel between writing and abstract painting, or abstract writing in the sense given by Klee (2004), and the semiography of Masson enlightened by the grammatologist Barthes. Finally, to end this story, it would not be wrong to mention the discipline of graphology which is defined as “the science of the physiological and psychological relationships existing between writing and the person who traced it.” (Deschamps, 1892, p. 5). According to the founder of this new science, the definition of writing as a cerebral product is inadequate because it does not capture the spiritual essence of the writer, the soul, by abstracting from the hand and rights. Indeed, for him, it is the soul that emits forms in a series of movements linked to graphic gestures. Any graphic form is not only inserted passively, but also participates in spatial symbolism by virtue of its specific modalities in this spatial inscription.¹

Describe and evaluate the functioning of writing from an intermediality perspective in the context of research into the intermediality of writing, the way of understanding the nature and uses of writing can be located on a continuum ranging from normative documents in situations inducing scriptural forms and structures to variations in the most ecological situation. possible. This ecological and comparative approach, which is inspired by the paradigm of intermediality, refers to visions that are both different and complementary to current grammatology: in the first case, we seek to construct theoretical stumbling blocks through an evaluation of production and absence of production of a phenomenon of written language in a decontextualized manner, that is to say cut off from the medial environment and intermedial links, while in the second, the objective is to appreciate the way in which the scriptural producer mobilizes all his skills in the context of intermediality. It should be noted in passing that grasping this importance of the intermedial device joins that of the discursive anchoring of the linguistic productions of any speaker, which is brought to light by current research into discourse. Indeed, scriptural skills are mobilized differently by producers according to intermedial activities and culturally different areas.

The concept of intermediality the concept of intermediality that this work has adopted in a massive way involves a genealogical and epistemological complexity. There is no place here to explain it. Let us note in passing a conceptual complementarity between this concept and related notions such as intericonicity,

¹ Abbé J. H. Michon (1875), who laid the foundations of this new discipline. For an introduction to graphology, including a genealogy of the discipline, see the following references: Varinard (1884) and P. J. Seiler (1995-2000).

intertextuality, interdiscursivity, interartiality, even intermateriality. In this genealogical lineage, this paradigm can also be linked to the media archeology conceived and developed by Wolfgang Ernst (2003) and Jussi Parrika (2012).

It is enough to recall the theoretical sources which contributed to the development of this paradigm: Bakhtin, Kristeva, Barthes, Riffaterre, Genette, Müller, etc. which mark the theories of the text of structuralism and post-structuralism. Indeed, the notion of intertextuality was first theorized by Julia Kristeva (1967 then 1969) based on the work of Bakhtin who had reaffirmed textual openness. Thus, “every text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations, every text is the absorption and transformation of another text”. Barthes disseminated this concept in the human sciences by providing the following remarkable synthesis: “The text redistributes language (it is the field of this redistribution). One of the ways of this deconstruction-reconstruction is to permute texts, shreds of texts which have existed or exist around the text considered, and finally in it: every text is an intertext [...]. [...] Intertextuality, a condition of any text, whatever it may be, is obviously not reduced to a problem of sources or influences; intertext is a general field of anonymous formulas, the origin of which is rarely identifiable, of unconscious or automatic quotations, given without quotation marks. Epistemologically, the concept of intertext is what brings to the theory of the text the volume of sociality: not according to the path of an identifiable filiation, of a conscious imitation, but according to that of a dissemination.

In the field of literature, it is indeed a question of observing intermedia processes within texts. As for the study of relationships between the arts, Walter Moser (2007) proposes the term “interartiality” to identify the nature and scope of these dynamic relationships which are part of the larger whole that is intermediality. The importance of the latter is crucial both in the production of meaning and in its decryption, in its transmission and in its reception. Hence the defining and operational relevance of intermediality for grammatology to the extent that it considers any process of production and reception of written languages as a system of infinite borrowings from other media. In this complex relationship, a scriptural production consists of a connection between the different media of writing, inside and outside this scriptural structure, of previous and/ or contemporary media. It is therefore important to note this double spatial and temporal dimension which is revealed in the grammatology of intermediality. In this context, it turns out that the dimension of historicity is therefore crucial in work in the field of intermediality. For the operationality of this paradigm of intermediality, it should be emphasized that it makes it possible to identify and describe all the intermedia elements which make up the scriptural productions manifested. We are content to mention the power and effectiveness of this notion in the field of grammatology. Indeed, the reader will recognize this conceptual primacy to which this work has granted the status of a paradigm for a comparative study of the different traditions of writing and the different media to which writing refers in different eras. As everyone knows, this concept designates a plurality of theoretical approaches treating relations between media. It is appropriate to note essential factors in this paradigm in the context of the study of writing. Firstly, it emphasizes the links, networks, interactions, and convergences of media which concern writing. I will call this factor a relational parameter which makes us stop considering the media as isolated from each other.

3. Conclusion

It goes without saying that the nature and characteristics of these relationships which are constructed in the different media of writing vary according to the different cultural contexts. On this subject, for example, in the chapters devoted to Far Eastern calligraphy and the traditional Korean illustrated book, we have underlined a privileged link between Chinese writing and this major art of Far Eastern civilization as a medium which has had an immense impact on the mentality of the people of this cultural area and all artistic and visual sectors. Secondly, the paradigm of the intermediality of writing relates to the materiality of mediation. This question of materiality is constantly present throughout the entire course of this work, from the sensitivity of Asian ink and paper to the different digital and electronic screens. However, this material perspective is not reduced to an essentialist and determinist and therefore fixed materialism, thanks to the adoption of a semiotic and culturalist perspective. Third, by using this paradigm, it is possible to highlight the dimension of practices relating to writing. In this context, we have constantly discussed writing spaces from a transversal perspective. It goes without saying that this dimension touches on the lively subject of power which concerns the question of the economic and political regime. The question arises like this; who had and still has the privilege of writing? In this line of reflections, we presented a radical study by asking the question of the agency of writing by suggesting a non-anthropocentric conception of the practice of writing. In the era of artificial intelligence which has already made robot-poets emerge beyond simple typewriters, it is time to pose the possibility of

deconstructing a tenacious presupposition of modern and postmodern grammarology itself which consists of granting an exclusive status of the autonomous and creative production of written language for human beings.

The constitution of the corpus presented in this work could, I hope, offer researchers of writing – linguists, anthropologists, literary theorists, historians of writing and books, etc. – new possibilities for the study and description of typical and atypical writing and graphic design behaviors, whatever the chronological period and cultural air, and the media. Indeed, the collection provides resources on scriptural and graphic productions and manifestations in various contexts and genres. These enlighten the researcher, for example, on the types of grammarological strategies implemented by calligraphers from East Asia in situ or on the evolution of skills which was not observable in the traditions of Western grammarology. Thus, by using a diversity of situations, media, and production spaces (from paper to the electronic screen via printing), the grammarologist or linguist can understand the renewed nature and the new imaginations of this adventure. Fascinating about humanity. The use of corpora extracted from the grammarological tradition of East Asia, on the one hand and digital language phenomena, on the other hand, can therefore be entirely appropriate to bring writing specialists to understand the dimensions of intermediality and interculturality of writing. Indeed, the observation and analysis of the data presented here would allow them to better understand the very characteristics of written language, very often unknown and devalued by the reference to the phonocentric and ethnocentric norm itself.

Thanks to corpus studies describing processes of the intermediality of writing, the field of research on writing has gradually broadened by focusing on intermedial achievements in a manner parallel to the interactions of writing and picture. From this perspective, the use of the corpus can be used to build with writing theorists a process for analyzing culturally differentiated writing practices if it is considered as a means of measuring the adequacy of practices with the targeted objectives. This approach to identifying processes of support and adjustment aims to modify the representations and language practices of grammarologists with a view to establishing an epistemological dynamic in the dialogic process. This requires considering the different parameters at play, namely not only the subject and their cognitive and language abilities, but also cultural productions and their variations manifested in different space and time. These will constitute the material from which the theorist will “work” to appropriate written language. It therefore appears that the constitution of authentic data, the development of a methodology and the creation of specific analysis tools are necessary for the development of knowledge in broader grammarology.

References

- Anis, J. (1983). Pour une graphématique autonome. *Langue française*, 59 (Le significant graphique), 31-44.
- Barthes, R. (1953). *Le degré zéro de l'écriture, suivi de Nouveaux essais critiques*. Seuil.
- Battestini, S. (1997). *Écriture et texte: contribution africaine*. Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Benveniste, É. (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Gallimard.
- Bertin, J. (2005). *Sémiologie graphique: les diagrammes, les réseaux, les cartes* [1967]. M. Barbu, S. Bonin & G. Arbellot (Ed.). Mouton/Gauthier-Villars.
- Bolter, J. D. (1991). *Writing space: the computer, hypertext, and the history of writing*. Mahwah (N.J.). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Catach, N. (Éd.) (1988). *Pour une théorie de la langue écrite*. CNRS Éditions.
- Christin, A. M. (1995). *L'image écrite ou la déraison graphique*. Flammarion.
- Derrida, J. (1967). *De la grammatologie*. Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Deschamps, L. (1892). *La philosophie de l'écriture : exposé de l'état actuel de la graphologie, avec une bibliographie générale*. Félix Alcan.
- Flusser, V. (2004). *Writings*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Gelb, I. J. (1952). *A Study of Writing*. University of Chicago Press.
- Goody, J. (1979). *La raison graphique. La domestication de la pensée sauvage* [1977]. (J. Bazin & A. Bensa, Trans.). Les Éditions de Minuit.

- Harris, R. (2001). *Saussure and his Interpreters*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kittler, F. (1992). *Discourse Networks 1800/1900*. Stanford University Press.
- Klee, P. (2004). *Théorie de l'art moderne* [1964]. (P.-H. Gonthier, Éd. and Trans.). Gallimard.
- Klinkenberg, J. M. (1996). *Précis de sémiotique générale*. Seuil.
- Kristeva, J. (1967). Bakhtine. Le mot, le dialogue et le roman. *Critique*, 239, 438-465.
- Kristeva, J. (1969). *Sèmiôtikè. Recherches sur une sémanalyse*. Seuil.
- Leroi-Gourhan, A. (1964). *Le geste et la parole, t. 1: Technique et langage*. Albin Michel.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1984). *Tristes tropiques* [1955]. Pocket.
- Lévy, P. (1990). *Les technologies de l'intelligence. L'Avenir de la pensée à l'ère informatique*. La Découverte.
- Michon, J. H. (1875). *Système de graphologie. L'art de connaître les hommes d'après leur écriture*. Au Bureau du Journal de la Graphologie.
- Ong, W. J. (2014). *Oralité et écriture: la technologie de la parole* [1982]. (H. Hiessler, Trans.). Les Belles Lettres.
- Seiler, P. J. (1995-2000). *De Lavater à Michon: Essai sur l'histoire de la graphologie (Vol. 1, Vol. 2)*. Éditions universitaires de Fribourg.
- Varinard, A. (1884). *J. H. Michon, fondateur de la graphologie - Sa vie et ses œuvres*. Bibliothèque graphologique.