

The first iteration of *Alphabet Prime* came on the occasion of Documenta 12 in 2007, as a letter I generated to secure free entry to the exhibition. It consisted mostly of non-language, filler sentences that intentionally offered no real information. The journal, at the time, was an embryonic conceptualization, genuinely meant to come to fruition though not yet with any real schedule or mandate. The letter was an open script, casting the parameters for an enactment that still needed to write itself.

Now, two years later, this editorial can begin to articulate the nascent sentiment that lay behind that reticent note: *Alphabet Prime* is a call to arms for new language to infiltrate the discourse of our contemporary culture, a response to the index of quick references and cavalier quotations that have been rendered as such in a common effort towards legitimacy. There is a code of conduct in place, a pedagogical and professional script to which we as curators, critics, artists, and scholars readily adhere. As the foundation for any language, a predetermined and unanimously accepted alphabet lays the basic stonework upon which discourse is edified. Here, an effort is identified in the way of a new alphabet—an alphabet prime—that emerges from the existing code to generate its own terminologies or to find new meaning in the terms already at play.

Perhaps not by coincidence, the notion of “scripting” has come to organize this inaugural issue, divided into three sections. The first, A, contains texts that probe

(continues on
inside cover)

Aslı Çavuşoğlu

FQA

A: You know the stories describing how the author couldn't come up with an idea for a story? The idea is the absence of the idea and you see how the absence can be so varied.

Q: That reminds me of Simon Iff's monologue in Crowley's *Moon Child*. He explained that the intention behind creating a homunculus came from the desire to fill a void with infinite possibilities. The privation of the idea or notion is the most available platform from which to work.

A: Do you know the opera house in Germany, in a small town called Bayreuth, which was designed by Wagner himself? The Wagner Festival takes place there during one week each year, and in order to attend you have to pay about 500 euros to be entered on a five-year waitlist. However, there is one single seat in front of a huge column that totally prevents you from seeing the stage.

It is the only cheap seat available, and for a shorter waiting period. But you really can't see a thing.

Q: Sometimes the luckiest audience is the impaired audience.

A: About a century ago everyone wanted to be invisible, to possess the gift of sneaking into closed rooms or simply the power to show oneself only when desired. I'm talking about what H.G. Wells implies, about a physical invisibility rather than a dull person who is difficult to distinguish. It always sounded to me like a desire to retaliate against the ability of others' eyes. It seems the cure was to be too visible.

Q: James Hinton mentions the idea of being invisible by utilizing words—but the term used here implies the unperceived—in *How to Play with Words without Breaking Them*. He begins with the question: “Is too much too little?” to deal with the idea of antonyms. He says white is not the antonym of black. It can only be the contrast of it or more like its reminiscent.

A: An Italian writer from the 18th Century, Giuseppe di Franca, wrote a book called *The Dictionary of the Reminiscent*.

Q: In fact, all dictionaries are based upon the idea that one word reminds you of another without replacing it totally. Think about identical twins. One can replace the other but not completely. They are only capable of evoking each other.