

What can ANT still learn from semiotics?

Original

What can ANT still learn from semiotics? / Mattozzi, Alvise - In: The Routledge Companion to Actor-Network Theory / Blok, A., Farias, I., Roberts, C.. - STAMPA. - London : Routledge, 2019. - ISBN 978-1-138-08472-8. - pp. 87-101 [10.4324/9781315111667]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2986522 since: 2024-03-04T08:07:13Z

Publisher:

Routledge

Published


DOI:10.4324/9781315111667

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)



The Routledge Companion to Actor-Network Theory

Edited by Anders Blok, Ignacio Fariás
and Celia Roberts

The Routledge Companion to Actor-Network Theory

This companion explores ANT as an intellectual practice, tracking its movements and engagements with a wide range of other academic and activist projects. Showcasing the work of a diverse set of 'second generation' ANT scholars from around the world, it highlights the exciting depth and breadth of contemporary ANT and its future possibilities.

The companion has 38 chapters, each answering a key question about ANT and its capacities. Early chapters explore ANT as an intellectual practice and highlight ANT's dialogues with other fields and key theorists. Others open critical, provocative discussions of its limitations. Later sections explore how ANT has been developed in a range of social scientific fields and how it has been used to explore a wide range of scales and sites. Chapters in the final section discuss ANT's involvement in 'real world' endeavours such as disability and environmental activism, and even running a Chilean hospital. Each chapter contains an overview of relevant work and introduces original examples and ideas from the authors' recent research. The chapters orient readers in rich, complex fields and can be read in any order or combination. Throughout the volume, authors mobilise ANT to explore and account for a range of exciting case studies: from wheelchair activism to parliamentary decision-making; from racial profiling to energy consumption monitoring; from queer sex to Korean cities. A comprehensive introduction by the editors explores the significance of ANT more broadly and provides an overview of the volume.

The Routledge Companion to Actor-Network Theory will be an inspiring and lively companion to academics and advanced undergraduates and postgraduates from across many disciplines across the social sciences, including Sociology, Geography, Politics and Urban Studies, Environmental Studies and STS, and anyone wishing to engage with ANT, to understand what it has already been used to do and to imagine what it might do in the future.

Anders Blok is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Copenhagen. He is the co-author (with Torben E. Jensen) of *Bruno Latour: Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World* (Routledge 2011) and the co-editor (with Ignacio Fariás) of *Urban Cosmopolitics: Agencements, Assemblies, Atmospheres* (Routledge 2016).

Ignacio Fariás is a Professor of Urban Anthropology at the Humboldt University Berlin. He is the co-editor of *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies* (Routledge 2009, with Thomas Bender), *Technical Democracy as a Challenge for Urban Studies* (2016, with Anders Blok) and *Studio Studies: Operations, Topologies & Displacements* (Routledge 2015, with Alex Wilkie).

Celia Roberts is a Professor in the School of Sociology, Australian National University. She is the co-author, with Adrian Mackenzie and Maggie Mort, of *Living Data: Making Sense of Health Biosensors* (2019) and the author of *Puberty in Crisis: The Sociology of Early Sexual Development* (2016).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

The Routledge Companion to Actor-Network Theory

*Edited by Anders Blok, Ignacio Fariás
and Celia Roberts*

First published 2020
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2020 selection and editorial matter, Anders Blok, Ignacio Farías and Celia Roberts; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Anders Blok, Ignacio Farías and Celia Roberts to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-1-138-08472-8 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-11166-7 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by codeMantra

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>List of contributors</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xix</i>
<i>Actor-network theory as a companion: an inquiry into intellectual practices</i> Ignacio Farías, Anders Blok and Celia Roberts	<i>xx</i>
SECTION 1	
Some elements of the ANT paradigm(s)	1
<i>Ignacio Farías, Anders Blok and Celia Roberts</i>	
1 What if ANT wouldn't pursue agnosticism but care? <i>Daniel López-Gómez</i>	4
2 How to make ANT concepts more real? <i>Adrian Mackenzie</i>	14
3 Is ANT's radical empiricism ethnographic? <i>Brit Ross Winthereik</i>	24
4 Can ANT compare with anthropology? <i>Atsuro Morita</i>	34
5 How to write after performativity? <i>José Ossandón</i>	46
6 Is ANT a critique of capital? <i>Fabian Muniesa</i>	56
7 How to use ANT in inventive ways so that its critique will not run out of steam? <i>Michael Guggenheim</i>	64

SECTION 2

Engaging dialogues with key intellectual companions 73

Anders Blok, Ignacio Farías and Celia Roberts

- 8 Is actant-rhizome ontology a more appropriate term for ANT? 76
Casper Bruun Jensen
- 9 What can ANT still learn from semiotics? 87
Alvise Mattozzi
- 10 What did we forget about ANT's roots in anthropology of writing? 101
Jérôme D. Pontille
- 11 As ANT is getting undone, can Pragmatism help us re-do it? 112
Noortje Marres
- 12 Why does ANT need Haraway for thinking about (gendered) bodies? 121
Ericka Johnson
- 13 How does thinking with dementing bodies and A. N. Whitehead
reassemble central propositions of ANT? 133
Michael Schillmeier
- 14 What is the relevance of Isabelle Stengers' philosophy to ANT? 143
Martin Savransky

SECTION 3

Trading zones of ANT: problematisations and ambivalences 155

Ignacio Farías, Anders Blok and Celia Roberts

- 15 What can go wrong when people become interested
in the non-human? 158
Nigel Clark
- 16 What possibilities would a queer ANT generate? 168
Kane Race
- 17 Is ANT capable of tracing spaces of affect? 181
Derek P. McCormack
- 18 How to care for our accounts? 190
Sonja Jerak-Zuiderent

19	Is ANT an artistic practice? <i>Francis Halsall</i>	200
20	How to stage a convergence between ANT and Southern sociologies? <i>Marcelo C. Rosa</i>	210
21	What might ANT learn from Chinese medicine about difference? <i>Wen-Yuan Lin</i>	220
SECTION 4		
	Translating ANT beyond science and technology <i>Celia Roberts, Anders Blok and Ignacio Fariás</i>	233
22	What about race? <i>Amade M'charek and Irene van Oorschot</i>	235
23	What might we learn from ANT for studying healthcare issues in the majority world, and what might ANT learn in turn? <i>Uli Beisel</i>	246
24	What is the value of ANT research into economic valuation devices? <i>Liliana Doganova</i>	256
25	How does ANT help us to rethink the city and its promises? <i>Alexa Färber</i>	264
26	How to study the construction of subjectivity with ANT? <i>Arthur Arruda Leal Ferreira</i>	273
27	Why do maintenance and repair matter? <i>David J. Denis</i>	283
SECTION 5		
	The sites and scales of ANT <i>Anders Blok, Ignacio Fariás and Celia Roberts</i>	295
28	Are parliaments still privileged sites for studying politics and liberal democracy? <i>Endre Dányi</i>	298
29	How does an ANT approach help us rethink the notion of site? <i>Albena Yaneva and Brett Mommersteeg</i>	306

Contents

30	How does the South Korean city of Kyōngju help ANT think place and scale? <i>Robert Oppenheim</i>	318
31	How can ANT trace slow-moving environmental harms as they become eventful political disruptions? <i>Kregg Hetherington</i>	328
32	Is ANT equally good in dealing with local, national and global natures? <i>Kristin Asdal</i>	337
33	What happens to ANT, and its emphasis on the socio-material grounding of the social, in digital sociology? <i>Carolin Gerlitz and Esther Weltevrede</i>	345
SECTION 6		
	The uses of ANT for public–professional engagement <i>Celia Roberts, Anders Blok and Ignacio Fariás</i>	357
34	Can ANT be a form of activism? <i>Tomás Sánchez Criado and Israel Rodríguez-Giralt</i>	360
35	How has ANT been helpful for public anthropologists after the 3.11 disaster in Japan? <i>Shuhei Kimura and Kohei Inose</i>	369
36	How to move beyond the dialogism of the ‘Parliament of Things’ and the ‘Hybrid Forum’ when rethinking participatory experiments with ANT? <i>Emma Cardwell and Claire Waterton</i>	378
37	How well does ANT equip designers for socio-material speculations? <i>Alex Wilkie</i>	389
38	How to run a hospital with ANT? <i>Yuri Carvajal Bañados</i>	400
	<i>Index</i>	411

Figures

2.1	Pectin molecule	15
2.2	Flat-felled seam	16
2.3	Rebasing a branch	18
2.4	Salto	20
9.1	Signification models: a. Peirce, o = object, r = representamen, i = interpretant (my elaboration); b. de Saussure's ([1916] 1959: 115); c. Hjelmslev's (my elaboration); d. ANT's (my elaboration)	88
9.2	Examples of enunciations referring to the same narrative relations	92
9.3	Example of the use of semiotics categories and models (Akrich and Latour, 1992: 263). Here, the following models are used: 'AND/OR relations,' 'program' and 'anti-program of action.' The 'program of action' is the goal an 'actor' wants to achieve – in this case the hotel manager wants to have the keys back; the 'anti-program of action' is the opposite programme, in this case carried out by the other 'actors,' the customers, and consists in keeping the key. The diagram shows the way in which, for each new association (AND), the entire set of relations is replaced (OR) by another set	92
9.4	Enunciational dynamics in fiction and in science (Latour 1988, 14)	96
9.5	Comparison among disciplinary architectures: a. Greimas' (Greimas and Courtés [1979] 1982: 107 and 171); b. Latour's (2005)	98
22.1	Nanolab snapshot	236
22.2	Nanolab snapshot result 2	240
29.1	Factory, OMA – building site in Manchester (Authors' Own)	310
30.1	Trans Eurasian Railway Network map, Torasan station, 2007. Photo by author	323
33.1	Spectrum of automation	351
33.2	Automation functions	353
34.1	Sebastián Ledesma testing the ramps at Fraternitat Street. Picture CC BY Functional Diversity Barcelona commission (August 2011, used with permission)	361
37.1	The Energy Babble (© Alex Wilkie)	395
37.2	An exploded view of the Energy Babble (© Interaction Research Studio)	396
37.3	Pages from the Energy Babble manual showing the quick start guide for the device (© Interaction Research Studio)	396
38.1	The map is not the territory: planning the simulation centre (taken by the author)	402
38.2	Statistical map (public image, Puerto Montt Hospital)	404
38.3	Clinical map (public image, Puerto Montt Hospital)	405
38.4	Nurses walk through the Cayenel neighbourhood (image taken by Maria Eleana Flores)	409

Contributors

Kristin Asdal is a Professor at TIK Center for Technology, Innovation and Culture at the University of Oslo. She has published widely across science and technology studies (STS), environmental studies and political and social theory. A key concern in her work is method issues in STS and beyond and she has co-edited several books and special issues on the subject. Her recent publications include *Humans, Animals and Biopolitics: The More than Human Condition* (co-edited with Tone Druglitrø and Steve Hinchliffe; Routledge 2017).

Yuri Carvajal Bañados was born in Valparaíso, Chile, in 1961. He studied at the University of Chile, Valparaíso. He was relegated in 1981, as a student opposed to the dictatorship, but then gained his MD in 1986. He was the Medical Chief in La Feria – public primary attention – in La Victoria (a lower-class township), Santiago during 1987–1993. He did a Master's in Public Health 1998 and worked as a Physician of Occupational and Environmental Health during 1997–2003. He became the Chief of the Llanchipal Health Service in 2003–2006 and then the Doctor of Public Health in 2011. He was the Editor of the *Chilean Journal of Public Health* 2011–2015 and the Director of Puerto Montt Hospital in 2016–2018. He is currently an Assistant Professor at the University of Chile and an Editor at Cuadernos Médico-Sociales.

Uli Beisel is an Assistant Professor of Culture and Technology at Bayreuth University (Germany) and holds a PhD in Human Geography from the Open University (UK). She has worked on human-mosquito-parasite entanglements in malaria control in Ghana and Sierra Leone and the translation of new health technologies in Uganda and Rwanda. Her new research is looking at trust in biomedicine and healthcare infrastructures after the Ebola epidemic in a comparative project in Sierra Leone, Ghana and Uganda. Uli's work has been published by *Science as Culture, Society and Space, Biosocieties, Medical Anthropology* and *Geoforum*.

Anders Blok is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark. He has published widely within science and technology studies (STS), urban studies, environmental sociology and social theory. He is the co-author (with Torben E. Jensen) of *Bruno Latour: Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World* (Routledge 2011) and the co-editor (with Ignacio Farías) of *Urban Cosmopolitics: Agencements, Assemblies, Atmospheres* (Routledge 2016).

Emma Cardwell is a Lecturer in Human Geography in the School of Geographical and Earth Sciences at the University of Glasgow. Her research explores the interrelationships between environment, materiality and knowledge practices, with a particular focus on the

production of food. Using theories from science and technology studies, political economy and feminist science studies, she examines processes of financialisation, market-creation, equality and participation in fisheries management and marine conservation; and the inter-relationships of agriculture, land, economics and biochemistry, via the modes and practices of crop nutrition and fertiliser use.

Nigel Clark is a Professor of Social Sustainability and Human Geography at Lancaster University, UK. He is the author of *Inhuman Nature: Sociable Life on a Dynamic Planet* (2011) and the co-editor with Kathryn Yusoff of a recent *Theory, Culture & Society* special issue on ‘Geo-social Formations and the Anthropocene’ (2017). Current research revolves around questions of how to think *through* the Earth while also decolonising global thought. He is working on a book with Bronislaw Szerszynski entitled *The Anthropocene and Society: Toward Planetary Social Thought*.

Tomás Sánchez Criado is a Senior Researcher at the Chair of Urban Anthropology of the Department of European Ethnology, Humboldt-University of Berlin. His work, at the crossroads of Anthropology and STS, experiments with forms of public and ethnographic engagement around urban and care infrastructures, and their technical democratisation through activist and pedagogic projects. He recently co-edited *Experimental Collaborations: Ethnography through Fieldwork Devices* (Berghahn, 2018, with Adolfo Estalella) and *Re-learning Design. Pedagogic Experiments with STS in Design Studio Courses* (DISEÑA, 2018, with Ignacio Fariás).

Endre Dányi is a Guest Professor for the Sociology of Globalisation at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the Bundeswehr University in Munich. Growing up in Budapest in the 1990s, he became fascinated with the dual transformation commonly referred to as the Velvet Revolution and the Information Revolution. In the early 2000s, in London and Lancaster, he was strongly influenced by ANT, exploring new ways of thinking about *the technical* and *the political*. In the 2010s, in Berlin and Frankfurt, he has combined these with other strands of critical thought, especially those associated with Walter Benjamin. Endre is currently working on his *habilitation*, provisionally titled ‘Melancholy Democracy.’ He is also busy co-running Mattering Press – an Open Access book publisher. E-mail: e.danyi@unibw.de.

David J. Denis is a Professor in Sociology at the Centre de Sociologie de l’Innovation (Mines ParisTech). He studies data labour in various organisations and explores maintenance practices, notably in urban settings. He is the co-founder of Scriptopolis, a collective scientific blog about writing practices (www.scriptopolis.fr/en).

Liliana Doganova is an Associate Professor at the Center for the Sociology of Innovation, MINES ParisTech. At the intersection of economic sociology and Science and Technology Studies, her work has focused on business models, the valorisation of public research and markets for bio- and clean-technologies. She has published in journals such as *Research Policy*, *Science and Public Policy* and the *Journal of Cultural Economy*, and she is currently preparing a monograph on the historical sociology of discounting and the economic valuation of the future.

Alexa Färber is a Professor of European Ethnology at the University of Vienna. She combines assemblage thinking and ethnographic urban research to explore the social implications of urban imagineering on everyday lives. Her recent project investigates the notion of the

Contributors

city as promissory assemblage. Before, she was the primary investigator for the ‘Low-Budget Urbanity’ research initiative at HafenCity University Hamburg (2012–2015). In her blog talkingphotobooks.net she explores the graspability of the city in photobooks and extroverted, shared reading. Her research interests include visual methodologies and ANT, historical dimensions of audit cultures, everyday representational work, dwelling and mobility.

Ignacio Farías is a Professor of Urban Anthropology at the Humboldt University Berlin. His research interests lie at the crossroads of urban studies, science and technology studies and cultural anthropology. His work explores the politics of urban disruptions, from disasters to noise, open forms of cultural and anthropological production, as well as participatory and pedagogical experiments with technical democratisation. He has co-edited *Urban Assemblages. How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies* (Routledge 2009, with Thomas Bender), *Technical Democracy as a Challenge for Urban Studies* (CITY 2016, with Anders Blok), *Urban Cosmopolitics: Agencements, Assemblies, Atmospheres* (Routledge 2016, with Anders Blok), *Studio Studies. Operations, Topologies & Displacements* (Routledge 2015, with Alex Wilkie) and *Re-learning Design: Pedagogical Experiments with STS in Design Studio Courses* (DISEÑA 2018, with Tomás S. Criado).

Arthur Arruda Leal Ferreira is a Postdoctoral Researcher in the History of Psychology from the UNED (Spain) and Janveriana University (Colombia), and is a Professor of the History of Psychology at the Institute of Psychology at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). He has recently edited the following books: *Psicologia, Tecnologia e Sociedade, A pluralidade do campo psicológico, História da Psicologia: Rumos e Percursos, Teoria Ator-Rede e a Psicologia* and *Pragmatismo e questões contemporâneas*. He has also contributed to the books: *Foucault e a Psicologia, Da metafísica moderna ao pragmatismo, Biosegurança e Biopolítica no Século XXI, Explicaciones em Psicologia* and *Neoliberalism and Technoscience*.

Carolin Gerlitz is a Professor in Digital Media and Methods at the University of Siegen and a Member of the Digital Methods Initiative Amsterdam. Her research interests involve among others data-intensive media, platform and infrastructure studies, digital methodologies, issue mapping, apps, sensormedia, quantification and evaluation. Before joining Siegen, she completed her PhD in Sociology at Goldsmiths and was an Assistant Professor in New Media and Digital Culture at the University of Amsterdam. She is the co-speaker of the DFG-funded graduate school ‘Locating Media’ and the deputy speaker of the DFG cooperative research centre ‘Media of Cooperation.’ She holds an NWO Veni grant for the project ‘Numbering Life.’

Michael Guggenheim is a Reader in the Department of Sociology, Goldsmiths, University of London and a Co-director of the Centre of Invention and Social Process (CISP). He works on disasters, buildings and food. He teaches mostly visual and inventive methods.

Francis Halsall is a Co-director of the Master’s Programs, *Art in the Contemporary World*, at National College of Art and Design, Dublin and a Research Fellow at the Department of Art History and Image Studies, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa. His research involves three main areas: (1) Modern and contemporary art; (2) Philosophical aesthetics; (3) Systems Thinking. He has published and lectured widely in all areas. He is

currently working on several projects under the broad heading of ‘Systems Aesthetics.’ More information at: www.alittletagend.blogspot.com.

Kregg Hetherington is a Political and Environmental Anthropologist based at Concordia University in Montreal where he also runs the Concordia Ethnography Lab. He is the author of *Guerrilla Auditors: The Politics of Transparency in Neoliberal Paraguay*, and the editor of *Infrastructure, Environment and Life in the Anthropocene*. His current ethnographic work on the relations between soybean monocultures and the regulatory state develops an analysis of regulation at the intersection of ANT, biopolitics and feminist STS.

Kohei Inose is a Professor of Volunteer Studies at Meiji Gakuin University, Japan. He has conducted ethnographic research on disability and public movement in Japan. His research interest includes disability, agriculture, development and regional history. Among his publication is ‘Living with Uncertainty: Public Anthropology and Radioactive Contamination’ (*Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology* 15, 2015). Currently, he is exploring the relationship between disability movements and economic development in Asian societies.

Casper Bruun Jensen is a specially appointed Associate Professor at Osaka University and Honorary Lecturer at Leicester University. He is the author of *Ontologies for Developing Things* (Sense, 2010) and *Monitoring Movements in Development Aid* (with Brit Ross Winthereik) (2013, MIT) and the editor of *Deleuzian Intersections: Science, Technology, Anthropology* with Kjetil Rødje (Berghahn, 2009) and *Infrastructures and Social Complexity* with Penny Harvey and Atsuro Morita (Routledge, 2016). His present work focuses on knowledge, infrastructure and practical ontologies in the Mekong river basin.

Sonja Jerak-Zuiderent is an Assistant Professor of Science and Technology Studies at the Department of General Practice at the Amsterdam University Medical Centres, Netherlands. Her overarching research interest lies in the question on ‘how to care’ in accountability and evaluation practices in healthcare and the sciences broadly defined; particularly in relation to the more neglected, socio-material aspects of ‘good(s)’ and ‘bad(s)’, studying the everyday marginalities that get produced. She has published on accountability devices in healthcare, like guidelines and performance indicators, on social studies of patient safety, is currently developing publications on trans* care in Argentina, ethnographically exploring ‘good science’ practices across and within disciplines and is finalising her manuscript ‘Generative Accountability: Comparing with Care’ (forthcoming with MatteringPress).

Ericka Johnson is a Professor of Gender and Society at the Department of Thematic Studies, Linköping University. Her research interests include the simulated body, medical technologies, pharmaceuticals and the production of anatomical knowledge about the (sometimes) healthy subject and body. She is currently leading the Bodies Hub, a collaborative research environment that explores tensions between the social and medical body. Her most recent books are *Refracting through Technologies. Seeing and Untangling Bodies, Medical Technologies and Discourses* (Routledge, 2019) and *Gendering Drugs. Feminist Studies of Pharmaceuticals* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

Shuhei Kimura is an Associate Professor of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Tsukuba, Japan. He has conducted ethnographic research on disaster in Turkey and Japan.

Contributors

His research interest includes disaster, infrastructure, temporality and public anthropology. Among his publication is ‘When a Seawall Is Visible: Infrastructure and Obstruction in Post-tsunami Reconstruction in Japan’ (*Science as Culture* 25(1), 2016). His current project addresses multi-temporal interactions between human and nonhuman actors in the post-tsunami coastal Japan.

Wen-Yuan Lin is a Professor at the National Tsing-hua University, Taiwan. He uses STS material semiotic approaches to explore emerging alternative knowing spaces and the politics of empirical ontology in medical practices. One of his current projects is exploring the possibility of mobilising alternative mode of knowing in Chinese medical practices to provincialise the frameworks of EuroAmerican social sciences. His webpage is at <http://cge.gec.nthu.edu.tw/faculty/wylin/>.

Daniel López-Gómez is an Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology and Education at the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya and a Researcher at the Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3) of the same university. He is an STS Scholar and Ethnographer interested in the study of care, ageing and disability, and of the emergence of grass-roots innovations in contexts of crisis and austerity.

Amade M’charek is a Professor of Anthropology of Science at the Department of Anthropology of the University of Amsterdam. Her research interests are in forensics, forensic anthropology and race. M’charek is the Principle Investigator of the ERC-Consolidator Project *RaceFaceID*, <http://race-face-id.eu>, a project on forensic identification, face and race. Her work has appeared in various peer-reviewed journals, such as *STHV*, *Science as Culture*, *Theory, Culture and Society* and *Cultural Anthropology*.

Adrian Mackenzie (Professor in the School of Sociology, ANU) researches how people work and live with sciences, media, devices and infrastructures. He often focuses on software and platforms. He has done fieldwork with software developers in making sense of how platforms are made, managed and maintained (see *Cutting Code: Software and Sociality*, Peter Lang 2006). He has tracked infrastructural experience (*Wirelessness: Radical Empiricism in Network Cultures*, MIT Press 2010). His most recent book *Machine Learners: Archaeology of a Data Practice* (MIT Press, 2017) describes changes in how science and commerce use data to make knowledge. He has a keen interest in the methodological challenges of media and data platforms for sociology and philosophy.

Noortje Marres is an Associate Professor and Director of the Centre of Interdisciplinary Methodologies at the University of Warwick (UK). She studied Sociology and Philosophy of Science and Technology at the University of Amsterdam, and conducted her doctoral research at the Centre de Sociologie d’innovation at MinesTech in Paris, on issue-centred concepts of participation in technological societies, in Pragmatism and ANT. She published two monographs, *Material Participation* (2012) and *Digital Sociology* (2017), and one edited collection *Inventing the Social* (with M. Guggenheim and A. Wilkie, 2018). More info at www.noortjemarres.net.

Alvise Mattozzi has PhD in Semiotics and is a Research Fellow in Sociology at the Faculty of Design and Art of the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano. He works at the crossroads of Science and Technology Studies and Design Studies, using semiotics as descriptive-analytical methodology. His main research focus regards the development of a method for the

description of the social mediation of artefacts, by recovering and expanding the *script* model as elaborated by Madeleine Akrich and Bruno Latour. He has used a revised version of the *script* model in research works addressing the use of artefacts by final users as well as in research works addressing designing practices.

Derek P. McCormack is a Professor of Cultural Geography at the University of Oxford. He has written about non-representational theory, affect, atmospheres and the elemental. He is the author of *Refrains for Moving Bodies: Experience and Experiment in Affective Spaces* (2014), and *Atmospheric Things: On the Allure of Elemental Envelopment* (2018), both published with Duke University Press.

Brett Mommersteeg is a PhD student at the University of Manchester in the Architecture Programme. His research focuses on Actor-Network Theory, ethnography and architectural projects. Currently, his dissertation follows the making of a building in Manchester, UK, called Factory, and traces the complex ecology of actors and their modes of relating through the design and construction stages. He has a recent publication about his dissertation in *Ardeth* entitled, ‘The Garden of Bifurcating Paths: Towards a Multi-Sited Ecological Approach to Design.’

Atsuro Morita is an Associate Professor of Science, Technology and Culture at Osaka University. His work concerns the travels of scientific knowledge and technology between Thailand and Japan, postcolonialism and Asianism in relation to the recent rise of Asian STS, and water infrastructures and global hydrology in the context of the crisis of climate change. His publications include *Infrastructure and Social Complexity* (co-edited with Penny Harvey and Casper Bruun Jensen), *The World Multiple* (co-edited with Keiichi Omura, Grant Otsuki and Shiho Satsuka) and *Engineering in the Wild* (in Japanese). His article ‘The Ethnographic Machine’ (*Science, Technology and Human Values* 39(2)) experiments with a notion of internal comparisons embedded in machines.

Fabian Muniesa, a Researcher at the Centre de Sociologie de l’Innovation (Mines ParisTech, PSL University, in Paris, France) since the mid-2000s and an ANT Practitioner since the mid-1990s, is the author of *The Provoked Economy: Economic Reality and the Performative Turn* (Routledge, 2014) and the co-author of *Capitalization: A Cultural Guide* (Presses des Mines, 2017). His past and current research includes work on the politics of valuation, quantification, simulation, automation and organisation, a series of topics he has been approaching from a constructivist, pragmatist perspective.

Irene van Oorschot is a Postdoctoral Researcher in the RaceFaceID project (PI: Prof. Amade M’charek). Having defended her dissertation on judicial and social-scientific ways of truth- and fact-making in 2018 (cum laude), she is currently focused on the mobilisation and contestation of forensic knowledge within legal settings, paying attention especially to the way relationships between individuals and populations are made and unmade within these practices.

Robert Oppenheim is a Professor of Asian Studies and Anthropology at the University of Texas at Austin. His primary work on the ‘ontological politics’ of development, heritage and place in the city of Kyōngju, South Korea appears in the 2008 book *Kyōngju Things: Assembling Place*. Other articles on place and space through an ANT lens appear in *Anthropological Theory* and the volume *Objects and Materials: A Routledge Companion*.

Contributors

José Ossandón is an Associate Professor in the Organization of Markets, Department of Organization, Copenhagen Business School. His current research focuses on two main areas. The first area is the organisation of markets. In particular, he studies expert knowledge and technologies developed with the intention to make markets to solve matters of collective concerns. The second is the management of households' financial economies. Here, he expects to help bridging between studies of mundane economic practices and analyses of the calculative devices produced by financial firms. He is an Associate Editor at the *Journal of Cultural Economy and Valuation Studies*.

Jérôme D. Pontille is a Researcher in the French National Center for Scientific Research and works at the Centre de Sociologie de l'Innovation (Mines ParisTech). His research focuses on writing practices, scientific authorship and evaluation technologies, the maintenance of urban infrastructures. He is the co-founder of Scriptopolis, a collective scientific blog about writing practices (www.scriptopolis.fr/en).

Kane Race is a Professor of Gender and Cultural Studies at the University of Sydney. Motivated by the capacity of bodies and pleasures to intervene in the disciplinary production of knowledge, subjects, technologies and forms of life, he has published widely on questions of HIV infection, sexuality, biomedicine, drug use, digital culture, risk and care practices. He is the author of *Pleasure Consuming Medicine: The Queer Politics of Drugs* (Duke University Press, 2009), *Plastic Water: The Social and Material Life of Bottled Water* (co-authored with Gay Hawkins and Emily Potter, MIT Press, 2015), and *The Gay Science: Intimate Experiments with the Problem of HIV* (Routledge, 2017).

Celia Roberts is a Professor in the School of Sociology at the Australian National University, Canberra. She previously worked at Lancaster University and was an active member of the Centre for Science Studies there for many years. She is currently working on health biosensing, stress and reproduction, and is the co-author, with Adrian Mackenzie and Maggie Mort of a forthcoming book entitled *Living Data: Making Sense of Health Biosensors*. Her previous books include *Puberty in Crisis: The Sociology of Early Sexual Development* (Cambridge, 2015) and *Messengers of Sex: Hormones, Biomedicine and Feminism* (Cambridge, 2007).

Israel Rodríguez-Giralt is an Associate Professor/Researcher at CareNet, Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3), Open University of Catalonia (UOC). His research focuses on technoscientific activism and new forms of social experimentation, mobilisation and public engagement, particularly in the field of social care and disaster situations. He co-edited *Disasters and Politics: Materials, Experiments, Preparedness* (Wiley/Blackwell, 2014).

Marcelo C. Rosa is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Brasilia, Brazil and a Researcher of National Council for the Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq). In the last two decades, he has led, participated and supervised research projects on landless social movements in the global south. The research has developed to a theoretical and methodological agenda on the possibilities of the Southern theories and existences to challenge the hegemonic social sciences. He is the Head of the Research Lab on Non-Exemplary Sociology (www.naoexemplar.com) and the Founder of the *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy*.

Martin Savransky is a Lecturer and Director of the Unit of Play in the Department of Sociology, Goldsmiths, University of London, where he teaches courses in philosophies of

difference, cultural theory and pluralistic politics. He is the author of *The Adventure of Relevance* (2016), co-editor of *Speculative Research: The Lure of Possible Futures* (2017) and editor of *Isabelle Stengers and the Dramatization of Philosophy* (2018). He is currently working on a new monograph titled *Around the Day in Eighty Worlds: Politics of the Pluriverse*.

Michael Schillmeier is a Professor of Sociology at the Department of Sociology, Philosophy and Anthropology at the University of Exeter (UK). He received his PhD from Lancaster University (UK). He had Schumpeter-Fellowship between 2010 and 2015 (funded by VolkswagenStiftung), is an honorary Senior Member of EGENIS, the Center for the Studies of Life Sciences, Exeter University, and the Co-Editor of *Space & Culture*. He has widely written on the eventful dynamics of the heterogeneity of societal orderings, outlining the relevance of embodied and affective relations, material objects and technologies. His research includes Science and Technology Studies, Dis/ability Studies and the Sociology of Health and Illness. His work is cross-disciplinary and links Sociology with Philosophy, Anthropology and Art. Publications include *Eventful Bodies: The Cosmopolitics of Illness* (Ashgate), *Rethinking Disability: Bodies, Senses, and Things* (Routledge), *Agency without Actors? New Approaches to Collective Action* with Jan-Henrick Passoth and Birgit Peuker (Routledge), *Un/knowing Bodies* with Joanna Latimer (Wiley-Blackwell), *New Technologies and Emerging Spaces of Care* with Miquel Domenech (Ashgate), *Disability in German Literature, Film, and Theater* with Eleoma Joshua (Camden House). With Juliane Sarnes, he has translated Gabriel Tarde's *Monadology and Sociology* into German.

Claire Waterton is a Professor of Environment and Culture in the Department of Sociology at Lancaster University. She uses STS theory and methods to explore some of the troubling consequences of contemporary systems of production, consumption and living. For example, the disposal of nuclear wastes, the diffuse pollution of soils and water, escalating biodiversity loss. She wants to open up new ways of knowing/feeling/connecting/making sense around these environmental issues and hence to find new ways of enacting nature-culture relations. She is the co-author of *Care and Policy Practices* (Sage 2017), *Barcoding Nature* (Routledge 2013) and *Nature Performed* (Blackwell 2003).

Esther Weltevrede is an Assistant Professor of New Media and Digital Culture, Coordinator of the Digital Methods Initiative at the University of Amsterdam and a Member of the App Studies Initiative. Her research interests include digital methods, platform and infrastructure studies, automation, apps, fake news circulation and software studies. In her dissertation on 'Repurposing digital methods: The research affordances of platforms and engines,' she has developed the notion of 'research affordances' to understand the action possibilities within software, from the perspective of, and aligned with the interests of, the researcher.

Alex Wilkie is a Reader in Design and a Sociologist at Goldsmiths, University of London, where he also directs the Centre for Invention and Social Process hosted by the Department of Sociology. His work involves experimental design and empirical research to explore social and technological future – making practices and more-than-human sociality. Alex's work cuts across and ties together science and technology studies, empirical philosophy, process theory and speculative reasoning as well as human-computer interaction, practice-based design research and design theory. He has co-edited *Studio Studies* (Routledge), *Speculative Research* (Routledge), and *Inventing the Social* (Mattering Press) and co-authored *Energy Babble* (Mattering Press).

Contributors

Brit Ross Winthereik is a Professor in the Technologies in Practice Research Group at the IT University of Copenhagen. Her research focuses on public sector digitalisation in Denmark, energy infrastructures, digital data and accountability. She has published widely in Science and Technology Studies and anthropology journals. Her book *Monitoring Movements in Development Aid: Recursive Infrastructures and Partnerships* (MIT Press, 2013) with Casper Bruun Jensen and her research on wave energy investigate lateral ethnography as a mode of analysis. She is a co-founder of the *Danish Association for Science and Technology Studies* (dasts.dk), and of the *ETHOS Lab* (ethos.itu.dk), and is heading the research project *Data as Relation: Governance in the age of big data* (2016–20).

Albena Yaneva is a Professor of Architectural Theory at the University of Manchester, UK. She gained her ANT training at *Ecole des Mines* (Centre of Sociology of Innovation) with Bruno Latour, Antoine Hennion and Madeleine Akrish. She is the author of a number of books: *The Making of a Building* (2009), *Made by the OMA: An Ethnography of Design* (2009), *Mapping Controversies in Architecture* (2012) and *Five Ways to Make Architecture Political* (2017). Her work has been translated into German, Italian, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Thai, Polish and Japanese. Yaneva is a Visiting Professor at Princeton, Lise Meitner Visiting Chair at Lund and is the recipient of the RIBA President's award for research (2010).

What can ANT still learn from semiotics?

Alvise Mattozzi

Semiotics, still

‘Still’ is the pivot, around which the question I have been asked to answer turns. ‘Still’ connects the past with present and, from there, with the future: It suggests that ANT has previously learned from semiotics and that it can possibly keep learning from semiotics.

Therefore, ‘still’ acknowledges a long-term relationship between ANT and semiotics. Such relationship has been frequently explored, reenacted and recalled by Latour and it has been sealed by John Law’s definition of ANT as ‘material semiotics.’ Despite all that, such relationship has been often overlooked, disregarded, forgotten.¹

Therefore, in order to answer the question making up the title of this contribution, I first need to recover the history of such relationship.

Semiotics, then

Semiotics (or semiology) is, from an etymological point of view, ‘the science of signs.’ As such, semiotics studies signification as the outcome of sign processes: Something, material, present to perception – the sound of a word, the coloured cloth of a flag, the shape of an emoticon, the look of a car or the cut of a suit – *stands for* something else, more immaterial, abstract and absent – the meaning of a word, a nation, an emotion, a lifestyle, a social class.

The first founder of modern semiotics, the American pragmatist philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce, thought the sign as a threefold relation (Figure 9.1a) among:

- an *object* or referent;
- a *representamen*, i.e. the actual sign – the configuration, which represents the *object*;
- an *interpretant*, i.e. the further configuration elicited by the *representamen*, usually intended as the idea created in the mind, but which does not need to be a mental representation.




Figure 9.1 Signification models: a. Peirce, o = object, r = representamen, i = interpretant (my elaboration); b. de Saussure's ([1916] 1959: 115); c. Hjelmlev's (my elaboration); d. ANT's (my elaboration)

Peirce's (1868) semiotics is a complex classification of signs, developed by considering the types of relations the three elements can entertain. The most famous classification is the one based on the relation between the *representamen* and the *object*, which can produce:

- an *icon* or *likeness*, i.e. a resemblance, as with a figurative images;
- an *index*, i.e. physical or causal relations, like a pointing finger or smoke for fire;
- a *symbol*, i.e. conventional relations, like the word 'dog' for the domestic barking animal.

The Swiss linguist and originator of structuralism Ferdinand de Saussure is the second founder of modern semiotics. Being a linguist, Saussure focused only on verbal language, considering it grounded in conventional signs, akin to Peirce's *symbols*. However, Saussure thought the sign as binary: A relation between a *signifier* – the sound of a word as perceived – and a *signified* – the concept recalled by the perception (Figure 9.1b).

Despite the focus on verbal language, Saussure ([1916] 1959: 16) acknowledged that language is comparable to other sign systems like 'the alphabet of deaf-mutes' or 'symbolic rites.' All of them are studied by 'semiology,' i.e. 'the science that studies the life of signs within society.'

Peirce's one is a philosophical semiotics aimed at developing a theory of knowledge, which could provide the rules for scientific inquiries, by considering which kinds of signs are used by scientists within their deductions, inductions or abductions.

Saussure's one is a scientific semiotics, aimed at providing a method for studying languages or, more in general, sign systems. Following Saussure's approach, linguistics and semiotics have been developed as methodologies providing terms, categories and models to describe-analyse² sign systems, as well as their specific empirical manifestations.

Semiotics: from signs to relations

All along the 20th century, various semiotics have been elaborated assuming as ground the sign and developed through various related notions such as representation, symbol, language, code, communication, etc. Within such framework, signs have been often reduced to what they represent, according to given societal, cultural or mental structures. Therefore, signs have been often reduced to their most de-situated, disembodied and immaterial aspects. Such approach to signs is clearly at odds with ANT. No wonder that 'semiotics readings' pursuing such dualist – material/immaterial-ideal – and transcendent understanding of signifying processes have been considered 'incompatible' with ANT (Farías and Mützel 2015: 524).

Nevertheless, such incompatibility is the result of a partial view of semiotics, based on a simplified and isolated conception of the sign, put forth and adopted, first of all, by many semioticians. Such conception of the sign does not, however, pertain neither to Peirce nor to Saussure, nor to some of their heirs. Peirce and Saussure developed their semiotics by addressing issues that take place beneath and above the sign. They indeed intended signs as mediating entities and mediation as a process, taking place through relations. Examples of mediating entities considered by semiotics can be: The *interpretant*, between *object* and *representamen*, within the Peircian sign (Figure 9.1a); language, between sound and thought (Saussure [1915] 1959: 112); *forms* between *substances of expression* and *of content* (Hjelmslev [1943] 1961; Figure 9.1c, see below), *enunciation* between *language (langue)* and *speech (parole)* (see below). These mediating entities not only allow establishing relations, but are constituted by relations: For Peirce (1898), the basic categories from which signs arise are relational; for Saussure ([1916] 1959: 122), in language 'everything is based on relations,' so that signification is never reducible to the simple coupling of *signifier-signified*, but it has always to be considered in relation with other couplings (Figure 9.1b). The latter approach has been radicalised by the Danish linguist Louis Hjelmslev ([1943] 1961), for whom signification is solely based on relations and relations among relations, i.e. relations among configurations of relations or, using Hjelmslev's terms, relations among '*forms*': A *form of expression (signifier)* and a *form of content (signified)* (Figure 9.1c).

Signs are then just the 'tip of an iceberg' and semiotics is actually concerned with the 'complex [...] work' under the 'tip' (Marrone 2002: 14, my translation), carried out by relations and mediations.

While signs, considered as isolated entities reduced to the immaterial representations to which they refer, can be of no relevance for ANT (Farías and Mützel 2015: 524), relations and mediations certainly are.

Relations have indeed provided the common ground for the exchange between ANT and semiotics. It is not coincidence, then, that ANT considers semiotics, not the 'science of signs,' but the 'science of relations' (Law 2002: 49).

What ANT has learned from semiotics

The ‘semiotic insight’ of ‘the relationality of entities’ (Law 1999: 4), according to which ‘everything in the social and natural worlds [is] a continuously generated effect of the webs of relations within which they are located’ (Law 2008: 141), is what, in general, ANT has learned from semiotics. As Annemarie Mol (2010: 257) acknowledges

In [d]e Saussure’s version of semiotics, words do not point directly to a referent, but form part of a network of words. They acquire their meaning relationally, through their similarities with and differences from other words. Thus, the word “fish” is not a label that points with an arrow to the swimming creature itself. Instead, it achieves sense through its contrast with “meat”, its association with “gills” or “scales” and its evocation of “water”. In ANT this semiotic understanding of relatedness has been shifted on from language to the rest of reality. Thus it is not simply the term, but the very phenomenon of “fish” that is taken to exist thanks to its relations.

Because of this extension of relationality ‘from language to the rest of reality,’ of its ‘ruthless’ application ‘to all materials,’ ANT has been considered ‘a *semiotics of materiality*’ (Law 1999: 4). As such, it ‘forget[s] about signs and signification, [...] only retain[ing] the stress on interdependence’ (Mol and Mesman 1996: 420), thus producing a version of semiotics which ‘is not about meaning’ (Mol and Mesman 1996: 429).

And yet, the ‘insight’ of relationality has emerged to be the ground for the relationship between ANT and semiotics only at a later stage.

At first, ANT has learned from semiotics a method. Only through the use of such method, the ‘insight of relationality’ has emerged as a shared ground between ANT and semiotics.

In semiotics, indeed, Latour initially found a way to describe–analyse agency (Latour 2014a), regardless of the ontological status of agents, by considering relations among entities and how they are transformed. Latour, together with semiotician Paolo Fabbri, was thus able to write the first ANT science studies article, by using semiotics as a ‘methodology’ able to take ‘sociology of science at the heart of [scientific] articles’ (Latour and Fabbri 1977: 82, my translation). In the following years, thanks also to the collaboration with biologist and semiotician Françoise Bastide, Latour and other ANT scholars have drawn on semiotics as

- a “method” that allows describing the “interdefinition of actors and the chains of translations” (Latour [1984] 1988: 11) or that allows “following, along the design phase, the user as is inscribed, translated” in a technical object (Akrich 1990: 84, my translation)
- a set of “tools” “used to compare what Einstein says about the activity of building spaces and times with what sociologists of science can tell us” (Latour 1988: 3),
- a way to map “a common ground, a common vocabulary, that would be intermediary between [empirical descriptions] one hand and the ontological questions [...] on the other” (Latour 2000: 251).

ANT has then learned from semiotics an insight about relationality and a method based on relationality. While the insight is still relevant as a general theoretical framework, the method semiotics provides has been relevant for ANT in a more circumscribed way: Mainly during the 1980s and early 1990s, for a limited number of ANT scholars. Nevertheless, for Latour, semiotics has continued to play a relevant role as descriptive–analytical methodology, because it provides an ‘organon’ or ‘toolkit’ able ‘to record important variations’ (Latour 2014b: 265).

A semiotics of relational transformations

What Latour refers to as ‘organon’ for ANT is not semiotics in general, but a very specific strand of semiotics: The one developed by the French–Lithuanian semiotician Algirdas J. Greimas and his collaborators (Greimas and Courtés 1979).

Greimas has turned the linguistics elaborated by Saussure and Hjelmslev into a semiotics not only by extending beyond verbal language the signifying configurations to be described–analysed, but also dynamicising them, by taking into account signification as a transformation occurring among configurations. He has achieved such dynamicisation by integrating Saussure’s and Hjelmslev’s framework with narratology and the theory of enunciation.

As for narratology, Greimas drew on the analysis of folktales elaborated by Russian folklorist Vladimir Propp and revised it through the relational syntax elaborated by French linguist Lucien Tesnière – the actual coiner of the term ‘actant.’ Thus, Greimas was able to develop a narrative syntax – considered the syntactic ground of signification – which allows describing transformation of relations among actants.

As for enunciation, by drawing and operationalising the theory of enunciation proposed by the French linguist Émile Benveniste, Greimas was able to describe–analyse the discursive dynamics taking place among various frames of reference. Benveniste introduced the notion of ‘enunciation’ in order to account for the individual act of appropriation of *language (langue)* through which *speech (parole)* is produced. Such appropriation entails various tensions between the person, the time and the space from which the appropriation takes place and the person, the time and the space within the produced sentence (Figure 9.2). The descriptions–analyses of these tensions and of the related dynamics give way to accounts of the circulation of meanings through various frames of reference, as well as of the shiftings among points of view and of the positionings of utterers and recipients (Figures 9.2 and 9.4).

These are the features that Latour has found interesting in Greimassian semiotics, which cannot be found in other semiotics that tend to be more rigid and more bound to signs and verbal language, rather than relational transformation more in general.

ANT thus uses Greimassian semiotics to describe the relational transformations it is interested in. However, it has always used Greimassian tools in a limited way, without borrowing ‘all of [semiotics] argument and jargon’ (Latour 2005: 55) and formalism, in order to prevent to efface actors’ own language, instead of highlighting it (Akrich 1992a).

Nevertheless, the use of semiotics’ tools has been extended from literary text, initially considered by Greimas, to ‘settings, machines, bodies, and programming languages’ (Akrich and Latour 1992: 259), thus overcoming the limits that Latour ([1984] 1988: 183) saw in the way semiotics had been enacted before ANT.³

Latour’s *infralanguage*, used in order ‘to help [analysts] become attentive to the actors’ own fully developed metalanguage’ (Latour 2005: 49), is indeed built on Greimassian semiotic tools and is used in order to account for

- narrative dynamics – related to actants’ actions and transformations – through semiotic tools like: “actant/actor”, “competence/performance”, “dictum/modus”, “do/make-do”, “figurative/non-figurative”, “prescription/proscription/affordances/allowances”, “program/anti-program of action” (Figure 9.3)
- enunciational dynamics – related to the way actants’ actions and transformations are framed and made to circulate: “enunciation”, “delegation”, “shifting in/out/down” (Figure 9.2 and 9.4).




Figure 9.2 Examples of enunciational relations referring to the same narrative relations




Figure 9.3 Example of the use of semiotics categories and models (Akrich and Latour, 1992: 263). Here, the following models are used: ‘AND/OR relations,’ ‘program’ and ‘anti-program of action.’ The ‘program of action’ is the goal an ‘actor’ wants to achieve – in this case the hotel manager wants to have the keys back; the ‘anti-program of action’ is the opposite programme, in this case carried out by the other ‘actors,’ the customers, and consists in keeping the key. The diagram shows the way in which, for each new association (AND), the entire set of relations is replaced (OR) by another set

The model built on the category ‘association/substitution’ or ‘AND/OR relations,’ able to map relations more in general, is also a semiotic model, coming originally from linguistics (Figure 9.3).

Coming out as a semiotics

As we have seen, ANT shares with semiotics – and especially with the semiotics emerged from the Saussurean tradition – an interest in describing–analysing relations and mediations through specific tools, however forgetting, apparently, about signification (Mol and Mesman 1996: 420). Despite the fact that signification, sense and meanings are not issues

often directly addressed by ANT, they are not forgotten, but reframed, breaking away from a dualist and transcendent way of conceiving them, clearly at odds with ANT (Fariás and Mützel 2015).

Akrich and Latour (1992: 259) assumed meaning as ANT's object of study by reframing it as 'how one privileged trajectory is built, out of an indefinite number of possibilities.' Akrich (1992a; 1992b) has made clear what 'trajectories' are through her research works on technical objects. For her, signification takes place through differences emerging through displacements, seen as passages from one moment to another of the configuration of relations characterising a specific technical object or as passages between the actions an artefact disposes and the actions a user unfolds. These displacements outline trajectories that can be then seen as 'concatenations of mediations,' in which each mediator 'transform[s] [...] the meaning or the elements it is supposed to carry' (Latour 2005: 39). More recently, Latour ([2012] 2013: 236) has clarified that 'sense' is 'the direction or trajectory [...] traced by a[ny] mode [of existence] and [...] defin[ing] both the predecessors and the successors of any course of action whatsoever,' whereas 'signs,' intended as figures undergoing the same general dynamic of sense, characterise one specific mode of existence, i.e. [FIC]tion. Therefore, for Latour, sense precedes signs and does not need them to unfold.

This way of conceiving sense (Figure 9.1d), signification and meanings is very far from the *signifier-signified* relation, to which these are often reduced by certain strands of semiotics. Yet, it is similar to the dynamics outlined by Peirce for signification, seen as chains of interpretants (Figure 9.1a). Moreover, it complies with signification as intended by Hjelmself (Figure 9.1c), especially if considered, as Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari ([1972] 2003: 241) did, like 'flows of form and substance, content and expression,' i.e. not as a rigid relationship between a *signifier* determining a *signified*, but as encounters between different *agencements* (or configurations), for instance, the *agencement* of the movements of a technological object, with the *agencement* of the movements of users, referring to a situation considered by Akrich (1992a; 1992b).

By addressing signification and sense, ANT turns out to be a semiotics in itself. Moreover, it turns out to be a quite innovative semiotics, able to combine in a new way the two main semiotic traditions, the one derived from pragmatism, more philosophical, and the one from structuralism, more scientific. Through a pragmatist reading of the structuralist Greimas, homologous to the pragmatist reading of the structuralist Hjelmself, carried out by Deleuze and Guattari ([1972] 2003), ANT is indeed able to provide Deleuze and Guattari's reflections on signification an actual descriptive-analytical methodology and empirical grounds on which to probe it.

What ANT can learn from other semiotics, still and again

Being ANT a semiotics, the initial question needs to be modified into 'what can ANT still learn from *other* semiotics?'

The answer to this question cannot but waive basic notions like signification, relationality and mediation, already appropriated and reformulated by ANT in the process of becoming a semiotics.

What is left to learn, as it happened at the beginning of the relation between semiotics and ANT, are then descriptive-analytical tools, i.e. terms, categories and models.

Greimassian semiotics, from which ANT has mainly drawn the already learned tools, has indeed kept refining old tools and elaborating new ones, of which ANT knows very little, since the relation between ANT and semiotics faded during the 1990s.

However, new and refined tools are not the only ones ANT can learn. Only few scholars have indeed followed Latour's example and used semiotic tools in a systematic and extended way, especially after the 1990s. Therefore, old tools are often unknown to many ANT scholars, so that they can also be learned again.

Given the limited space, I will provide just two examples of the tools ANT can learn anew and of their background that needs to be relearned. The two examples will refer to the main sets of relations, which these tools allow to describe-analyse.

Narrative relations

As Latour (2014b) has recently noted, the semiotic category of 'actant/actor' has been key for his work in order to describe the unfolding of agency, by accounting for actions and transformations of any entity. The terms constituting such category have been used by Latour and other scholars in at least three ways. Each of them gives relevance to different aspects of the terms and of the category.

First, 'actant' has been used to point to 'anything that acts' (Latour 1992), regardless of its ontological status, size, scale, features, etc., thus providing the principle of symmetry with a descriptive term.

Secondly, 'actant' has been used in tension with the term 'actor,' thus having the possibility to distinguish between actants. The fact that anything that acts is an actant does not mean that what acts is reducible to the performed action and then that it is 'just' an actant. Any actant can enjoy other relations and have other features that distinguish it from other actants. Thus, for example, the action of reminding to bring the hotel room's key back can be performed by a written note or by a weight attached to the key (Figure 9.3). They are both actants and, as for the action they perform, they are the same actant: They occupy the same position within the network manager-desk-key-customer, by providing the latter with a certain competence, namely a knowledge. However, on another level, with reference to other relations, they are different – they are different actors: A written note, a weight. The first is white, flat, made of paper bearing inscriptions; the second is brown, bulgy and made of metal. Because of that, notwithstanding they perform the same action related to providing a knowledge to the customer, they do that in different ways, so that the second results to be more effective in contributing to the success of the hotel manager's program of action (Figure 9.3).

Thirdly, 'actor' has been intended not just as an actant provided with its various features besides the action it accomplishes, but as 'what is made the source of action' (Latour 2014a). Thus, 'actor' has been intended as the specific entity to which agency is attributed, despite the fact that agency always unfolds through many actants. Akrich (1993) has called the 'actor' seen in this way 'author.'

As we can see, by deploying semiotic tools, 'variations,' differences, can be recorded and comparisons made, among entities, as well as among their features. Allowing the detailed description-analysis of actant-actors and of their actions was indeed the aim of Greimas' narrative grammar. In order to achieve such aim, Greimas elaborated many more terms and categories than those actually used by ANT. He, for instance, introduced other levels between the actant and the actor like actantial and thematic roles. Thus, for Greimas, any actor can cover one or more thematic roles, which, in turn, are performed by covering one or more actantial roles.

Akrich (1990; 1993) is one of the few⁴ to have actually took advantage of a more stratified articulation of the 'actant/actor' category, by considering also 'positions' (Akrich 1990) or

'postures' (Akrich 1993) – akin to Greimas' 'thematic roles.' Analysing the design process of a pay-TV service, she has been able to show that the connection between the receiver and the VCR had been neglected, since it would have disrupted the superposition of 'actant,' 'position-posture' and 'actor-author' necessary for the service to work. With

- "actants", she referred to elements of the receiver related to a certain action, like the button "enter";
- "position-posture", she referred to roles assumed by entities, in relation to the milieu in which they would act as, for instance, "the subscriber", "the viewer", "the paying viewer";
- "actor-author" she referred to the entity to which the action can be attributed.

For the service to work properly, the three entities need to superpose, so that to the action of pushing 'enter' corresponds a 'viewer,' to which the action can be attributed and thus made responsible for payments.

ANT can thus learn again to further articulate the 'actant/actor' relation, in order describe and compare more in detail actants and actors.

Such opportunity is even higher today, thanks to the questioning that both ANT and Greimassian semiotics have carried out of action, in order to give relevance to passions and affects. This parallel reconsideration of action, acknowledged by ANT (Hennion, Maisonneuve and Gomart 2000), has led both to thematise more and more the role of the body. Jacques Fontanille (2004), French semioticians collaborator of Greimas, has recently proposed to integrate the body or, better, a schematic version of it that works for humans as well for non-humans, into Greimas' narrative syntax. Fontanille has thus provided the actant with a body, allowing to account for actants' senses and passions or, more in general, affects, intended as 'change[s], or variation[s], that occur when bodies collide, or come into contact' (Colman 2005: 11).

Fontanille, in a way similar to the one attempted by Tim Ingold (2007) for the description of materials and their perceptions, shows how contacts and collisions among bodies can be described as pressures-penetrations and envelopments involving internal substances – like flesh – and their envelopes-surfaces – like skin.

I deem Fontanille's schematisation of the body a new tool ANT can learn from Greimassian semiotics, which allows ANT to address up-to-date issues like affects and to describe their unfoldings in detail.

For instance, only by considering the bodies of the actors accompanying the hotel's key (Figure 9.3), we can actually account for their different efficacy. While the written note acts only through its inscribed envelope-surface, which has to be taken into account by the customer's body taking a certain distance from it, the weight reminds of its presence continuously when in contact with the customers' body, by pressing the latter on its surface-envelope through its specific internal-substance and envelope-surface, which provide weight's consistency and shape.

Enunciational relations

The Greimassian enunciational model (Figure 9.2) has been key for Latour's work in order to distinguish fiction from science (Latour 1988; Figure 9.4), technology from fiction (Latour 1992), science from law, to describe religion and, eventually, to organise the various modes of existence (Latour [1998] 2017; [2012] 2013).

Indeed, through it, Latour has been able to account, distinguish and compare the ways in which entities circulate among different frames of reference. For instance, he has shown how




Figure 9.4 Enunciational dynamics in fiction and in science (Latour 1988, 14)

in fiction, figures tend to be shifted out within nested frames away from the original situation of enunciation, whereas in sciences, references tend not only to be shifted out within nested frames, like in fiction, but also to be shifted in, back towards the original situation of enunciation (Figure 9.4).

Despite the relevance the Greimassian enunciational model has had for Latour, it has been neglected by ANT scholars. Because of that, it is certainly a tool that ANT can learn again and, in a certain way, anew from semiotics.

As it should emerge from the references to frames, as well as from the examples provided here, the Greimassian enunciational model can contribute to provide tools to develop an ANT approach to media, which would be able to consider the relation between technology and what is displayed in and through technologies – what Latour ([2012] 2013) would call the intersection between fiction [FIC] and [TEC], or what media scholar Roger Silverstone called the ‘double articulation’ of media.

This is not such a novelty, given that enunciation, in general, and the Greimassian model more specifically have been widely used in the neo-Latin-speaking world to analyse various forms of communication, probing its efficacy especially for forms of visual communication (advertisements, paintings, cinema, television, etc.). These analyses have mainly focused on the dialogue images disposed with the recipient. The Greimassian model of enunciation could be further used, however, in order to account for the role of media technologies, and especially the role of interfaces, which dispose various shiftings in and out among frames of reference, as well as modes of existence.

Such an approach could lead to rearticulate the present debate around ANT and media. Indeed, the enunciational model, by fully considering mediation (Hennion [1993] 2015), allows accounting for ‘the ways in which particular framings of entities are made to circulate,’ as asked by Marres and Rogers (2008, 276). However, at the same time, by being akin to a ‘diffusionist model[...], which conceive the dissemination of information as a movement from source to recipients,’ criticised by Marres and Rogers (2008, 276), it also allows to account for the framed entities and thus account for dynamics that are usually filed under the notion of ‘interpretation’ – deemed key by Nick Couldry, but criticised by Marres and Rogers. However, such ‘interpretation’ would take place through dynamics akin to those studied by Akrich (1992) for technical objects (see above), related to the passage between the actions a certain frame and what framed dispose, and the action a recipient unfolds. Using semiotic tools relative to both narrative and enunciational relations would make such approach possible and, I deem, productive.

Conclusions: The conditions at which ANT can learn from semiotics still and again

From semiotics, and specifically from Greimassian semiotics, ANT has learned the use of various tools – terms, categories and models – enabling the description–analysis of relations. Through their use, ANT has learned the ‘insight of relationality.’ Furthermore, by unfolding these tools and this insight, ANT has turned out to be itself a semiotics.

Today, ANT can still learn new tools, as well as refined old ones. Indeed, since the 1990s, the exchange between ANT and Greimassian semiotics has faded and ANT has stopped being up-to-date about other semiotics. Given that the tools previously learned have been used only by a limited number of ANT scholars and, though with relevant exceptions, for a limited time, besides the new tools, ANT can also learn again the old ones – and actually this would be a necessary step in order to learn the new ones.

This chapter has then been less of a showcase of new Greimassian semiotic tools, than a refresher of old ones and of the grounds on which the previous learning has been possible.

At the end of this walkthrough, another question can thus be raised: ‘Why has ANT stopped learning from semiotics?’ Answering it would not only require another chapter, but a further research.

As for now, I intend to conclude by only touching upon the conditions at which I consider ANT can learn still and again from semiotics. Given that the failing of these conditions cannot but lead to a missed learning, their listing provides a first outline for a possible answer to the question emerged here in the conclusion.

ANT can learn from other semiotics still and again if

- 1 it is interested in description – if it is actually ‘descriptive’ (Law 2008: 141). If ANT is mainly interested in other activities like developing concepts, theorising, speculating, providing empirical examples for specific concepts, then, there is not much to re/learn, since semiotic tools are not meant to enable these activities – at least not directly;
- 2 it is interested in describing in detail relations, or, in Latour’s terms, ‘associations,’ of any kind, included those ‘out of which [actors are] made’ (Latour 2005: 233);
- 3 it provides, within its architecture, relevant room and autonomy for the methodological level, a ‘middle ground’ (Latour 2000: 252), in between the theoretical–conceptual and the empirical ones, around which ANT, like other STS approaches, ‘continuous[ly] variat[e]’ (Jensen 2014). Indeed, the methodological level is the one on which semiotics mainly operates and from which it addresses the other levels (Figure 9.5);
- 4 it considers, within the methodological level, not only data–gathering methods, summarised by ‘follow the actors themselves’ and ‘generalized symmetry,’ which have always characterised ANT as more of a methodology than of a theory (Law 2008: 141; Mol 2010: 253; Sayes 2014: 144), but also the descriptive–analytical methods and tools. Basically, what Latour calls the *infralanguage*.

Indeed, this methodological aspect of semiotics has been the one that led Latour to learn it at first:

the systematic study of texts in this French tradition became what was imported into an American context as ‘Theory.’ While on this side of the Atlantic, I took it as exactly the opposite of ‘theory’: as the chance to acquire an empirical method.

(Latour 2016: 468)

This is still the aspect that can lead ANT to learn from other semiotics, still and again.

Conceptual-theoretical level




Figure 9.5 Comparison among disciplinary architectures: a. Greimas' (Greimas and Courtés [1979] 1982: 107 and 171); b. Latour's (2005)

Notes

- 1 But see Muniesa (2015) for an outline of ANT where semiotics is considered; Beetz (2017) and Høstaker (2005) for an account of the Greimassian semiotics in Latour's work; Blok and Elgaard (2011) and Schmidgen ([2011] 2015) for a general account of Latour's work, where semiotics is considered; Lenoir (1994) for a critique of Latour's use of semiotics.
- 2 After Hjelmslev ([1943] 1961: 131), in semiotics, an analysis is considered a description of relations. In order to highlight such connection, I will use the two terms together.
- 3 Actually, Greimassian semiotics has always tended to describe-analyse configurations beyond language and literary texts, which also resulted in early forms of ANT (Greimas [1972] 1995: 73). Since the 1990s, such extended use of semiotics' tools has been systematic (Floch [1995] 2000; Marrone 2002).
- 4 Denis and Pontille (2010) recover Akrich's proposal.

References

- Akrich, M. (1990) 'De la sociologie des techniques à une sociologie des usages', *Techniques et Culture*, 16: 83–110.
- (1992a) 'Appendice. Sémiotique et sociologie des techniques: jusqu'où pousser le parallèle?', in Centre de Sociologie de l'Innovation (ed.), *Ces réseaux que la raison ignore*, Paris: L'Harmattan, 24–30.
- (1992b) 'The De-description of Technical Objects', in W.E. Bijker and J. Law (eds.), *Shaping Technology/building Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 205–224.
- (1993) 'Les objets techniques et leur utilisateurs : de la conception à l'action', in B. Conein, N. Dodier, et L. Thévenot (eds.), *Les objets dans l'action*, Paris: Editions de l'EHESS, 35–57.
- Akrich, M. and Latour, B. (1992) 'A Summary of Convenient Vocabulary for the Semiotics of Human and Nonhuman Assemblies', in W.E. Bijker and J. Law (eds.), *Shaping Technology/building Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 259–264.
- Blok, A. and Elgaard, T.J. (2011) *Bruno Latour: Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World*, London: Routledge.

- Colman, F.J. (2005) 'Affect', in A. Parr (ed.), *The Deleuze Dictionary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 11–12.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari F. ([1972] 2003) *Anti-Œdipus. Capitalism and schizophrenia*, transl. R. Hurley, M. Seem and H.R. Lane, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Denis, J. and Pontille, D. (2010) *Petite sociologie de la signalétique. Les coulisses des panneaux du métro*, Paris: Presses de l'École des mines.
- Farias, I. and Mützel S. (2015) 'Culture and Actor Network Theory', in J.D. Wright (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, Oxford: Elsevier, 523–527.
- Floch J.M. ([1995] 2000) *Visual Identities*, transl. P. Van Osselar and A. McHoul, London: Continuum.
- Fontanille, J. (2004) *Soma et séma: figures du corps*, Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.
- Greimas, A.J. ([1972] 1995) 'Toward a Topological Semiotics', transl. P. Perron and F.H. Collins, *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research*, 8(4): 65–81.
- Greimas, A.J. and Courtés, J. ([1979] 1982) *Semiotics and Language. An Analytical Dictionary*, transl. L. Christ et al., Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hennion, A. ([1993] 2015) *The Passion for Music: A Sociology of Mediation*, transl. M. Rigaud, London: Routledge.
- Hjelmslev, L. ([1943] 1961) *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*, transl. F.J. Whitfield, Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Høstaker, R. (2005) 'Latour – Semiotics and Science Studies', *Science & Technology Studies*, 18(2): 5–25.
- Ingold, T. (2007) 'Materials against Materiality', *Archaeological Dialogues*, 14(1): 1–16.
- Jensen, C.B. (2014) 'Continuous Variations. The Conceptual and the Empirical in STS', *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 39(2): 192–213.
- Latour, Bruno ([1984] 1988) *The Pasteurization of France*, transl. A. Sheridan and J. Law, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- (1988) 'A Relativistic Account of Einstein's Relativity', *Social Studies of Science*, 18(1): 3–44.
- ([1993] 2000) 'The Berlin Key or How to Do Words with Things', transl. P. Graves, in P. Graves (ed.), *Matter, Materiality and Modern Culture*, London: Routledge, 10–21.
- ([1998] 2017) *Piccola filosofia dell'enunciazione*, Roma: Aracne.
- (2000) 'On the Partial Existence of Existing and Nonexisting Objects', in L. Daston (ed.), *Biographies of Scientific Objects*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 247–269.
- (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ([2012] 2013) *An Inquiry Into Modes of Existence*, transl. C. Porter, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- (2014a) 'How Better to Register the Agency of Things | Tanner One – Semiotics' *Tanner Lectures*, Yale University, 26th and 27th of March 2014 (www.bruno-latour.fr/node/562, visited on the 12 of December 2018).
- (2014b) 'On Selves, Forms and Forces', *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 4(2): 261–266.
- (2016) 'Life among Conceptual Characters', *New Literary History*, 47: 463–476.
- Latour, B. and Fabbri, P. (1977) 'La rhétorique de la science [pouvoir et devoir dans un article de science exacte]', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 13(1): 81–95.
- Law, J. (1999) 'After ANT: Complexity, Naming and Topology', in J. Law and J. Hassard (eds.), *Actor Network Theory and After*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1–14.
- (2002) *Aircraft Stories: Decentering the Object in Technoscience*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- (2008) 'Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics', in B.S. Turner (ed.), *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 141–158.
- Lenoir, T. (1994) 'Was the Last Turn The Right Turn? The Semiotic Turn and A. J. Greimas.', *Configurations*, 2(1): 119–136.
- Marres N. and Rogers, R. (2008) 'Subsuming the Ground: How Local Realities of the Fergana Valley, the Narmada Dams and the BTC Pipeline Are Put to Use on the Web', *Economy and Society*, 37(2): 251–281.
- Marrone, G. (2002) *Corpi sociali. Processi comunicativi e semiotica del testo*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Mol, A. (2010) 'Actor-Network Theory: Sensitive Terms and Enduring Tensions', *Kölner Zeitschrift Für Soziologie Und Sozialpsychologie*, 50: 253–269.
- Mol, A. and Mesman J. (1996) 'Neonatal Food and the Politics of Theory: Some Questions of Method', *Social Studies of Science*, 2(2): 419–444.

- Muniesa, F. (2015) 'Actor Network Theory', in J.D. Wright (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, Oxford: Elsevier, 80–84.
- Peirce C.S. (1868) 'On a New List of categories', *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 7: 287–298.
- de Saussure, F. ([1916] 1959) *Course in General Linguistics*, transl. W. Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Sayes, E. (2014) 'Actor–Network Theory and Methodology: Just What Does It Mean to Say That Nonhumans Have Agency?', *Social Studies of Science*, 44(1): 134–149.
- Schmidgen, H. ([2011] 2015) *Bruno Latour in Pieces. An Intellectual Biography*, transl. G. Cunstance, New York: Fordham University Press.