

“Walking Threads, Threading Walk”:
Weaving and Entangling Deleuze and Ingold with Threads

JAN PETER LAURENS LOOVERS



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 UK: Scotland License | © Jan Peter Laurens Loovers. ISSN 2050-778X (Online). DOI: 10.2218/unfamiliar.v5i1-2.1313

“Walking Threads, Threading Walk”: Weaving and Entangling Deleuze and Ingold with Threads

JAN PETER LAURENS LOOVERS

In this paper, I explore theoretical discussions that have emerged through the exercise with Paola, Ragnhild, Valeria and Brian, and through personal correspondences with Valeria, philosophical treatises by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, and anthropological works by Tim Ingold. The subsequent theoretical exploration has been my attempt in weaving together all these different correspondences by walking in the theoretical imaginations of Ingold and Deleuze. Walking Threads, I conclude, can be considered as an exercise or way of incorporating theory into practice.

Introduction: Walking Threads, Walking Theories

It is a sunny early afternoon on the first day of spring 2014 when the walking moves the golden thread, and the thread moves the walk. Together with my fellow collaborators (Paola Esposito, Ragnhild Freng Dale, Valeria Lembo, and Brian Schultis) we had just emerged out of St. Machar Cathedral, Aberdeen. Nearing the exit, or entry, gates of this medieval holy place, a ball of golden thread appears in the hands of Valeria. Playfully and without a sound she gives the thread to the others. Initially I start making photos as an observer, but soon I find myself becoming entangled with the thread as we start walking towards, and later into, the adjacent Seaton Park. I become mesmerised by the geometrical shaping of the thread and the collective movement of the five of us in relation to the thread. Using my fingers, hands and even mouth, I try to keep the flow of the thread going without it getting entangled with the trees or my video camera. My attempts are futile and soon the thread incorporates the camera into the meshwork. As we descend down the small slope and enter the central part of Seaton Park with lawns, flowerbeds, and paved footpaths, we start diverging and converging from each other and geometrical figures are being formed. The wind picks up a little bit and affects the thread and subsequently our movements with the thread and each other. It is at this precise moment during our walk that I am reminded of Deleuze and Guattari’s multiplicity, haecceity, and rhizome and Ingold’s field of manifold relations, meshwork, and lines. The lines of the thread that are now moving with the wind and our movements, the geometric shapes of our entanglement, lead me to ponder about theoretical conundrums that have occupied my thoughts for over a decade since I was first introduced to Deleuze and Guattari and Ingold in 2002 by Fabiola Jara at Utrecht University.

We continued “drifting” (Schultis, this volume) or “journeying” (Freng Dale, this volume) further into Seaton Park towards the Fountain. Of the five of us, I was the only person who had been to Seaton Park before. In fact, during my first year of postgraduate studies at the Department of Anthropology, I had numerous times walked the paved footpath moving between University and the student halls up the hill behind Seaton Park. Since then I had frequently returned to Seaton Park for a Sunday stroll, or to enjoy the flowers in spring, summer and autumn. Thus I was quite familiar with Seaton Park, and yet while we were moving in the flows and counter-flows of each other, other things and people and the golden thread, I felt I experienced Seaton Park in a very different way. My attention was drawn to our “correspondences” (c.f. Ingold, see below). The event finished as abruptly as it had started when the thread ‘grabbed’ a pole and became entangled with the fixed point. Each of us went to the pole and left their part of the thread knotted and woven to the pole.

In the weeks that followed, the five participants contemplated how to make sense of these experiences. My initial intuition towards, and pondering on, Deleuze and Guattari’s multiplicity and rhizome and Ingold’s lines, meshwork and field of manifold relations led me to phrase our walk as “Walking Threads, Threading Walk”. I imagined how we were threads becoming entangled in the “weather-world”, how we were a multiplicity of multiplicities in which the golden thread became a rhizomatic expansion connecting our beings with the thread.

In the subsequent correspondences with Valeria Lembo, I revisited Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophy as well as investigated in more depth Ingold’s work. Quite like the walk, the process was messy with texts and books moving to and away from my desk and thoughts. During this theoretical exploration, which very much has been a practical endeavour of weaving together the different ideas, the ‘memorial imagination’ of our threaded walk in Seaton Park often emerged to the front as I was writing and thinking about concepts that these three academic scholars had developed. At the same time, I corresponded with Valeria about her

embroideries and questions and ideas she had about Tim Ingold's anthropology. The result that you find below, then, is very much reflecting this 'messiness' of books and articles becoming woven together with ideas, clarifications, confusions, playfulness, and last but not least, the experience of being walking threads.

Maria Elizabeth De Freitas' (2014: 285), who argues that a "theoretical framework is like a meshwork of lines ... a knot of entangled lines", points to something similar to what I have in mind. I here invite the reader to take, or walk, this theoretical threading walk with me, to take up parts of the threads and move along or away, to continue her or his own weaving with Deleuze, Guattari, and Ingold (see also Esposito, this volume, for an alternative weaving). Finally, I ask the reader to explore with an actual thread (colour is not the most significant, ours happens to be golden) and consider which theoretical imaginations or walks the thread might afford to her or him personally. Perhaps the thread does not lead to those scholars that have shaped me tremendously, instead it might lead to different insights and conundrums and contemplations. As for me, in the following pages I will elaborate on multiplicity, rhizome, surfaces, graphic anthropology, weather-world, lines and more as facets that I related to the walking thread and correspondences with Valeria on wind, embroidery, and drawing amongst other discussions. As the below pages will exemplify, I follow Ingold in saying that:

Life is lived in a zone in which earthly substances and aerial media are brought together in the constitution of beings, which, in their activity, participate in weaving the textures of the land. Here, organisms figure not as externally bounded entities but as bundles of interwoven lines of growth and movement, together constituting a meshwork in fluid space ... [or as] a zone of entanglement ... [where the organism] threads its way along paths through the weather world (Ingold 2008: 1796)

Deleuze – Lines, Rhizome, Multiplicity, Becoming

There is a beautiful picture of Sylvano Bussoti's entangled musical notes that introduces Deleuze's notion of the rhizome (Deleuze and Guattari 2003: 3). I have returned to the rhizome and accompanying multiplicity on many occasions and often contemplated how to visualize it. An entanglement of lines with knots, loose ends or beginnings, a divergence and confluence of threads would perhaps be such a summary of understanding rhizomes. Like Bussoti's 'scrabbled' musical notes, the notion of the rhizome, in essence, concerns itself with relations. In a widely cited elaboration, Deleuze and Guattari describe the rhizome as something that breaks away from Cartesian dualities, away from hierarchies and the notion of clear beginnings and endings (2003: 3-25). Thus the rhizome grows and ruptures, moves, converges and diverges. What Deleuze and Guattari consider are lines, and we shall see in a short while that they are not alone. They make a distinction between three kinds of lines: molar, molecular, and flight or fleeing (Deleuze and Guattari 2003: 505). The depiction of the tree throughout Western scientific history, according to Deleuze and Guattari, is of the first line - thus we have the kinship tree, the animal kingdom tree. Or in short, these are trees of hierarchies or "segments" with confined "contours", such as concrete boundaries and points of starting and ending. The idea of the rhizome is that of the molecular line: whilst the tree grows upwards, the rhizome spreads and grows up and down. Or in their words: "[the rhizome] frees itself, breaks and twists ... [it] passes *between* things, *between* points" (ibid: 505). It is in this sense that the molecular line is that of a multiplicity. The *One* tree of the molar line becomes that of a *multitude* of tubers or roots (lines) of the molecular line. The line that has the most interest for Deleuze and Guattari is the final kind of line – the line of flight which is similar to the molecular line. The line of flight flees away from the molar line, they break away and rupture them. It is the interplay and the movements away from the previous lines that constitute the line of flight.¹ The line of flight, thus, enables an endless openness in becoming without being confined to State regimes, scientific schema, societal pressures. Before we proceed I need to briefly introduce the notion of haecceity as an important element of the molecular line and the line of flight. For Deleuze and Guattari (2003: 261-3), a haecceity is constituted by the "relations of movement and rest ... capacities to affect and being affected". The haecceity "has neither beginning or end, origin nor destination; it is always in the middle. It is not made of points, only of lines. It is a rhizome". The haecceity, thus, is always becoming.

The above outline of the three lines is important to keep in mind. Deleuze and Guattari reappear

¹ In his book *Difference and Repetition* (1994), Deleuze elaborates on this line of flight as being generated by the abstract line (see also De Freitas 2014: 289). Deleuze and Guattari find this line the most interesting as it furthers their ideas on becoming.

throughout their work and certainly they have *become* these lines to stay in their terminology. In this fashion we read:

... becoming and multiplicity are the same thing. A multiplicity is defined not by its elements, not by a centre of unification or comprehension. It is defined [and here we have to accept their contradiction to define and perhaps to be grown might be a better wording] by the number of dimensions it has; it is not divisible, it cannot lose or gain a dimension without *changing its nature*. Since its variations and dimensions are immanent to it, it amounts to the same thing to say that each multiplicity is already composed of heterogeneous terms in symbiosis, and that a multiplicity is continually transforming itself into a string of other multiplicities, according to its thresholds and doors (Deleuze and Guattari 2003: 249).

Following this line of thought, Deleuze and Guattari argue that the individual is “an infinite multiplicity” (ibid: 254). Subsequently, and re-reading the earlier lengthy citation, the individual is thus not a *One*; it is not a confined molar line. Rather the individual multiplicity is “continually transforming itself into a string of other multiplicities”. In my own understanding, I have considered multiplicities as relations and all that I see, feel, contemplate about are relations. Thus it is not surprising, then, that I first considered our walking with the golden thread in Seaton Park as a multiplicity of multiplicities. We were connected, or related, physically through the thread as well as through our movements together. My own movement, then, was in a continuous play, alignment, tension, exploration with the other four collaborators as well as with the wind, the by-passers, my video-camera, trees and twigs, clothes. The consideration of relations also brings me to the next step in this ‘theoretical walk’, namely Tim Ingold.

Ingold – Field Of Relations, Walking, Making, Lines

Sometimes it amazes me how much Ingold and Deleuze share whilst using different words and examples. One particular sentence has captivated me for over a decade since I first came across it in 2002. Ingold outlines a person as a “singular locus of creative growth within continually unfolding fields of relations” (2000: 4-5; see also Ingold 2011a). To a certain extent, this is quite similar to Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of multiplicity. Thus, like the multiplicity of an individual, the singular locus – like the field – is necessarily constituted through relations. To further this argument Ingold also arrives to the notion of lines, and indeed finds his connection with Deleuze. Ingold describes the person and things as a “bundle of lines” (citing Deleuze and Guattari *in* Ingold 2011a: 10) or “parliament of lines” (Ingold 2007a: 5). He distinguishes two kinds of lines: a thread and a trace (Ingold 2007a, 2010b).² A thread, Ingold describes, can be considered as a rhizome or as an animal in that both are “complexly connected bundles of threads” (2007a: 42). A thread, Ingold goes on to say, can also be seen as the more common association with wool and other things fashioned by human hands. A trace, Ingold continues, is “any enduring mark left in or on a solid surface by a continuous movement” (ibid: 43). Whilst making a distinction at first, Ingold concludes that “[i]t is through the transformation of threads into traces ... that surfaces are brought into being. And conversely, it is through the transformation of traces into threads that surfaces are dissolved” (ibid: 52; see also Ingold 2015: 64-5). To exemplify this interplay between trace and thread, Ingold offers a number of examples about weaving in which the surface organically grows through tracing or threading/embroidery. Here he finds the relation not only with weaving or drawing but also with writing:

Just as the weaver’s shuttle moves back and forth as it lays down the weft, so the writer’s pen moves up and down, leaving a trail of ink behind it. But this trail, the letter-line, is no more the same as the line of text than is the line on a tapestry the same as the lines of its constituent threads. As with the woven tapestry, when we look for the text-line we do not find it. It exists neither as a visible trace nor as a thread. Rather, it emerges ... (Ingold 2007a: 69-70).

Building forth on the notion of trail, Ingold makes a distinction between the transporter and the wayfarer. For the careful reader, it might become clear that here we can find some resonance with Deleuze and Guattari’s molar and molecular lines. Thus the transporter moves from point to point in a sequence. In fact, so Ingold argues, the transporter is not walking but is an assembly of point-to-point connectors. Wayfaring, to the contrary, is like the molecular line in that it is the becoming of a line which counts. Perhaps wayfaring is like

² Maria Elizabeth De Freitas (2014: 287), referring to Ingold’s work on lines and Deleuze and Guattari’s work on topology, elaborates that besides the trace and the thread, Ingold distinguishes a third line – the ragged line that appears when a surface is cut or ripped.

Schultis' "drifting" (this volume). The wayfarer is the movement whilst the transporter is moved. It is in this sense that we arrive to Ingold's notion of respectively meshwork, molecular lines or lines of flight in Deleuze and Guattari's terminology, versus network, what they would refer to as molar lines or lines of occupation. A meshwork, according to Ingold (2007a, 2011a, 2013), is constituted of interwoven trails, and the "lines of the meshwork are the trails *along* life is lived" (Ingold 2007a: 81, original emphasis) and in which movements of the inhabitants weave the environment. The encountering of a place, or wayfaring into a place, is considered by Ingold as a complex knot of the lines of movement. These knots are constituted by a multitude of lines of person's trails. "Every place, then, is a knot in the meshwork, and the threads from which it is traced are lines of wayfaring" (ibid: 100). The meshwork, Ingold restates in his later work, is an 'entanglement of lines' (2013: 132) or "entangled lines of life, growth, and movement". And it is in this work that he marries the meshwork with Deleuze and Guattari's "lines of becoming" (ibid: 132). Flowing out of his reading of Deleuze and Guattari, Ingold (2013: 134-6) distinguishes between geometric, organic and abstract line.³ For the geometric line, Ingold refers to it as the connection between two points, such as a thread that connects A with B. The organic line, in contrast, "trace the envelopes or contours of things as though they were contained within them" (ibid: 134). The abstract line, however, is of a different kind. It is the line that is a becoming, that is between, that is movement. It is indeed the line of life. In the bringing together of movement, lines and life, Ingold returns once more to Deleuze and Guattari. *Haecceity*, Ingold illustrates, is at the heart of becoming and multiplicity or meshwork.

Now we need to return to the field of relations and a discussion of the world we inhabit when wayfaring, or when becoming. Here Ingold has been reformulating concepts such as environment and more recently sky-earth or weather-world. Rightfully so, Ingold reminds us of the sky and the earth and the weather. The weather-world has often been left aside in anthropological literature. Whereas his work on environment did perhaps not capture such a reminder, his most recent work attempts to do just to the wind, the sun, the clouds, the earth (see Ingold 2010b, 2011, 2015). He writes about the inhabited world as constituted by the flows of dynamic earth, weather, and sky. It speaks of the emergence of the inhabitant in these flows or movements *in* life. The environment, or weather-world, is "a tapestry ... a field not of interconnected points but of interwoven lines" (ibid: 84), where the "living, breathing body is at once a body-on-the-ground and a body-in-the-air" (Ingold 2010b). Ingold (2011a: 117) puts a lot of effort on emphasising the "open world" which "has no boundaries, no insides or outsides, only comings and goings".

How does the wind figure in all this? As we were walking with the golden thread through Seaton Park, the wind would at particular moments become more forceful, pulling the thread and ourselves, shaping the geometrical figures of the golden thread that connected us, and affecting the movements of speed and the rest of ourselves as threads. "The wind," Ingold goes on to say, "mingles with substances as it blows through the land, leaving *traces* of its passing in tracks and trails" (2011a: 120, my emphasis). In the article *Earth, Sky, Wind, and Weather*, Ingold (2007b: 32) elaborates on the wind and offers the word '*enwinded*' to suggest that the body rather than being embodied should be seen as enwinded. By this he connects the body with the wind through breathing. Interestingly enough, as Ingold (ibid: 31) illustrates, the Latin words for life-giving (*animare*) and breath (*anima*) derive from the Greek word for wind (*anemos*). Wind, it could be said, is life-giving and breathing. For the wayfarer, then, tracing paths through threading in the weather-world is ever to "feel the wind" and "to experience [the] comingling" between perceiver with the world and the perceiver who touches (ibid: 29). "[W]hen the body feels, the wind feels, since the wind, in its currents has already invaded the body's tactile awareness" (Ingold 2011a: 134). It is through such "body's sensory entanglement in the lifeworld" that "knowledge [is] formed along paths of movement in the weather-world" (Ingold 2010b: 136). It is as such that knowing is growing with the movements of the way-farer in or through the weather-world. The body comes to know the world through its movements in the weather. Whilst in his previous work Ingold has focused on the ground to elaborate his ideas, in the chapter *Wind-Walking* in his most recent book *The Life of Lines*, Ingold turns to the theme of paths, traces, threads, breath and wind. In some more detail, the link is made between breathing, wind, and walking. "The wind-walker's every inhalation [or inspiration]", Ingold (2015: 66) exemplifies, "forms a vortex in the wind's passage as it sweeps past, and every exhalation [or expiration] is like an invisible stick which thrusts through the opening created thereby". Whilst he had left wind behind in his earlier work, Ingold now explains that it is through breathing the air that it becomes possible to perceive the air. Perhaps, enigmatically, one could argue that Ingold now

³ In his earlier work (2011a: 63), he speaks unfortunately of a geometrical abstract line as the geometric line.

speaks of the ‘enbreathing body’.⁴

Ingold - Drawing, Writing, and Correspondence

As I started sharing my work on the lines of Deleuze, Guattari and Ingold with Valeria, she started sharing her work on embroidery and drawing. Inspired by her initial drawings for embroidery, I also took up the pencil and made a few sketches as well as revisited a previous exercise to draw movement. During our correspondence we reflected on the connection between drawing, weaving and lines in Ingold’s work. Ingold (2007a: 51-3) comes to an epiphany on the relationship between lines and surfaces whilst travelling on a ferry between Norway and Sweden. Watching three ladies, he contemplates their activities. One woman is writing, the second is knitting, and the last one is doing embroidery. He argues that in the case of writing the person is tracing a line *upon* an existing surface. In the case of knitting, the person is threading a line *into* a surface. It is embroidery, however, which offers an in-between. The person starts with a trace *upon* an existing surface, much like the writer, yet as the knitter the person threads the lines *into* the surface. Thus the trace transforms into the thread and perhaps likewise the thread transforms into a trace, but what about drawing?

In the article *Drawing Together: Materials, Gestures, Lines*, Ingold reasserts his work on lines and moves away from a study *of* lines to a study *in* lines (2010a: 300-1; see also Ingold 2011a: 220-6). By this he implies that through practical engagements with materials, insights are shaped without a clearly pre-conceived idea rather than a detached, observational endeavour in which hypothesis or endings of projects are the goal. He turns to painting and drawing to make his point with support of the work by the art historian Norman Bryson. To paint is to perceive a surface with particular boundaries defined by the edges of the canvas. Every trace, the touch of the brush, has to be calculated in relation to the totality of the painting. Thus there is a moment of hesitation, a moment of reserved anticipation. The pencil, however, is free from such hesitation and can carry on where it has left or begin where it wants. The drawing of lines, so Ingold concludes with Bryson, is never finished since there is always another possible line to be drawn. Or as Ingold puts it eloquently: “[s]o as painting moves to completion, drawing carries on: it is always work in progress, manifesting itself in its lines of becoming rather than an image of being” (2010a: 301-2). Contemplating Bryson’s work, Ingold moves to comparing painting and drawing or closeness and openness with society and anthropology. Thus life can be understood:

as a tangle of threads or life paths, ever ravelling here and unravelling there, within which the task for any being is to improvise a way through, and to keep on going. Lives are bound up *in* the tangle, but are not bound *by* it, since there is no enframing, no external boundary’ instead it ‘undergoes continual generation along a line of growth’ (ibid: 302).

As a result Ingold argues for a “graphic anthropology” (ibid: 303-4; see also Ingold 2011b). This kind of anthropology, he contends, is concerned with following the materials, copying gestures (or learning movements) and drawing lines. The lines of the drawing are threads which “weave the surface rather than being laid upon it” (Ingold 2010a: 304) in which the drawing is “a mode of description” where the “observing eye is drawn into the labyrinthine entanglements of the life world, yielding a sense of its forms, proportions, and textures, but above all its movements” (ibid: 309). Here Ingold furthers his critique on the dichotomy between written texts and the image or literacy versus photography and painting.⁵

In a number of recent articles (2010a, 2011a, 2011b, 2013, 2014, 2015), Ingold takes a stance against ethnography and develops his advocacy for anthropology. He elaborates that ethnography is concerned with describing a study *of* people and thus subsequently “*othering*” (2010a) the people with whom the anthropologists work. In *That’s Enough About Ethnography* (2014), he leaves no doubt that we need to rethink anthropology and ethnography. Building on the previous discussed urge towards a graphic anthropology, Ingold restates the relation between ethnography and painting as an “art of description” (Alpers *in* Ingold 2014)

⁴ See also Lembo (this volume) on a further discussion of breathing, weather, singing, and embroidering.

⁵ Ingold’s elaboration on drawing and correspondence resonates with the French philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy’s recently translated book *The Pleasure of Drawing*. The opening sentence, “[d]rawing is the opening of form” (2013: 1), gives away what Nancy has in mind. Like Ingold, Nancy is sceptical about painting as totalizing and non-dynamic. Instead, Nancy goes on to say that drawing brings together “act and force [puissance]” (ibid: 1). For Nancy it is not only an opening of form, but also a “birth of form” (ibid: 3) in which form equals idea (ibid: 5-10). “[D]rawing”, as he restates a little later on, “unfolds a novel sense that does not conform to a pre-formed project. It is carried away by a design that joins with movement, gesture and expansion ... to give birth to form” (ibid: 26).

or as “*ethnographicness*” to borrow his own word. To further his argument, Ingold turns to the notion of participant observation as an “ontological commitment” in which observing and participating are intimately woven together and should not be considered as separate (2014: 387-8). To get away from the impasse with ethnography as being dripped with description (e.g. factual descriptions of cultural practices), Ingold passionately advocates for anthropology and to consider it as a “practice of education” (ibid: 388). The novice anthropologist has to *attend* to what others are saying, doing. Such education necessarily brings the method of participant observation together with “one’s own perception and action with the movements of others” (ibid: 394). Such “togetherness” (Ingold 2010a: 311) is coined by Ingold as “correspondence” (2010a, 2011a, 2013, 2014, 2015) and concerns living attentionally not intentionally with others (2014: 389). It is thus to “open up our perception to what is going on there so that we, in turn, can respond to it” (2013: 7), and it is this “relation with the world” that Ingold calls *correspondence*. This has also implications for writing, thinking, talking as well as in knowing and being *in the world*. Anthropology, as a correspondence, “is carried forward in a process of life, and effects transformations within that process” (Ingold 2013: 3). Such correspondence very much looks like Ingold’s views on drawing by hand, discussed above, where there are no endings but instead “carries forward” in “lines of becomings”.

Deleuze and Guattari - Form and Matter

Let us now delve a little deeper into the relation between becoming, materials, and lines. What was happening as I was walking together with my fellow collaborators through the park and becoming threads? What Ingold (2013: 21) investigates “making... as a process of growth”. Such investigation defies the conventional theory of *hylomorphism* in which practioners (makers) impose form onto material (see also Ingold 2012a, 2012b). The form, in this view, is a set *idea in the mind* that needs to be transformed *onto* the matter. Instead, very much like the drawing discussed above, Ingold (2013: 22-5) argues that we need to take a *morphogenetic* approach in which making is understood as a “confluence of forces and materials”, as “form-generating”, or as “form-taking activity” to refer to Ingold’s borrowing of a word by the French philosopher Gilbert Simondon. Deleuze and Guattari have also turned to Simondon’s critique of the hylomorphic argument, and Ingold goes to some length to express their view. Here the relation between wayfaring and lines is illuminated:

The trouble with the matter-form model, argued Deleuze and Guattari, is that in assuming ‘a fixed form and a matter deemed homogeneous’ it fails to acknowledge, on the one hand, the variability of matter – its tensions and elasticities, lines of flows and resistances – and, on the other hand, the conformations and deformations to which these modulations give rise. In reality, they insist, whenever we encounter matter ‘it is matter in movement, in flux, in variation’, with the consequence that ‘this matter-flow can only be *followed*’ [sic. Deleuze and Guattari 2003: 408-9]. Artisans or practioners who follow the flow are, in effect, itinerants, wayfarers, whose task is to enter the grain of the world’s becoming and bend it to an evolving purpose. There is an ‘intuition in action’ (Ingold 2013: 25).

According to Deleuze and Guattari (2003: 369-72), this distinction between the hylomorphic and the morphogenetic model also resonates with two types of sciences and scientific procedures: respectively royal science and reproduction (or *logos*) and nomad science and following (or *nomos*). This distinction also seems to resonate with Ingold’s distinction between ethnography and painting and anthropology and drawing as I discussed above. Deleuze and Guattari use form, matter, content, and expression in a particular way. These terms are connected through a “double articulation”:

The first articulation (“sedimentation”) chooses or deducts, from unstable particle-flows, metastable molecular or quasi-molecular units (*substances*) upon which it imposes a statistical of connections and successions (*forms*). The second articulation (“folding”) establishes functional, compact, stable structures (*forms*), and constructs the molar compounds in which these structures are simultaneously actualized (*substances*) (Deleuze and Guattari 2003: 401-1).

Here Deleuze and Guattari turn to the geologist Louis Hjelmslev. Hjelmslev “used the term content for formed matters, which would now have to be considered from two points of view: substance, insofar as these matters are ‘chosen,’ and form, insofar they are chosen in a certain order” and by doing so “[h]e used the term expression for functional structures, which would also have to be considered from two points of view: the organization of their specific form, and substances insofar they form compounds” (ibid: 43). The main point I take from this is that form and matter cannot be separated.

A hylomorphic distinction between form and matter can also be found in Deleuze and Guattari’s dis-

cussion of reproduction. “Reproducing,” they argue, “implies the permanence of a fixed point of *view* that is external to what is reproduced: watching the flow from the bank” (ibid: 372, original emphasis), and in which the “iterator” constantly *reterritorializes* around *this point of view* to use Deleuze and Guattari’s enigmatic words. To make, to write, or to reproduce for that matter, is in this fashion to ‘discover’ the form bound to laws of description and objectification. The “iterator”, or royal scientist, thus steps outside the flows in life. The form, as pre-conceived concept in the mind, is produced as a reproduced object. Rather than wayfaring, the royal scientist goes from one point of view to another point of view. To *follow*, Deleuze and Guattari argue, needs to be distinguished from reproduction. “*Following* the flow of material” and “to be carried away by a ... flow” (ibid: 373), as the nomad science or morphogenetic model exemplifies, means to be like Ingold’s wayfarer or Deleuze and Guattari’s itinerant. It concerns an “intuition in action”. This *following* corresponds closely with the lines of becoming and lines of flight. Like the lines of becoming and lines of flight, to follow implies to be swept up in the currents of life and to be in between. There is thus not a clear ending nor beginning which marks a finished product. Nomad science understands form and matter as:

...more immediately in tune with the connection between content and expression in themselves, each of these two terms encompassing both form and matter [see the double articulation]. Thus matter ... is never prepared and therefore homogenized matter, but is essentially laden with singularities (which constitute a form of content). And neither is expression formal: it is inseparable from pertinent traits (which constitute a matter of expression) (Deleuze and Guattari 2003: 369).

Now where does weaving come into place? Although not referring to the double articulation, Ingold (2011a: 210-19) provides an insightful perspective on Deleuze and Guattari’s critique of the hylomorphic model. With Deleuze and Guattari, Ingold considers practioners as wayfarers who follow where the materials lead them to. Ingold (ibid: 211) points out that “the skill of the practioner, *tehkne*, is derived from the Sanskrit” by combining the words for axe and carpenter. Thus, “[t]he carpenter” is “one who fashions ... a shaper, a maker”. Interestingly enough, as Ingold addresses, the Latin verb for ‘to weave’, *texere*, derives from this word *tehkne*. Ingold, thus, shows that the carpenter can be understood as a weaver. In his earlier work (2007a), he already noted that the words texts and textile come from this Latin word *texere*. To make is to weave, to write is to weave. This entails “improvisation ... [t]o improvise is to follow the way of the world, as they open up” as wayfarers (or itinerants or practioners) weave themselves into life with “thread-lines” (Ingold 2011a: 216).

Deleuze, Guattari and Ingold - Spaces and Surfaces

This weaving in the world also gives a different understanding of surfaces. As Valeria was ‘finishing’ her embroideries (Lembo, this volume) we started discussing the notion of surfaces and I was reminded of our walk in Seaton Park when we were moving towards the river Don. Whereas the earlier part of the walk had been on pavement and grass, the sandy path towards the river was less trodden and indeed muddy closer to the river. Being intrigued by the thread, I had not paid attention to the ground, something that changed abruptly when my feet started to get slightly stuck in the mud. The wind, as I will discuss in further detail below, had increased again in the open and the thread and ourselves being swept up with the flows and forces.

Pondering about Seaton Park and Valeria’s embroidery work, my theoretical walk took me back to Deleuze and Guattari’s *A Thousand Plateaus*. Let’s start with their work on “strata” and the “plane of consistency” or a “surface of stratification” (Deleuze and Guattari 2003: 40). The strata also referred to as striated or sedentary space by Deleuze and Guattari (2003: 474-500), concerns the layers or boundaries that imprison the flow and confine it. The striated space organises and orders. “Lines,” in this space, “go [sic] from one point to another” (ibid: 478) whereby the “line describes a contour” (ibid: 497). The smooth space or plane of consistency, however, is in-between the layers of striated spaces. It is concerned with lines of flight and haecceities (see also Schultis, this volume). “The plane [of consistency] consists abstractly, but really, in relations of speed and slowness between unformed elements and in compositions of corresponding intensive affects”, and these haecceities “are precisely modes of individuation proceeding neither by form nor by the subject” (ibid: 507). Thus, whilst in striated space “the line is between points”, in the smooth space “the point is between lines” (2003: 480). Deleuze and Guattari see a constant moving between these spaces where the striated space ever tries to enclose, or narrow down, the smooth space.

Until recently (see Ingold 2015: 80-2) Ingold does not speak of striated and smooth spaces, but instead contemplates surfaces. Building on James Gibson’s work, Ingold illustrates Gibson’s distinction between the three components that constitute the environment: medium, substance, and surface (Ingold 2011a:

22-4, 115-25). “The medium is air” and “affords movement and perception” (ibid: 22). The substance, however, is more solid and consists of the materials that constitute the “necessary physical foundations for life”. Finally, the surfaces are in between the substance and the medium. Here, Ingold stresses, it is important to note that Gibson considers these surfaces between one kind of material (e.g. a solid rock) and another kind of materials (e.g. a gaseous air). Surfaces, for Ingold, are “open ... where life is going on” and where the division between “earth [substance] and sky [medium] gives way to flows and counter-flows of materials” (ibid: 87). Ingold, however, is critical towards Gibson’s understanding of environment and objects (2010b: S124-5, see also Ingold 2011a for a critical review on Gibson’s affordances). For Gibson there are objects on the surface that afford inhabitancy – the cave, the tree, the burrow. These, however, are laid onto the world like “furniture ... on a pre-prepared and absolute featureless floor” (in Ingold 2010b: S124). Ingold, instead, argues that the hills and trees are “the formations of that surface”. The usage of the notion of surfaces in Ingold’s work, however, seems not only to refer to Gibson’s work. Above I have written about the relation between threads and surfaces in which the surface grows through the weaving (or writing or drawing) (Ingold 2007a: 65). Citing artist Vasily Kandinsky, Ingold shows that “a particular capacity of line [is] its capacity to create *surfaces*” (in Ingold 2007a: 45). Cuts and cracks made by walking or digging elucidate the fluidity of the surface. The surface, then, too is woven through the movements in the world or indeed through drawing (see Ingold 2010a: 304). In such fashion, I would argue that Ingold opposes the idea of a surface *upon* the world, but rather considers a surface *in* the world (see Ingold 2011a: 111; also 2015). As he writes: “it is in this intermediate zone that life is lived, at depths depending upon the scale of the creature and its capacity to penetrate an environment that is ever more tightly woven. It is in this sense that creatures live *in* the land and not *on* it” (Ingold 2008: 1803). The “land”, then, is a “vaguely defined zone of admixture and intermingling” (Ingold 2011a: 119).

Walking Threads

Let us now return once more to the fateful Friday early afternoon when the sun was shining and a little wind was flowing through the land. As the golden thread was unravelling and we were making our way into the park, a thought occurred to me. The thought itself was not particular novel and has been re-appearing for many times throughout this last decade since I have been introduced to the work of Ingold and Deleuze (and Spinoza and Leibniz for that matter). “Bundles of lines” it echoes, “multiplicities” it whispers, “rhizome” it calls. With such pondering, ‘walking threads, threading walk’ came into being. As I mentioned above, I see fields of relations or multiplicities throughout my movements in life. It appeared to me, as the camera started to tangle up and a tree tried to embrace and hold the thread, that this exercise was a ‘visual reminder’ (for the time being let me phrase it as such even though it is an incomplete wording) of multiplicities and Ingold’s work on walking, lines, and weaving. As we deliberately, or non-deliberately, moved under or above the golden thread, and thus weaving knots and entanglements through our movements, the *geometric lines* subsided. Instead, our *lines of becoming* started to weave together and it became difficult if not impossible to distinguish ending or beginning. Indeed, as we moved on, trying to keep the thread away from the ground and exploring the capacities of the thread as well of ourselves as a cohort, it reminded me in great delight of a multiplicity, or rhizome, with ebbing and flowing geometric patterns. It reminded me of the field of relations, and the movements of relations both that pass swiftly and those that become tangled up or again untangled (such as the twig, camera, and the tree or shoe or by-passers). At the same time, knots were unfolding through our movements or weavings. Contemplating about these becomings, I wondered whether we are threads that were taken for a walk or if we were walking a thread. I suppose the answer is to be found in the between. Thus we were lines of flight, being transformed through the connecting string of multiplicities, as we moved through Seaton Park. A *haecceity*, with movements of speed and rest (and perhaps capacity to affect and be affected). The thread, too, was a line of flight as I found in my futile attempts of tying together both ends of the thread at one stage. The thread, however, did not want to be knotted into a bound circle but instead was unbinding and flowing.

As we continued walking, we arrived at a crossing where one path would lead us to the student dormitories I once lived, one path would lead us to the playground, and one path would lead us to the river. We halted, questioning this dilemma of where to take the thread – or be taking by the thread – and an initial move was made to take the right path and go towards the playground. With the knowledge of the Park, however, I responded, seeking to guide Ragnhild as the walker in front towards the river-side with the particular thought of Ingold’s work on wind and water. I imagined more openings and liked to share this part of Seaton Park with my fellow walkers. The walking threads attentively responded again, and we changed direction. Upon approaching the river, the wind was sweeping the threads and here another thought came to me. How can this

golden thread make us understand Ingold's notions of weather-sky-earth more profoundly? As we were (or at least I was) amazed with the relating wind and the alternations in the geometric patterns, I began to answer the question that through the weaving of the thread, and to perceiving ourselves as threads (like lines), it was clear how our bodies move with and against the wind and how we might understand the field of relations in the terms of force (*puissance*) and power (*pouvoir*) in which movement is not a homogenous flow but rather fluxes and waves, ruptures and grows, follows and works against. Through the wind we were *threading into the world*, weaving our textures in the air. To follow Ingold's line of thought, we were *drawing with the wind as we were walking with our threads curving and waving*.

The watchful reader can see how we were moving in smooth space, though always finding the efforts of the striated space to reterritorialize, to "bound" the threads. The wind is not particularly a cooperative participant in the striated space, it flows and moves at its pleases - very much like the lines in the smooth space. Remembering the wind whilst walking in the park and especially alongside the river, it has become clearer to me what Deleuze and Guattari might mean with "lines of flight". The threads that want to flow, to move with the wind whilst other powers try to restrain and enclose. This very much looks like a *windy thought or world*. By this I build forth on an idea of Valeria Lembo to start with a *common wind* rather than a *common ground* to think and to have a *wind of thought* rather than a (*river*) *current of thought* (personal communication). Rather than moving or flowing with the current of the river – the metaphor that Deleuze, Guattari, and Ingold have used – the moving wind offers different perspectives. It speeds and rest, its desire is to flow. Perhaps the wind is a haecceity? To sum up, what does it entail to use *the river or the wind to think with*? It is a question that the Walking Threads, to me, has offered some more insights into Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy and Ingold's anthropology. This walk and its open experimentation has made it more tangible and easier "to imagine the social world as a tangle of threads or life paths, ever ravelling here and unravelling there" (Ingold 2010a: 302) whilst being "immersed in the incessant movements of wind and weather, in a zone wherein substances and medium are brought together in the constitution of beings that, by the way of their activity, participate in stitching the textures of the land" (Ingold 2011a: 121) in which "[l]ives are bound up in the tangle" (Ingold 2010a: 302). It is this *binding* that became so apparent when we were walking threads, as the threads between the bodies bound the five of us together whilst mingling with the ground, the wind, the camera, and other beings. Our lives were quite literally bound up *in* the tangle, but not bound to it as the wind carries on the threads. Deleuze and Guattari's "intuition in action", Ingold's "practice in education", and Gibson's "education of attention" seem to correspond closely with Walking Threads in that it has been through the practice of 'walking with threads' and 'threading the walk' that insights have appeared in life. Indeed, Walking Threads challenges the hylomorphic model, offering instead a different kind of anthropology based upon practical engagement, experimentation and the realisation that anthropological knowledge production is intimately part of the ongoing flow of life.

The walk with the thread 'ended', or perhaps transformed, as abruptly as it 'began', as we entangled the thread to a post. With the tying of the thread, I was thinking of particular knots that are commonly used in northern Canada to hold boats. It was here, as with the other parts of walking, and perhaps indicated by this text, that the interplay between past, present, and future was woven together.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank all the participants of the Walking Threads Event (this also includes the wind, the trees, the branches, by-passers, the thread, etcetera). I thank The Unfamiliar editors and reviewers. I want to particularly acknowledge Valeria Lembo whose questions and discussions formed the inspiration and encouragement to engage more intensively with Ingold and Deleuze. The article was made possible through the financial support of ERC Advanced Grant Arctic Domus. Any shortcomings are mine.

References

- Deleuze, G. (1994) *Difference and Repetition*. (P. Patton, Trans.) New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. & F. Guattari (2003) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum.
- De Freitas, E. (2014) 'How Theories of Perception Deploy the Line: Reconfiguring Students' Bodies Through Topo-Philosophy.' *Educational Theory*, 64 (3): 285-301.
- Ingold, T. (2000) *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2007a) *Lines: A Brief History*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2007b) 'Earth, Sky, Wind, and Weather.' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 13: 19-38.
- Ingold, T. (2008) 'Binding Against Boundaries: Entanglements of Life in an Open World.' *Environment and Planning A*. 40: 1796-1810.
- Ingold, T. (2010a) 'Drawing Together: Materials, Gestures, Lines.' Pp. 299-313 in T. Otto and N. Bubandt (eds.) *Experiments in Holism: Theory and Practice in Contemporary Anthropology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ingold, T. (2010b) 'Footprints through the Weather-World: Walking, Breathing, Knowing'. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 16: 121-139.
- Ingold, T. (2011a) *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2011b) 'Introduction'. In T. Ingold (ed.) *Redrawing Anthropology: Materials, Movement, Lines* (pp. 1-20). Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Ingold, T. (2012a) 'Making Culture and Weaving the World.' Pp. 368-384 in S. H. Dudley (ed.) *Museum Objects: Experiencing the Properties of Things*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2012b) 'Towards an Ecology of Materials.' *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 42: 427-442.
- Ingold, T. (2013) *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2014) 'That's Enough About Ethnography!'. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*. 4 (1): 383-395.
- Ingold, T. (2015) *The Life of Lines*. London and New York: Routledge
- Ingold, T. & L. Hallam (2014) 'Making and Growing: An Introduction.' Pp. 1-24 in L. Hallam and T. Ingold (eds.) *Making and Growing: Anthropological Studies of Organisms and Artefacts*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2013) *The Pleasure of Drawing*. (P. Armstrong, Trans.) New York: Fordham University Press.