

This inquiry has been situated around exploring the application and potential of language(s) in applied arts and craft. Through studio and research practice, I have interrogated the digital and the physical, the linguistic and the pictorial and continue to explore the instructional and the gestural, as these concepts relate to language.

I started by investigating the relationship between algorithmic languages and weaving; mining the links between the binaries and syntax of pattern generation. The relationship between punch cards and early computation gave me a thread to follow, leading me to an intersection between screen-based and analogue technologies. Working through different coding systems and investigating the aesthetic meaning of their garbled outputs allowed me to think differently through the digital. My haphazard, laboured coding experiments and punched holes embodied a physical labour that often isn't associated with computer outputs. *Digital* was then related back to its etymological origin — stemming from the latin *digitalis* to mean *finger, toe* (OED, 2025) — and, when applied to my project, came to mean “the systematic ability to impose structure” (Tenen, D. 2017) on any medium, object or method. Weaving and letterpress thus became digital technologies, and I the physical processor for their outputs. This union of prose and practice led me to draft notation, a system of pattern making structured around a binary representation of a loom. Using the modular bittiness of letterpress as a medium, I processed a set of words using the Huffman system of coding and created a printed pattern from it. This became my draft, a type of pictorial representation of language that can be translated into textile.

The next step in my inquiry was to expand my investigation of these aesthetic languages into the diagrammatic as a meeting place of the linguistic and the pictorial. I was moving from embedding meaning within a preexisting language to exploring the meaning already within the languages that exist around applied arts and crafts. By indexing and cataloguing sets of diagrams from textile workbooks, their similarities and differences became clear, and my inquiry took shape around what is revealed through the diagram. Through subverting their intended instruction, the possible potential of this language is explored and new, unexpected outputs are generated. Animation from pattern draft sequences, a stitched sampler of stitch diagrams, a woven tapestry of a loom. Throughout my enquiry the significance of tactile outputs, rather than screen-based ones, has been emphasised. Here, the act of making something tactile becomes an exercise of the *gesture* of a diagram (Ingold, 2007); a figuring-out of the diagrammatic not by following its instructions, but by following the motion implicit within its lines (Leeb, 2015).

Taking this gesture forward, my inquiry shifts from looking at the results of a diagram to the practice of diagramming; the diagram moves from being actioned in the past to a present happening. Can a diagram project forward — to depict a potential — rather than portray a fixed action that has already occurred? My current explorations start to explore the plurality of diagrams, seeing them not as fixed entities, but live sites of interpretation. Can I diagram a thought process as it is happening — and can this be followed to produce other live gestures? Or unspecified results?