

Another way of looking at the research

Is:

That despite it being about translating architecture to music where the problem of translation per se needs working out and in order to reduce architecture to a manageable proportion, one representative of architecture has been nominated, Zaha Hadid, it then resolves to being all about translating her, as a person.

So the task, then, is to translate a person to music. It is found that translation per se is impossible and that to translate a person needs the whole panoply of understanding the universe, to relate each part and the whole of the person, through the sieve that extends infinitely in all directions. This sieve is the division, medium, or barrier between the translatee and translator.

The easier route is as regards language, which has to be forced through a funnel, the sieve condensed to a focal point, like in a time cone (as explained by Roger Penrose in Roger Penrose, Reinhard Genzel and Andrea Ghez's '2020 Nobel Lectures in Physics', <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWF1uNb9Q1Q>), where there is a before and afterwards. The translator, then, straddles both, with both feet in the universe at large. The greater the knowledge, the greater the intensity and closeness to the subject to be translated. Maggie Hambling said something to this effect in a BBC Collections programme (6th August 1990, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/p02t7k03/making-their-mark-six-artists-on-drawing-3-maggi-hambling>).

In the modern world of AI, robotics and data capture in the cloud it is possible to capture data, log and store it so that a simulacrum or facsimile of a person may be obtained. This could be similar to the type of person envisaged by Nir Lahav and Zachariah A. Neemeh (in 'A Relativistic Theory of Consciousness'. *Frontiers of Psychology*, 12th May, 2022, <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.704270/full>). But despite their argumentation—and potential usefulness of their research possibly helping to decide when brain death occurs, for instance, and their refutation of zombies, as propounded by Chalmers (ibid)—their data captured people and human like robots (zombies, if Chalmers' argument perpetuates), are not people; it is the essence, the soul, that is needed to be recognised and represented in translation. Walter Benjamin said as much in 'The Task of the Translator' per Archipelago's 'Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator" – Part 1', 2013, <https://archipelagobooks.org/2013/07/benjamins-the-task-of-the-translator-part-i-2>).

The robots talked about here are at their current, or near future state of evolution. It is possible that in the future robots will break through barriers of intelligence, cognition, sentience and autonomy, to be recognisable entities in their own rights, as, or similar to, humans, perhaps in a parallel way as envisaged by Luciana Parisi in 'Instrumentality or the Origin of Techno-logic' (Goldsmiths University

London, Public Lecture, Spring Semester “New Social Abstractions”, 23rd March, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_laVln30Rjk). As part of a current society-wide debate, this view, currently, is not widely subscribed; it is the author’s view. Where it is agreed, some commentators consider that computers may take over and even dispense with humans, being of lesser intelligence and usefulness and inefficient as organic beings. I personally consider this not to be the likely outcome, that computerised intelligence will evolve to have great capacity and although the logic may be of its own nature, not exactly the same as that of humans, but in parallel, as Parisi intimates (ibid), and, as she also recommends, we should inter communicate.

So, translation then involves these issues of knowledge of the subject and for humans, to be translated within a total field of knowledge, for the translation to have validity, where the validity is proportional to the intensity of knowledge. So, the first issue is about translation. What is translation? How can it be done? Then, what is the subject to be translated? Then, to translate a human, to understand that human within an infinite field of knowledge, the translator also has to know herself/himself in a similar fashion and then find cross linkages or relationships between the translator and the translatee, to make some sort of determined/indeterminate (?) mix of a translation result. Maggie Hambling commented similarly to this effect regarding drawing an object, or subject, expressed through her, to the outcome, the drawing, where she admits, and says that indeed it is needed: subjectivity, a tenet of this research (ibid).

Mathematicians can do transforms; and the universe translates constantly, via evolution. Transforms can help mechanistically in a translator’s processes and the whole process has to take place within the universe in constant evolution.

So, where Walter Benjamin (ibid) effectively said the task of the translator is not an easy one, this reasoning illustrates how right he was, but it can be done, even if partially, with inadequate knowledge, and possibly less intensity than overlaying all knowledge theories and scenarios than theoretically, even hypothetically, possible.

In itself, it is a creative act, requiring great courage, faith, knowledge, sometimes risk taking, an act of entrepreneurship, and, tautologically, creativity.

This is roughly the story of translating Zaha Hadid to music by me, by the holistic approach.