The Inscription as Ontogenesis

Finitude, Emergence and the Philosophical Gesture — a Quantum Example

David Cota — Fundador da Ontologia da Complexidade Emergente

Abstract

This text proposes a radical reformulation of contemporary ontology through the concept of inscription as a material and symbolic operation that stabilizes differences under local conditions. Rejecting the classical dualism between matter and thought, as well as the transcendental residues present in various philosophical traditions, the text affirms the Ontology of Emerging Complexity (OEC) as an operative regime of immanent intelligibility. Inscription is presented as an ontogenetic gesture that does not reveal essences, but reorganizes material instabilities into legible marks, implying energetic cost, finitude, and ethical responsibility.

Quantum measurement is analysed as an exemplary onto-epistemic paradigm, in which subject-function, object-function, and apparatus are co-produced in the stabilization of traces. Epistemology ceases to be representational and becomes an intervening practice, while truth is reconceptualized as operative consistency. In this horizon, philosophy abandons the contemplation of essences and assumes itself as co-inscription: a situated practice of symbolic reorganization of the real.

Finitude emerges as the affirmative condition of inscription, founding an ethics of emergence based on material listening, responsibility for the gesture, and cohabitation with the variability of the real. Inscription is also technogenesis, implying that language, consciousness, and intelligence are material regimes of symbolic differentiation. The chapter culminates in the affirmation of philosophy as an aesthetic and ethical intervention in the regimes of legibility, where to think is to inscribe — and to inscribe is to share the responsibility for the emergence of possible worlds.

Rejecting ontological dualism is not merely a refutation of an inherited thesis; it is the institution of a positive demand for immanent intelligibility. The critique of spiritualism — whether in the form of an immaterial soul, transcendental consciousness, or a priori epistemic subject — remains insufficient unless accompanied by a consistent and affirmative ontological alternative. Transcendence, as the history of philosophy clearly shows, does not dissolve with denial: it reappears under new disguises — from the sensible/intelligible split in Plato, to the res cogitans/res extensa dichotomy in Descartes, through Kant's transcendental subject, and into the ontolinguistic inflections of Heidegger, Derrida, Lacan, and Levinas. Despite their divergences, all ultimately preserve the inaugural rupture between matter and thought.

True emancipation of thought demands more than negative critique: it requires the inscription of an immanent positivity, understood as a regime of material, emergent, and operative consistency. Every transcendental supplement — spiritual, anthropological, or technical-formal — is nothing but an ontological fiction. Only a philosophy grounded in the

immanent power of matter can avoid the return of transcendental figures in new guises. The issue is not reconciling body and mind as opposing poles, but deactivating the inaugural gesture of separation that instituted the dichotomy between interiority and exteriority, between consciousness and extension.

It is at this threshold that the Ontology of Emerging Complexity (OEC) repositions the horizon of intelligibility: matter is no longer seen as mere extensive passivity or linear causality but as the ontological operator of difference — unstable, self-organizing, and productive. Under certain conditions, it generates symbolic inscription (Morin, 1990; Prigogine & Stengers, 1984). Intelligibility does not emanate from a spirit that orders the real, but from complex and relational matter, capable of organizing the conditions under which differences become legible. To think is not to access a virtual plane (contra Deleuze), nor to actualize attributes of an infinite substance (contra Spinoza), nor to retrieve a pure pre-individuality (contra Simondon). To think is to inscribe, symbolically, reorganizations already operated by matter. Thought prolongs these reorganizations in the symbolic plane, where they can acquire legibility and shareable consistency — but it does not produce them as material reality.

Against both mechanism and the hypothesis of an immaterial substance, OEC asserts matter as simultaneously the source of forms and the operative condition of the symbolic. This matter does not realize pre-inscribed potentials; it invents relations through its operative excess. In continuity with Simondon (1958), who conceives individuation as a metastable process, and with Deleuze (1968), who proposes an ontology of difference without essence, OEC radicalizes this lineage: the real is a field of continuous recomposition, and the symbolic emerges only at specific thresholds — as localized inscription of legible differences. Instability, far from being a flaw, is ontogenetic condition: it is the medium in which galaxies form, stars forge elements, planets consolidate, proteins fold, and neurons reconfigure synaptic circuits. Order is but an expressive pause of this instability — never its negation.

Any attempt to reinstate an external principle — divine, mental, or formal — is rejected. OEC affirms radical immanence as a non-negotiable ontological criterion: no philosophical operation is valid if it appeals to instances external to material processes. Hence the demand for a grammar of inscription: a regime in which matter, through differential reorganization, generates symbolic consistency without recourse to pre-existing essences. It is at this point that OEC distances itself from Derrida, whose *différance* retains a logic of absence; from Lacan, whose symbolic order depends on a structural lack; and from Heidegger, whose *Ereignis* still presupposes an originary horizon of disclosure. For OEC, the symbol is not lack, nor deferral, nor ontological destiny: it is a material structure representing relations between previously stabilized differences — an operative form of the symbolization of a material structure.

The focus shifts: the question is no longer "what does the world reveal?" but "how does the world inscribe itself?" (Latour, 1999). Ontology ceases to be a doctrine of represented being and becomes an analysis of production: it does not seek essences, but modes of emergence. Within this horizon, the Ontology of Emerging Complexity (OEC) aligns itself with Karen Barad's (2007) ontoepistemology, in which reality results from discursive-material intra-actions, yet introduces a decisive distinction: the symbolic is not a universal condition of emergence, but an operative exception — a localized and contingent inscription that renders certain material relations legible.

Against Aristotelian teleology, Hegel's dialectic of Spirit, Bergson's élan vital, Teilhard de Chardin's eschatology, or Kauffman's finalist models of self-organization, OEC rejects every promise of necessary convergence. There is no plan, no destiny: only local recombinations of matter.

From this nucleus emerges the thesis structuring the rest of the text: quantum measurement is taken as a paradigmatic example of an inaugural ontological gesture — a material operation that does not reveal latent properties but inscribes. By materially reorganizing the system under concrete conditions, it stabilizes a difference that, once symbolized, acquires legible consistency. This operation replaces the paradigm of revelation with the logic of inscription. And, as OEC insists, every inscription involves energetic cost, auditable error, and bounded scale: there is no symbolization without expenditure. The cost lies in forming the material configuration that makes difference possible, and in the symbolic operation that inscribes it as a mark. The mark, as such, does not incur further expenditure: it is the same material structure, now symbolized, whose legibility results from prior energetic work and effective symbolic reorganization.

By shifting the centre of philosophical discourse from the primacy of being or subject to the operation, OEC affirms that thinking is not reflection upon a prior essence, but the prolongation of material inscriptions under local conditions. Inscription is not repetition of norms nor mere discursive play: it is a constitutive operation through which the real reorganizes itself differentially and founds consistency without transcendental grounds. It does not describe pre-given identities nor reproduce fixed structures: it institutes the real at the level where differences become legible, opening the field of intelligibility.

As an ontological operator, inscription is not restricted to the domain of quantum physics. Its reference in this context results only from its exemplary clarity — it implies no ontological privilege. The quantum merely illustrates, in a paradigmatic way, how differences stabilize under localized regimes of inscription — a dynamic that could occur in any physical system. This distinction prevents the improper transposition of quantum physics into a universalizing ontology.

From this follows the foundational point of OEC: inscription opens the symbolic field in which material consistency becomes legible and modulable. Matter is not a passive support of meaning; at certain thresholds, its reorganization can become symbolizable. Thought, far from being a reflection, is a situated continuation of inscription — that is, symbolic modulation of differences previously stabilized at the material level. Subject and object do not preexist this process: they emerge as subject-function and object-function, differential positions produced by the same gesture of inscription.

In this light, quantum measurement is no longer conceived as a verification technique but as an inaugural ontological gesture: a material and energetic event in which an instability reorganizes and stabilizes a difference under concrete conditions of coupling. The classical paradigm of observation, which assumed the revelation of latent properties, gives way to the notion of inscription — an irreversible operation that fixes, within a local regime of interaction, material differentiation in legible form. Against the model of revelation, in which reality is a repository of hidden properties, OEC affirms that only differences stabilized within situated regimes of interaction exist. This shift compels a reassessment of the epistemological foundations of modern science, particularly its adherence to the representational model of knowledge (Bohr, 1935; Heisenberg, 1958).

Within the scope of this text, measurement refers exclusively to the context of quantum physics: it designates the material coupling to an isolated system, through which a stable difference is instantiated that, once symbolized, becomes legible. As Barad (2007) notes, drawing from Bohr, quantum measurement does not reveal intrinsic properties: it configures phenomena. The decisive divergence is that, for OEC, this phenomenon is not merely an experimental description but an inaugural material inscription in which subject-function and object-function are co-produced as differential positions of the same sociotechnical coupling.

It is, however, essential to avoid misunderstanding: inscription does not accompany every scientific operation or every experimental record, but occurs at the moment when a phenomenon, particle, or property is symbolized for the first time and becomes legible as difference. It is this inaugural gesture that opens the field of transmissibility and reflection; from it, scientific work may multiply descriptions, calculations, and verifications — all of which already depend upon the first inscription.

At this stage, it becomes crucial to distinguish between regimes of symbolic legibility. In the classical regime, the marks derived from traces possess relative stability: planetary orbits, molecular crystallizations, or instrumental signals can be symbolized and remain legible over time. In the quantum regime, however, the mark is only formed during the moment of measurement: the trace stabilizes for minimal fractions of time and dissolves thereafter. This does not imply that particles do not exist outside of observation, but that their symbolic legibility is intrinsically ephemeral — which compels a rethinking of the epistemological conditions of inscription. The quantum thus confirms the OEC thesis: all material organization is transient; in the quantum realm, this transience reaches its extreme limit.

There is no transcendental interiority nor human prerogative: the "subject" is an operational position — that is, a relational function emerging within the network of symbolic and material co-production. The material real precedes and exceeds this scene; what is born from co-inscription is the symbolic field wherein such positions become operable and legible.

This entails a profound transformation of the concept of observer. The classical observer is replaced by the operator of inscription: not a transcendental consciousness that illuminates the real, but a material-symbolic configuration in which subject-function, object-function, and apparatus are co-produced in the stabilization of a trace. This trace is the minimal material configuration — condensation, energy variation, or localized disturbance — that results from the coupling between system and instrument, but only acquires semiotic status once inscribed as a shareable mark.

The experimental apparatus, far from being external to the phenomenon, organizes the material conditions of inscription. Beyond physical devices, it encompasses technical protocols, energetic architectures, and recording modes that render certain differences legible. As Latour (1999) has shown, the laboratory does not reveal hidden properties: it fabricates traces that, once symbolized, become operable data.

Measurement is thus an ontoepistemic act: it inscribes pre-existing differences in the form of a trace, enabling their symbolization and integration as knowledge. This operation is not neutral: it consumes energy, produces entropy, and reorganizes the system. Knowledge is therefore also physical transformation. The second law of thermodynamics becomes an ontological criterion: to inscribe is to dissipate, to intervene, and to leave a trace. Each

inscription is a situated gesture, whose result only persists within the material conditions that make it possible.

Epistemology, thus reconceived within the quantum horizon, no longer seeks essences but devices of emergence. The question is no longer "what is the particle in itself?" but "how does the trace emerge that can be symbolized and, upon becoming a mark, confer symbolic consistency?" Physics becomes an operative archaeology: a science of modes of inscription, of the conditions of emergence, and of the operations that render the real visible, measurable, and thinkable. This archaeology, however, does not reduce to Foucauldian discourse genealogy: it investigates not only discursive formations but also how specific material, technical, and energetic configurations establish ontological conditions of legibility.

Objectivity, in this horizon, is no longer correspondence but operative consistency: a trace is objective if the regime that produces it is repeatable, materially sustainable, energetically auditable, and capable of generating symbolic stability. The real is not reducible to what is inscribed, since matter precedes any symbolic regime; but the real, as legible and stabilized within the epistemic plane, is only constituted through inscription. This is not arbitrary constructivism, but the recognition that inscription is a material gesture governed by its own conditions. Truth, in this horizon, ceases to be a mirror and becomes consistency: a statement is true if it operates with symbolic and material efficacy within a given regime. Truth is an operative function, in alignment with post-foundational epistemologies (Butler, 1997; Haraway, 2016; Latour, 1999).

From this perspective, quantum measurement must be understood as an ontoepistemic paradigm that, on a minimal scale, shows how certain material organizations convert into writing. Between measuring and writing there is no hiatus: both are material gestures that, by reorganizing instability, produce symbolic consistency. The laboratory thus becomes a privileged space of inscription — a site where the intelligible is co-produced through operations that stabilize differences in matter.

Despite reformulations in contemporary physics, the classical notion of particle as a substantial entity endowed with intrinsic properties persists as a residue of substance metaphysics. Quantum formalization, however, shows that while quantum matter indeed organizes itself into real particles, these only become legible when the experimental coupling produces a transitory inscription. Unlike supramolecular or macroscopic levels of matter — where acquired marks can maintain relative persistence — in the quantum regime the trace is ephemeral: it appears only in the instant of observation and dissipates shortly thereafter. This condition of instability and transitivity requires a revision of the classical criterion of objectivity, shifting it toward highly localized material regimes, energetically fragile and symbolically unstable.

The wave function, with its logic of superposition and contextual dependence, demands a decisive ontological redesign: there is no fully legible substantial identity prior to inscription. The so-called "wave-particle duality" should not be taken as an ontological given, but as a linguistic symptom — a historical effort to preserve classical categories in the face of phenomena whose consistency stabilizes only within specific regimes of material inscription. The real does not possess two natures: "wave" and "particle" are differential effects of distinct material couplings, each of which fixes, for an instant, a legible and energetically stabilized trace.

It is crucial, however, to underline the scope of this reflection: here OEC deliberately risks a speculative philosophical hypothesis, rather than an empirical assertion. The difficulty in accommodating quantum behavior may not stem from an actual ontological duality, but from the fact that the phenomena in question correspond to a form of material organization not yet symbolized — an intermediate regime between inherited categories of wave and particle. Within this register, duality would be nothing more than a negative residue left by the absence of adequate symbolization — an index of the conceptual insufficiency of inherited systems when faced with a regime of inscription not yet stabilized.

As Karen Barad (2007) notes, following Bohr, what we designate as "particle" is not a hidden essence, but an intra-active phenomenon co-produced by the interaction between system, apparatus, and material conditions. The particle is not denied as material reality — it exists — but is understood as a physical process whose legibility depends on inscription. Its existence precedes observation, but the trace that stabilizes it as a mark only occurs at the moment of measurement. This measurement does not create the object, but organizes a material-symbolic regime in which state, position, or property become legible as stabilized differences. The ontology of the particle is thus displaced from substance to inscribed event: from "being-in-itself" to situated operative difference, where legibility is not a reflection of essence, but an effect of inscription.

From this displacement follow decisive epistemological consequences. The particle is no longer sought as a prior essence but as produced consistency: the question becomes under what conditions it becomes nameable, legible, and measurable. The "being" of the particle is defined by its regime of legibility, whose consistency depends on the repeatability of the material and symbolic conditions that institute it. The work of the laboratory does not reveal hidden properties: it stabilizes regularities as traces inscribed within regimes of material constraint — but these traces are not mere statistical recurrences; they are effects stabilized by energetic and operative protocols that ensure their repeatability.

Thus, the rigid boundary between ontology and epistemology dissolves: to know is to inscribe, and to inscribe is to create symbolic-operative reality. Physical reality exists independently of us, but it only becomes intelligible when reorganized through inscriptions that are themselves new material organizations. The truth of the particle is not measured by correspondence with a metaphysical essence, but by the efficacy of the inscription regime that stabilizes it as legible. The analogy with Austin (1962) and Butler (1997) helps clarify this point: just as certain performative utterances instantiate real effects within the symbolic domain, quantum measurement also reorganizes matter into material symbols — that is, physically configured inscriptions — that render the real accessible, though without creating it ex nihilo. The difference is decisive: linguistic performativity operates within the discursive plane, whereas quantum inscription is a material-energetic gesture that precedes and conditions symbolic legibility.

Reconfiguring the particle as an operative effect means abandoning the nostalgia for substance and embracing the constitutive finitude of inscription. That nostalgia runs through the philosophical tradition, from Plato to Hegel, through Aristotle, Bergson, and Teilhard de Chardin — always seeking an essence, an origin, or an end. OEC rejects this pathos of origin: stability is not immutable essence or teleology, but the result of local processes of organization that, though provisional, can persist long enough to allow for emergence and legibility. This apparent identity results not from essence but from successful operative

repetitions — effective reiterations of energetic and symbolic conditions that stabilize within inscribed regimes. And it is not only "things" that can be named: energetic instabilities, momentary variations, and dissolving processes can also acquire symbolic status when inscribed. From this perspective, the real is not a fabric of essences but of differential processes that stabilize locally — sometimes as things, sometimes as events, sometimes as fleeting traces — of which only some become legible and symbolically operable.

It is important to stress that the inscription of the particle does not dissolve it into appearance: its intelligibility always depends on material conditions of symbolization. The so-called collapse of the wave function — often misread, especially in vulgarized or mystical interpretations, as signifying the disappearance of matter — does not herald the end of the real, but reveals the inadequacy of inherited symbolic categories to describe the complexity of quantum regimes. The particle is a material entity that, upon being inscribed, is converted into a legible mark of a real process. Quantum mechanics makes this point explicit: as matter reorganizes itself within unstable regimes, it demands new symbolic forms capable of accompanying the density and variation of its processes.

This displacement redefines the problem of knowledge: what matters now is to make explicit the conditions under which a result is maintained. The criteria become operative: rigorous delimitation of the regime, controlled repetition, thermoenergetic auditability, and concrete exposure to the risks of error. There is no neutrality: every verification intervenes in the field of legibility and reconfigures it.

The implications go beyond epistemology and affect the status of the accessible real: finite, historical, situated, composed of locally consistent configurations rather than an essential substratum. The so-called "ontology of the given" — which assumes a stable substratum — operates as a regulatory fiction masking the operative character of emergence. The legible real is not a substrate: it is an effect of inscription. It falls to philosophy to map these regimes and their limits, rejecting the ideal of a stable ground and assuming itself as a material analysis of the conditions that configure the world.

From this, it follows that epistemology becomes operative ontology. Ontology is no longer a theory of being as essence, but an analysis of the modes of emergence of difference. Material reality precedes any inscription; however, at the level of thought, the real only becomes accessible as difference when stabilized in concrete regimes of inscription. This task is never neutral: every inscription redefines the field of the possible. Thus, the shift from a philosophy of representation to a philosophy of inscription is consolidated: the legible real is the effect of material and symbolic operations, and knowledge is an intervening practice in that production. Inscription becomes the axial concept of a post-foundational ontology, where being is thought as emergence and truth is measured by consistency. Thought no longer reflects the world: it participates in its writing.

The elaboration of the concept of inscription thus imposes an operative grammar capable of integrating different levels of material complexity — from quantum phenomena to the symbolic configurations of consciousness. "Grammar" here does not mean metaphor or formal system of rules, but real ontogenetic structure: a matrix of material, technical, and symbolic operations that organize the emergence of meaning. It is a generative, situated, and contingent device of differentiation that points not to teleology but to a multiplicity of cuts and reconfigurations. Not every material reorganization is symbolic; however, wherever there

is symbolization, there is always material reorganization: inscription is the name of the gesture that converts physical differences into symbolizable marks, capable of circulation and testing.

Quantum measurement is not the revelation of hidden properties, but a gesture of inscription that stabilizes, under specific material conditions, a legible difference. This stabilization is not reducible to the physical plane as an "inert substrate": it involves technical apparatus, parameter selection, energetic conditions, and operational temporality. What emerges is not the truth of a prior state, but the consistency of a produced trace. This logic breaks with the dichotomy between nature and language: in scientific practice, inscription is simultaneously a physical and symbolic process, as it translates material differences into marks that may circulate as knowledge and be audited through protocols of repetition and scale.

More rigorous than speaking of continuity is to speak of operative homology: between the stabilization of traces in physical regimes and their conversion into marks within linguistic regimes, there exist contingent couplings that render certain traces symbolizable. This homology does not dissolve the heterogeneity between planes — physical and symbolic — but reveals that certain operations function in structurally analogous ways, even when their ontological levels do not coincide. Consciousness — understood as a reflexive regime of inscription — neither opposes matter nor transcends it: it is an emergent exception of neurocorporeal and sociotechnical couplings, without necessary teleology, in which complex matter reorganizes and stabilizes forms that may acquire shareable meaning.

This unity rejects both physicalist reductionism — which seeks to deduce biological and symbolic levels from the physical (including the quantum) — and the classical dualism that separates body and spirit, language and reality. Rather than fusing planes or disciplines, the grammar of inscription recognizes an ontogenetic kinship among material operations that, in different regimes, make symbolization possible. What distinguishes these regimes is not a prior essence, but the way each produces traces, the field in which these traces become legible, and the conditions under which they may be symbolized. Physics, biology, linguistics, and technology do not subordinate one another: they emerge as specific regimes of inscription, each with its own constraints, potentials, and responsibilities. Philosophy, in this framework, does not assume a position of overview: it intervenes in these regimes, thinking them from within their materiality, historicity, and symbolic power.

Thus consolidates the shift towards an operative ontology of inscription: a philosophy that does not take the real as given, but recognizes it as produced by material and symbolic operations. The grammar of inscription, far from metaphor, designates an ontogenetic structure that traverses levels of complex matter wherever symbolization occurs. From the quantum to the symbolic, from physics to ethics, from trace to meaning — what counts as meaning depends on inscription. And thinking, within this horizon, is to inscribe with responsibility, rigor, and attentiveness to the material conditions that render the world legible and inhabitable.

To understand inscription as a situated operation implies recognizing its most fundamental condition: finitude. This is not absence nor negative limitation, but the affirmative condition of emergence. Inscription is only effected because there is cut, selection, and organization in the face of the excess of the real. Every gesture establishes an inside and an outside, a trace and a noise, an event and a virtuality. It is this delimitation —

this impossibility of inscribing everything — that founds difference as operative consistency and sustains the legibility of the world.

Finitude, in this horizon, is not the opposite of power but its very possibility. It is what allows the emergence of forms, the emergence of meaning, the stabilization of symbolic regimes. As Georges Canguilhem (1966) emphasizes, the normativity of the living arises from exposure to the limit — the possibility of error, failure, death. The Ontology of Emerging Complexity displaces this diagnosis: it is not failure that moves the real, but the limit that opens the field of possibilities. There is inscription only because there is cut, and meaning only because every mark excludes an infinity of alternatives. The inscribed trace is not a mere negative selection but an organizing operation that stabilizes a difference over others, under explicit material cost.

In this sense, finitude is not restriction, but configurative power. The act of inscribing is decision, organization, and institution. That decision is always risky, because it takes place against a backdrop of excess and indeterminacy that matter presents. Quantum physics offers here an exemplary image: measurement does not reveal a prior essence, but stabilizes a difference under precise material conditions; this stabilization is always partial, situated, and irreversible. The so-called collapse of the wave function is not failure, but operative inscription: an affirmation of finitude as the condition of emergence of the real (Zurek, 2003).

The finitude of inscription is manifest in the impossibility of totalization. No symbolic system can inscribe the totality of the real, just as no operative regime offers absolute transparency. The philosophy of difference — from Nietzsche to Deleuze — insisted on this point: the real always exceeds what can be thought, said, or inscribed. In the horizon of OEC, this excess does not refer to transcendence, but to the inexhaustible immanence of material variation. The real is combinatory profusion, not a promise of hidden essence. The task of philosophy is not to capture being within a definitive conceptual net, but to accompany becoming operatively, inscribing at the margins of the thinkable that which becomes legible under situated regimes of consistency. The "excess" here is immanent positivity: a field of variation that no system can exhaust.

Conceiving finitude as an operative condition leads to an ethics of inscription: not a transcendental code of norms, but a practice of care with limits, attentiveness to what remains excluded, and responsibility for the decision that institutes meaning. Donna Haraway (2016) clarifies this responsibility as situated response — the capacity to listen to context, act with regard to consequences, and inhabit instability without recourse to external guarantees. In the horizon of OEC, to inscribe is to decide and to respond: for the forms produced, the meanings stabilized, and the inevitable exclusions enacted. Because materiality exceeds any inscription, every operative decision is also political: it determines which differences become visible and which remain in the shadows.

Philosophy is, above all, the practice of situated inscription: it does not aim to encompass totality, but to intervene in symbolic regimes, destabilize crystallized forms, propose new cuts and new grammars. Every philosophical intervention operates under the condition of finitude, historicity, and material implication. There is no philosophy outside the world, nor thought detached from matter; there is only the incessant attempt to think at the limit, inscribe within incompletion, and reorganize the real from its constitutive openness. It is precisely this finitude that grounds the creative power of philosophy as operation.

Finitude thus becomes not only an ontological concept, but also a methodological and ethical principle. It compels thought to relinquish ultimate foundation, to accept instability as the condition of creation, and to recognize each inscription as a political gesture. Because it determines what can be thought and recognized, inscription is always contestable, transformable, and reconfigurable. Far from signifying limitation, finitude is what renders thought possible, necessary, and alive.

This model also breaks with the anthropocentric view that intelligence is an exclusively human attribute. If inscription is the condition for symbolic emergence and depends on technical and material regimes, then non-biological intelligences—capable of inscribing, reorganizing, and operating symbols with autonomy—may emerge. The criterion ceases to be ontological (about origin of substrate) and becomes operative: it is measured by the functionality and complexity of inscription—including self-modulation and responsiveness to otherness (emergent functional subjectivity)—rather than by the biology of the bearer. Consciousness, in this framework, does not transcend matter: it is one of its possible regimes, finite and historically situated.

The technogenesis of inscription equally redefines the status of language. No longer a system of inner representation, language becomes a material technology for symbolic differentiation. Each language is a technical regime of inscription, with its own rules, grammars, and limits. By organizing the world, it delimits it; by making it legible, it excludes; by configuring it, it produces silences and omissions. As Derrida (1967) showed, there is no thought outside writing—and writing is always technical, always material inscription. OEC adds a decisive point: the symbol is a material representation of relations among material structures; it does not reveal essence, it operates on marks, reconfiguring the field of the possible.

Within this horizon, philosophy must rethink its place as a material practice of inscription. The philosopher is not the guardian of a pure language, but a symbolic operator intervening within regimes of legibility. To think is to inscribe—and to inscribe is to materially reorganize the real. Technogenesis, thus understood, is not external to philosophy: it constitutes its operative territory. Philosophizing is working with and upon the technical conditions of meaning, assuming responsibility for the cuts it institutes and the forms of world it stabilizes.

Thus it is affirmed that inscription gives rise to technique in the broad sense whenever symbolic gesture externalizes into supports and devices, extending traces and enhancing material legibility. Symbolization is broader than reason: it also operates in regimes without rational thresholds (such as genetic code). However, when symbolic exteriorization attains a rational threshold—not as essence, but as a reflective meta-inscription modality—we speak of technogenesis in the strict sense: a regime that organizes devices, protocols, and audits, extending persistence, circulation, and tests of consistency. Reason does not precede technique as substance; it co-emerges with certain regimes of inscription that make it possible. Thus, technology is not an external domain to nature but its second complexity instance: the externalization of the same symbolic function operative in the living, reorganized by rational thresholds (biological or artificial) and diversified into new inscription supports. Thought is not substance but operative gesture; not essence but mediated emergence. Within this framework, the quantum, language, and consciousness are moments of the same process: symbolic reorganization of matter under situated, finite, and politically

charged regimes of inscription. The quantum is not metaphor, but an exemplary material grammar indicating at the most elementary level how differences stabilize as marks—without implying that "everything is quantum."

Thus, technology is not an external domain to nature but its second instance: the exteriorization of the same symbolic function operative in the living, extended into new supports of inscription.

Inscription carries a decisive ontological mark: finitude. It is not an exterior limit, but a constitutive condition. Every gesture is localized, conditioned by material constraints and sustained by precarious stability. It is this impossibility of totalization that makes the emergence of meaning possible. Finitude not only enables inscription and legibility but compels us to recognize that every symbolic reorganization of the real is made under conditions of delimitation and responsibility. In this horizon, OCE rejects the image of reality as a closed or fully legible system: reality appears as an open field of variations in constant recomposition, whose stabilization is always local, energetic, and provisional (Nancy, 2000).

Variability is here understood as the ontological structure of the real. Complex matter does not organize from a center but through distributed interactions, nonlinear feedbacks, and self-organizing processes without final states. Inscription is only possible because there is excess and indeterminacy; far from being noise, this variability is the power of continuous differentiation. Finitude functions as the horizon within which excess inscribes itself and becomes symbolic form. Thought, understood as an inscription practice, organises variability under situated regimes, embracing it as positive condition.

From this follows a reformulation of ethics: not based on universal principles, but on situated practice of material listening to variability, response to finitude, and symbolic creation amid indeterminacy. This shift implies recognizing that ethics is, firstly, relational responsibility: responding to variability is not controlling it, but cohabiting with it, embracing its positivity as a condition of the real (Haraway, 2016). Secondly, that responsibility is immanent, grounded not in external commands but in the material implication of each gesture. To inscribe is to intervene; every intervention transforms the regime of possibilities; each inscription carries irreducible ethical charge.

In this context, the ethics of emergence demands a renewed philosophical practice: not contemplation of ideal values, but co-inscription of modes of existence. The philosopher intervenes in the reorganization of inscription regimes, attentive to their material conditions, constitutive exclusions, and differentiation powers. To think is to act responsibly in the symbolic configuration of the real; it is to assume risk: every inscription stabilizes differences under local conditions and, in doing so, reorganizes the horizon of the thinkable.

Operative finitude demands a non-redemptive ontology. There is no salvation, transcendence, or ultimate purpose: only successive reorganizations of symbolic matter under always partial conditions. Truth is not the revelation of essence but the consistency of situated inscriptions; objectivity is not neutrality, but emergent stability of replicable, energetically sustainable conditions; ethics is not universal norm but immanent responsibility for the finite organization of the possible. Finitude is not constraint: it is the engine of creation. Precisely because there is no totality, the field of the real opens to invention, responsibility, and coexistence—and that blocks a return to substantive or foundationalist philosophies.

It is important, however, to avoid recurring misunderstandings: this does not reduce all processes to the quantum, but recognizes that the quantum regime offers a paradigmatic formalization of inscription processes that traverse matter at different scales. What it shows—finite stabilization of instabilities under strict material measurement conditions—is neither metaphor nor marginal exception but an operative grammar of how differences become consistent only when inscribed. The quantum, in its infra-scalar nature, reveals a domain where inscription conditions no longer obey classical regularities and demand new technical and conceptual devices. From this arises the shift: the quantum ceases to be a peripheral domain of physics and becomes a transversal paradigm for formalizing material complexity—not by reducing other scales to itself but by showing that in all of them the real organizes locally through regimes of inscription. To think from the quantum is to assume this operative principle as ontological criterion: all intelligibility depends on material conditions of inscription, and it is in this gesture that philosophy rediscovers its task—not of contemplation, but of co-production of the legible real.

Philosophy, thus repositioned, abandons foundational frameworks—essences, universalisms, transcendences—to embrace inscription as immanent practice. Thought is not judge of truth but symbolic operator of difference. Ontology becomes a pragmatics of emergence: analysis of inscription devices that render something real, thinkable, and shareable. Within this framework, philosophy is simultaneously aesthetic and ethical: aesthetic, because it works with sensitive regimes of symbolic composition; ethical, because every inscription is an operative decision that reconfigures the field of the possible. To inscribe is to act, and acting implies responsibility. Philosophical rigor is no longer that of abstract deduction but of consistency between matter, symbol, and world: a thought is rigorous when, in inscribing, it reorganizes the real in a coherent and shareable way.

The philosophical practice is thus a situated intervention within the inscription regimes that configure the contemporary world. Just as quantum measurement stabilizes a trace, philosophy produces concepts that stabilize zones of meaning without crystallizing them. The philosopher is not keeper of essences but symbolic artisan operating within instability, exploring emergence regimes that reorganize lived experience. The divide between theory and practice dissolves: thought is technical, language is material, and all knowledge is world-making. Philosophy is always co-inscription: it does not overlay science or arts but intervenes with them, reorganizing the realm of the possible materially and symbolically.

This co-inscription also demands a rigorous regime of listening: attention to material conditions of emergence, thresholds of intelligibility, and margins of symbolization. Listening is an operative gesture of care: inscribing fragile signals of the becoming responsibly, giving them symbolic consistency without crystallizing them. It involves active delay—suspending the haste to signify—to allow nascent marks to emerge. It is a gesture capable of concurrently recognizing the density of stabilized inscriptions and the vulnerability of what is yet un-inscribed.

Thus, thought finds its measure in incompletion. Every inscription is partial, situated, and provisional; time is not a continuous line, but a field of bifurcations where the past is archive and the future is potential emergence. The value of thought is measured by its capacity to reorganize symbolic regimes ethically and shareably. The risk of inscription is inevitable: error and exclusion are not external failures but operative conditions of all

stabilization. Philosophy rediscovers here its vocation: to care for what cannot be fully inscribed and for the excess that escapes every gesture.

Therefore, to inscribe is always also to share. No inscription is an isolated gesture: it intervenes in common regimes of legibility and reorganizes collective world-making practices. Every philosophical concept, by stabilizing a zone of meaning, simultaneously produces exclusions and forgetting. Recognizing this shared dimension is accepting the ethical and political responsibility of inscription. Aesthetics is not ornament but the constitutive dimension of the operative gesture: to inscribe is to compose symbolically and reorganize materially the real.

It is in this work of incompletion and sharing that the operative turn is fulfilled. The quantum, as grammar of instability and emergence, is an exemplary formalization of a logic that traverses levels of reality. To think is to inscribe; and to inscribe is to share responsibility for emergence of possible worlds. Philosophy does not enclose the real in a last word: it becomes gesture—a gesture of shared inscription, openness to difference, co-production of what may yet become.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bohr, N. (1935). Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? *Physical Review*, 48(8), 696–702.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge.
- Canguilhem, G. (1966). *Le normal et le pathologique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Derrida, J. (1967). *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Deleuze, G. (1968). *Différence et répétition*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Heisenberg, W. (1958). *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science*. New York: Harper.
- Kauffman, S. (1995). *At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morin, E. (1990). *Introduction à la pensée complexe*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2000). *Être singulier pluriel*. Paris: Éditions Galilée.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Simondon, G. (1958). *L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information*. Paris: Éditions Jérôme Millon.
- Teilhard de Chardin, P. (1955). *Le phénomène humain*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, Einselection, and the Quantum Origins of the Classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75(3), 715–775.