

**Abstract:****Radical Fragmentation: A proposal for the facilitation of a complete overview**

The questions of how and where can fragments be understood is central to our discipline, yet the necessary rigour has been missing when ascertaining a complete overview of fragmentation. The radical notion of falling, proposed in this paper, is a shift in the interrogation and interruption of fragmentary theory and focuses on a different aspect of the facilitation to a complete overview. Here, the proposal of falling fragments shifts the viewpoint from a traditional mode of engagement to one which centres around the movement which is inherent within the fragments and the movement that extends beyond the fragments. By using new and innovative techniques, examination of falling fragments finally gives a clear insight into the discovery of the beginnings of this new process – a process which provides more of a complete overview than had ever previously been achieved.

## **Radical Fragmentation: A Proposal for the Facilitation of a Complete Overview**

This paper seeks to ascertain how a complete overview of fragments can be facilitated through one radical physical and theoretical technique, that of falling.<sup>1</sup> This is a multi-step process which involves interrogation of object, movement and result. It is intended to be an overture to understanding and shall facilitate further work on the subject.

### **Interrogation of Object**

There are myriad objects which perform well under this type of scrutiny. These can be neatly divided into almost half, and form the basis for the overview of fragments falling. There are two types of fragmentary objects - concrete and indistinct.<sup>2</sup> The concrete objects can include but are not limited to: papyri; photography; a paper pattern;<sup>3</sup> peelings. Indistinct objects are by their nature more difficult to comprehend. As a set of examples, indirect objects can include but again are not limited to: sunlight on the canal; the thought of yogurt growing;<sup>4</sup> how it came to be that we all had lunch on the same day, at that same restaurant in the West Midlands.

### **Questions on Movement**

With the set of examples given above, it enables easier understanding of how both types of fragmented objects fall in the pursuit of a complete overview.<sup>5</sup> Questions that might arise could be in relation to how this falling occurs. Do the fragments twist as they fall? Do the fragmentary objects fall as one to create a larger overview of the falling? Does each fragmentary object, either concrete or indistinct, fall fragmentarily? Does the height of a falling fragmentary object affect the speed at which it falls?

Firstly, they may. Secondarily, no.<sup>6</sup> The fragmentary objects do not fall together to create larger overview of the falling. The fragmentary objects can only be pieced together discretely once they have fallen.<sup>7</sup> Tertiarily, fragmentary objects do not fall fragmentarily. Each fragment falls in and of itself but does not fall fragmentarily, in pieces. Tetratos, fragmentary objects fall in the same way as everything else has always fallen.<sup>8</sup>

### ***In Coniunctione Falling versus Distinctive Falling***

The central idea which is posed by the second question is the difference between the new radical technique of falling versus prior attempts to interrogate this practice.<sup>9</sup> Previous attempts to examine fragments and their interpretation have focused on a uniform examination with sets of fragmented objects falling together. However this

---

<sup>1</sup> 10.6

<sup>2</sup> 1.2

<sup>3</sup> Pattern 8

<sup>4</sup> 4.114

<sup>5</sup> 445-52

<sup>6</sup> 2.40

<sup>7</sup> 10.173-8

<sup>8</sup> 23.615

<sup>9</sup> 1.4.3

methodology shifts focus from the fragmentary nature of the objects themselves to the position in their fallen pose, as it removes the inherent movement within the complete fragmented objects as defined in the third answer.<sup>10</sup> The outdated methodology of *In Coniunctione* Falling is in direct contrast with the second answer in the above section and is in opposition to Distinctive Falling.

### **Distinctive Falling Typology**

As *In Coniunctione* falling is disproved by the new radical technique, the new way in which fragmentary objects fall focuses instead on a glass, and yet another glass.<sup>11</sup> If both pieces fall together then the tray is falling, however if both pieces fall independently of each other than something more than the sum of its parts is happening. This facilitates the complete overview, the focus of this paper.<sup>12</sup> Fragments do not always have to be this type of object, but the glass is used as an example to illustrate one type of fragment. This type of fragmentary material can be additionally explained in a number of ways.

The first way of this additional number of ways in which the complete overview of fragmentary material can be explained is through another demonstration. A piece of speech settles in the furrow of a new hole and this is a fragment in its own way.<sup>13</sup> The fall in the current example settles the fragment within the furrow but without the other pieces of speech.<sup>14</sup> In this way the fragment has fallen as a complete piece but when taken in context, has fallen with the other pieces. There are other things which live in the hole and the other things do not know of the pieces or the speech, only of the fragment which is in their hole and how it came to be there. In this way, all fragments are discrete pieces.<sup>15</sup> It is only in the overview that completeness can be ascertained of the individual parts.

### **Falling and Placing: A Dichotomy**

In addition to *In Coniunctione* Falling versus Distinctive Falling, there is another methodological consideration - the distinction between fragmentary objects which have been placed on a surface, and fragmentary objects which have fallen and landed.<sup>16</sup> This action, applied to the objects, effects the way that a complete overview is obtained. It is the act of falling itself which facilitates the shift of the objects and brings them to a state in which they can be understood. When fragments pass through time and space simultaneously and at speed, they are moving through a multi-dimensional space which alters their composition.<sup>17</sup> On landing, these objects are able to provide more information than they did prior to the radical action.

---

<sup>10</sup> 1.1, T02278

<sup>11</sup> 1.1

<sup>12</sup> 1110-1114

<sup>13</sup> 71.5-8

<sup>14</sup> 1.3.19

<sup>15</sup> 25-26

<sup>16</sup> 18.132-3

<sup>17</sup> 1.507-13.

## Conclusions

When a set of fragmentary objects has undergone a radical transformation, the completeness of their overview is plain to see. As has been discussed here in a number of ways, the type of object and physicality of falling each combine to create a sense of more than just the individual fragments.<sup>18</sup> In a sense, it begins to reach towards a way of understanding fragments which is simultaneously focussed on the fragment and also focussed on the way in which the fragments function together, both within and without the framework that has been imposed on them as discrete pieces. Fields for searching can include a book, a box, a small furrow, the spaces between planks of wood or tiles. There is much that can be ascertained from the new radical physical and theoretical technique. However, if there are no fragments to fall, then there will not be any falling and a complete overview cannot be achieved.

---

<sup>18</sup> 2.47

**Bibliography (in order of appearance)**

Lumière, L. (1895). *L'Arroseur, Arrosé*. Lyon.

Grimm. (1969). *Six Fairy Tales from the Brothers Grimm* [illustrated by David Hockney]. Oxford.

Casey, L. (2017). *Sew Different*. Hunsworth.

O'Hara, F. (2008). *Selected Poems*. New York.

Aeschylus. *Agamemnon*. trans. R. Fagels.

Hesiod. *Works and Days*. trans. G. W. Most 2018. London.

Schliemann, H. (1875). *Troy and its Remains: A Narrative of Researches and Discoveries Made on the Site of Ilium and in the Trojan Plain*. London. (trans. unknown)

Homer. *Iliad*. trans. R. Lattimore. Chicago. 2011.

Carson, A. (2016). *Float*. London.

Aphaia. (510BC) *East Pediment of the Temple of Aphaia*. Aegina, Greece.

Moore, H. (1956-7) *Falling Warrior*. London.

Stein, G. (1914). *Tender Buttons*. New York.

Sappho (2002). *If Not, Winter*. London. trans. A. Carson.

Seneca (2018), *Phaedra*. London. trans. J. G. Fitch.

Smith, M. E. (1990). 'Bill is Dead' in *Extricate*. Manchester.

Housman, A. E. (1883) 'Fragment of a Greek Tragedy' in *The Bromsgrovian*. Bromsgrove.

Tiphaigne de la Roche, C-F. (1760) *Giphantie, or A View of What Has Passed, What is Now Passing, and, During the Present Century, What Will Pass, in the World*. Paris.

Budin, S. (2009). *The Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity*. London.