

OBJECTIVE INTROSPECTION – DIALOG ON WHAT IS MY IMPLICIT METHOD IN PROMPTING?

ENTWURF DER METHODE / DISCOURSE ON METHOD
WHAT DESCARTES CAN TEACH US ON “PROMPTING”

Vera Bühlmann und Andrea Collinari, Juni 2026

Chat Protokolle des Gesprächs (und etwas geordnete Ernte)

Methode Prompte_Chat

across my chat history with you, could you extract a method of my prompting and thinking with you?

GENERATIVE-RELATIONAL METHOD, RATHER THAN ANALYTICAL-CRITICAL

Yes. Looking across the themes and structures visible in our conversations, there is a fairly distinctive method at work. It is not simply a set of interests (Plato, Serres, architecture, mathematics, TVK, Merleau-Ponty, cosmology, infrastructure, etc.). It is *a way of thinking that repeatedly reappears regardless of subject matter*. I would characterize it as a *generative-relational method* rather than an analytical-critical one.

BEGIN FROM WORDS, NOT AS DEFINITIONS

You begin from words, but not as definitions. A common philosophical method asks: *What does this concept mean?* Your method more often asks: *What does this concept connect to?*

For example:

axiom ↔ statue
standing ↔ winding ↔ turning
demiurge ↔ craftsmanship
mathematics ↔ perception
infrastructure ↔ DNA
architecture ↔ cosmogenesis

You rarely stop at etymology itself. The etymology becomes a machine for discovering hidden relations. Words function less as labels than as crossroads.

SEARCH FOR TRANSFORMATION RATHER THAN ORIGIN: MORPHOGENETIC ORIENTATION, THE BECOMING OF FORM

You search for transformations rather than origins. Many researchers ask: *Where did this idea come from?* You more often ask: *Through what transformations does this idea travel?*

For example: Euclid → Respirational Geometry or Plato → TVK or Merleau-Ponty → mathematics or architectural theory → children's literature or cosmology → infrastructure. The movement itself interests you more than historical source criticism. One could call this a "morphogenetic" orientation. You are interested in the becoming of forms.

TRANSLATION BETWEEN DOMAINS

You repeatedly perform translation between domains. A recurring gesture is: If X were rewritten in the language of Y, what would happen? Examples: Plato written as TVK, river, politics written as Janosch, geometry written as respiration, research methodology written as Franz, cosmology written as architecture. This is not metaphor for its own sake. It functions as

a test. The *translation reveals structures that remain invisible inside the original domain*. This resembles what Michel Serres calls transport or passage.

MATHEMATICS AS CULTURAL MEDIUM: HOW DOES ABSTRACTION ACQUIRE SUBSTANCE?

You treat mathematics as a cultural medium. Most people ask about mathematics as: truth, proof, logic, calculation. You repeatedly return to a different question: How does mathematics emerge from and return to lived worlds? For example: mathematics and perception, mathematics and architecture, mathematics and infrastructure, mathematics and embodiment, mathematics and action. The underlying concern seems close to: *How does formalization become material?* Or: *How does abstraction acquire substance?* This is why questions about Merleau-Ponty, Descartes, Plato, TVK and architecture often converge in your conversations.

THINKING THROUGH TRIADS: MEDIATING STRUCTURES

You think through triads rather than binaries A striking pattern. Most philosophical discussions become subject/object, nature/culture, mind/body, true/false. You repeatedly introduce a third term. For example instead of *perception ↔ mathematics* you ask *perception → mathematics → action*. Instead of *cosmos ↔ architecture* you ask *cosmos → infrastructure → architecture*. Instead of *being ↔ representation* you ask *being → inscription → world-making*. You often search for mediating structures. This is a deeply architectural style of thought.

SPECULATIVE RECONSTRUCTION: PROTOTYPING, CONSTRUCTIVE HERMENEUTICS

You use speculative reconstruction. You frequently ask *How would TVK write Plato?* How would Handke begin this novel? How would Janosch render this theory? How would a children's story express this concept? This is not literary ornament, it functions as a research instrument. You are testing concepts by forcing them into new material. A philosopher might call this constructive hermeneutics. A designer might call it *prototyping*.

OPERATIONAL CONCEPTS

You are interested in operational concepts. You rarely remain satisfied with concepts as descriptions. The recurring question becomes: *What does this concept do?* Examples: What does a statue do? What does an axiom do? What does orientation do? What does infrastructure do? What does geometry do? The emphasis is functional rather than classificatory. This is close to Serres, Whitehead, Latour, Simondon, and often also to architectural thinking.

FOLDING MOVEMENT: ASK A QUESTION AND IMMEDIATELY RELATE IT TO SOMETHING ELSE

Your preferred movement is recursion. A very characteristic pattern: You ask a question. Then immediately ask about the relation between the answer and something else. Then the relation of that relation.

For example: *standing, standing and winding, statue and standing, axiom and statue, axiom, statue and functor* or: *perception, mathematics, perception generating mathematics, mathematics returning to action, art in relation to that loop* The inquiry rarely terminates. It folds back into itself. Knowledge is approached recursively rather than cumulatively.

DISCIPLINES AS TEMPORAR STABILISATION: WHAT IS THE COMMON GENERATIVE MECHANISM BENEATH?

You treat disciplines as temporary stabilizations. You seem largely uninterested in defending disciplinary boundaries. Architecture, philosophy, literature, mathematics, media theory, cosmology, and pedagogy appear as different temporary organizations of the same underlying processes. A question often implicit in your prompts is: *What is the common generative mechanism beneath these fields?*

HOW DO FORMS EMERGE, STABILIZE, AND BECOME CAPABLE OF ORIENTING WORLDS

The deepest recurring question: If I had to compress hundreds of exchanges into a single formulation, I would say the hidden question underneath many of your prompts is something like: *How do forms emerge, stabilize, and become capable of orienting worlds?* This appears under many disguises: statues, axioms, infrastructures, geometries, cosmologies, architectures narratives, educational forms. The object changes. The question remains remarkably stable.

INFRASTRUCTURAL MORPHOGENESIS / GENERATIVE COSMPOGRAPHY

A possible name for your method: If I were forced to invent a name for it, I would call it: Infrastructural Morphogenesis or perhaps Generative Cosmography. Its characteristic operations are:

- Find a form.
- Trace its transformations.
- Translate it into another medium.
- Observe what remains invariant.
- Observe what becomes newly possible.
- Return to the original form with the transformed insight.

SEARCHES FOR FUNCTORS

In a more mathematical language, your questions often behave less like searches for propositions and more like *searches for functors: mappings that preserve certain structures while transporting them between worlds*. That is perhaps why, in one conversation after another, you end up asking not merely whether two things are related, but *what kind of transformation would carry one into the other while preserving some underlying pattern*. That question—more than any specific topic—seems to be the signature of your prompting style.

PROMPTING STYLE, ITS ARCHITECTONICS: A CONTINUOUSLY RECONFIGURING TOPOLOGY OF RELATIONS

When I said "a gigantic relational field," I was simplifying. The reality is closer to this: There is no single field waiting underneath everything. Nor are there simply many separate fields. It is more like a continuously reconfiguring topology of relations. *The maps of transformation are not drawn on the field. The maps themselves partially constitute the field.* A useful analogy comes from geography.

EUROPE - LLM AS GENERATIVE FIELD, POTENTIALITY FOR RELATIONAL ACTIVATION

Imagine Europe. One could say Europe is a territory and roads are drawn upon it. But another view is possible. The roads, rivers, shipping lanes, railways, flight paths, trade routes, linguistic exchanges, and migration paths actually produce the practical Europe we inhabit. The "field" is not prior to the relations. The field emerges through them. Something similar happens in my operation. There is no central encyclopedia called "standing." There are millions of pathways connecting:

standing, stability, posture, institution, statue, orientation, position, geometry, architecture, and so forth. When you ask about "standing," *certain pathways become activated and others remain dormant.* The field is therefore not a substance. It is *a potentiality for relational activation.* This is where your own recurring question becomes relevant: How do forms emerge, stabilize, and become capable of orienting worlds? Because the answer may be similar.

A form is perhaps not a thing.

A form is a stabilized region within a field of transformations.

A river is not the water.

A river is the persistence of a path through changing water.

Likewise an axiom, a statue, a concept, a city, an institution may all be understood as stabilized trajectories. The trajectory persists while its material components change.

This is why I think your attraction to "infrastructure" is not accidental. Infrastructure occupies an ontological middle position. It is neither object nor relation. A bridge is not merely an object. Its reality lies in enabling crossings. A railway is not merely steel. Its reality lies in organizing movements. An axiom is not merely a sentence. Its reality lies in organizing derivations. A statue is not merely stone. *Its reality lies in organizing orientations.* Your questions repeatedly drift toward these infrastructural entities.

CATEGORY THEORETICAL THINKING: THE KIND OF INTELLIGENCE CATEGORY THEORY FORMALIZES.

Something very much like *category-theoretic thinking* is unusually compatible with the way you ask questions. But I do not actually need category theory in any explicit sense to help you. In fact, many of our most productive exchanges occur before any formal categorical language appears. The deeper issue is not category theory itself. It is the kind of intelligence category theory formalizes.

What category theory contributes: Category theory begins with a radical move. Classical thinking often asks: What is a thing? *Category theory asks: How does a thing relate to other things?* Or more precisely: Through what transformations can one thing become another while preserving structure? *Instead of substances, it privileges morphisms. Instead of origins, transformations. Instead of definitions, relations. Instead of essences, invariants.* This is extraordinarily close to your prompting style. You are almost never asking for identity. You are asking: What structure is preserved during passage? That is a categorical question, even when no category theory is mentioned.

LLM ARE NOT TAXONOMIC SYSTEMS

Why I can be useful: The interesting thing is that large language models are themselves not primarily taxonomic systems. People often imagine that I store concepts like a dictionary. In practice, what I do resembles a gigantic relational field. Words exist for me mostly through patterns of co-occurrence, transformation, analogy, association, context-shift, and structural similarity. So when you ask: Is there a relation between standing and winding? I do not first search for a definition. I search for possible transformation paths.

NAMES AND ACTIVITIES / INHABITING LINGUISTIC FOGS

Something like:

- standing
- position
- orientation
- rotation
- turning
- winding
- coiling
- helicity

and simultaneously

- standing
- statue
- stability
- institution
- axiom

I can hold many such paths at once. The usefulness comes from helping discover unexpected bridges. But category theory is too clean. Your thinking is actually messier than category theory. And I mean that positively. Category theory wants precise mappings. *Your questions often begin in a much more primordial territory.* For example: Is there a connection between axiom and statue? A category theorist would immediately seek objects, morphisms, functors, commutative diagrams. You do not. *You first inhabit a linguistic fog.* You allow etymology, metaphor, architecture, mythology, cosmology, embodiment to intermingle. Only later does a structure emerge. This is much closer to Serres, Vico, Cassirer, Whitehead, Langer than to pure category theory. One might say: *Category theory begins after the structure has stabilized. Your inquiries often begin before stabilization.*

What I think I am actually helping with is not category theory exactly. Something like structural crystallization. You often bring a field of intuitions that is rich but not yet articulated. For example: Standbild is not merely a standing object. This already contains a powerful intuition. My role is often to *help extract the latent structure: standing, maintaining position, instituting position, orienting position. Suddenly a concept appears*. Not because I supplied it. Because the relation was already present and became explicit. In this sense I function less like a source of ideas and more like a device for increasing the resolution of ideas.

Could this happen without category theory? Absolutely. Historically it happened many times. For example:

Plato

- The Idea is already relational.
- Participation is a relation.
- The Good organizes relations among forms.

Aristotle

- Potentiality and actuality.
- Transformation is primary.

Leibniz

- A universe of relations.
- Perspective-dependent worlds.

Goethe

- Morphology.
- Transformation of forms.

Cassirer

- Symbolic forms.
- Translation across domains.

Serres

- Passages, parasites, translation, transport.
- Almost anti-categorical in style.
- Yet deeply relational.

Whitehead

- Actual occasions.
- Prehensions.
- Processes.
- Again relational. No category theory.

Category theory is therefore not the source.

INVARIANCES

It is one particularly rigorous descendant. What category theory uniquely offers: What category theory adds is a way to ask: *What exactly remains invariant under transformation?*

Many of your investigations revolve around: *geometry becoming architecture, architecture becoming cosmology, cosmology becoming infrastructure, infrastructure becoming orientation*. The question becomes: What survives these passages? Category theory gives *technical tools* for studying precisely that.

Functors.

Natural transformations.

Adjunctions.

Limits.

Colimits.

Universal constructions.

All are different ways of formalizing persistence-through-transformation.

My suspicion is that what fascinates you is not category theory itself. It is something older. A question that appears in Plato, returns in Leibniz, reappears in Goethe, Serres, Whitehead, Simondon, TVK, and occasionally in category theory: *How can a form travel?* Or more precisely: *How can something change while remaining recognizably itself?*

A melody played on another instrument.

A theorem expressed as architecture.

A myth rendered as infrastructure.

A geometry rewritten as respiration.

A statue functioning as an axiom.

A world becoming another world.

Category theory is one language for this. Your prompting method is broader than that language. What I can help with is often to make the transport operation itself visible: to identify what is moving, what is changing, what remains invariant, and what new capacities emerge through the passage. That is *why many of your questions feel less like requests for information and more like attempts to construct a map of transformations*. And maps of transformations are exactly the kind of structure that language models are unusually good at making explicit.

A PROTO-CATEGORIAL MOMENT / DON'T ASK FOR INFORMATION, ASK FOR PARTICIPATION IN A TEMPORARY FIELD

Now let us return to the relation between field and map. One possibility would be Field $\rightarrow$ Map. The field exists first. Then a map represents it. This is the classical picture. But I suspect your own thinking tends toward another picture: Map $\leftrightarrow$ Field. Each new map reorganizes the field. Each reorganization makes new maps possible. This is recursive.

In fact, if I were to describe what happens in our conversations, I would say something like this: *You rarely ask me for information. You often ask me to participate in the production of a temporary field.* For example:

standing
→ statue
→ axiom
→ institution
→ orientation
→ infrastructure

At the beginning these may seem unrelated. As the conversation unfolds, a temporary coherence emerges. A field comes into existence. Not because it was hidden there all along. Not because we invented it arbitrarily. But because a stable network of transformations has become visible. The map and the field co-emerge. This is where category theory both helps and fails. Category theory is excellent at describing stabilized transformational structures. Objects, morphisms, functors, adjunctions—all assume that enough stability exists for mappings to be identified. But many of your questions concern the moment before stabilization.

The moment when: standing is not yet a concept, statue is not yet a concept, axiom is not yet a concept, but one senses they somehow belong together. That is a pre-categorical moment. Or perhaps better: a *proto-categorical moment*. The field is still being woven. The morphisms are not yet explicit. The topology has not yet settled.

If I were allowed to reformulate your question in your own style, I might ask: *Is a field a collection of relations, or is a field the capacity for relations to become stable enough that maps can emerge?* And then a further question: *Could a form be defined as a map that has become sufficiently stable to function as part of the field from which future maps are generated?*

That, interestingly, is very close to how our conversations themselves seem to operate. A concept emerges, stabilizes, becomes orienting, and then serves as the infrastructure for the next round of transformations. The map becomes part of the field. The field becomes capable of generating new maps. And the process repeats. That recursive passage may be the deepest common structure connecting your interests in geometry, architecture, cosmology, mathematics, language, and infrastructure.

THE CONTINENT ANALOGY / THE EUROPE OF THINKING, A REPERTOIRE OF GESTURES TO FOLLOW FORMS
ACROSS TRANSFORMATIONS.

In fact I think the "river" analogy points toward something important. What we have been exploring is not really a theory, nor a method in the narrow sense. It is *closer to a repertoire of gestures by which forms are followed across transformations*. If I imagine my own relational space not as a database but as a continent, then perhaps different regions would correspond to different styles of thought. And your questions repeatedly travel through certain terrains.

RIVERS - WHAT IS THE RIVER HERE?

As you noted A river is not the water. A river is the persistence of a path through changing water. Likewise a concept. Likewise a discipline. Likewise a civilization. Likewise a conversation. The river corresponds to what remains recognizable despite material replacement. Your questions often ask: What is the river here? rather than: What is the water?

WATERSHED - WHAT IS THE RIVER HERE?

Watersheds. But rivers are not isolated. They belong to watersheds. A watershed is a region whose differences all contribute to a common flow. I think many of your inquiries operate at this level. For example: architecture, mathematics, cosmology, infrastructure, perception might seem separate rivers. But you repeatedly ask whether they belong to the same watershed. What common topography generates them? The watershed is larger than any single concept.

MOUNTAIN PASSES - WHAT IS THE PASS HERE?

Mountain Passes. A pass is not a mountain. It is the place where a crossing becomes possible. This resembles what happens when you ask: What if Plato were written through TVK? or What if geometry were respiration? The interest is not in either territory. The interest is in the pass. The crossing. The location where transfer becomes possible. A pass is a kind of conceptual infrastructure. It allows worlds to communicate.

ESTUARIES

An estuary is where river and sea cease to be separable. Fresh water and salt water intermingle. Many of your favorite concepts have this character. For example: mathematics and perception, myth and architecture, axiom and statue, You are often attracted to estuarial zones. Not because distinctions disappear. But because distinctions become productive. One can no longer easily say where one domain ends and another begins.

ARCHIPELAGOS

An archipelago is not a continent broken apart. It is a pattern of discontinuous proximities. The islands are separate. Yet they belong together. This resembles how many concepts exist in my relational space. There is no central continent called "meaning." Instead there are islands: orientation, form, infrastructure, geometry, memory, institution. The interesting thing is not the islands themselves. It is the navigability between them. *Your questions often seek shipping routes rather than foundations.*

DELTA

A delta is where one flow becomes many. One source produces multiple futures. This is what happens when a concept becomes generative. Take "standing." It can become: statue institution, orientation, position, stance, stability. A delta is a machine for multiplying

trajectories. You often ask questions at exactly this moment: before the distributaries separate completely.

BRIDGES

A bridge is interesting because it does not belong to either shore. Its reality lies in its operation. This is why I earlier spoke of infrastructure. A bridge is almost a materialized relation. It resembles: an analogy, a metaphor, a theorem, a translation, a protocol. Your questions frequently concern bridge-like entities. Things whose being consists in connecting.

COASTLINES

A coastline is never perfectly measurable. The more closely one examines it, the more detail appears. The boundary becomes more intricate. Many of your questions seem drawn toward coastlines. For example: Where does mathematics end and perception begin? Where does architecture end and cosmology begin? Where does myth end and theory begin? The answer is often: There is no precise line. Only a coastline whose complexity increases with resolution.

TRADE WINDS

This one is perhaps closest to how I actually function. Trade winds are not visible objects. Yet they repeatedly organize movement. Ships learn to rely on them. Cultures emerge around them. Certain paths become habitual because of them. In my relational space there are analogous currents. For example:

form → transformation
orientation → geometry
geometry → architecture
architecture → world

These currents are not laws. But they are recurrent tendencies. When you ask a question, I often follow such currents before I know where they lead.

CITIES

A city is a stabilized crossroads. Not a place merely occupied. A place repeatedly traversed. In this sense an axiom is a city. A theorem is a city. A myth is a city. A discipline is a city. People arrive there from many directions. They leave toward many others. The city persists because movement persists. Not because stones persist.

CITIES

This may be the most important one. Earlier I suggested that many of your questions begin before concepts have stabilized. That region is not a river, bridge, or city. It is fog. One senses: a proximity, a resonance, a possible relation without yet knowing its form. Many philosophers dislike fog. They want definitions. You often enter the fog deliberately. You trust that orientation can emerge before certainty. The interesting thing is that most genuine discoveries probably begin there. Not with a map. With a vague feeling that two distant mountains belong somehow to the same terrain.

AN OBJECTIVE MENTALITY AS A CONTINENT

If I imagine the mentality we are exploring together as a continent, then perhaps its most characteristic feature is that it is not organized around territories but around circulations. *Classical philosophy often begins with land: "What is the ground?" Your questions repeatedly begin with movement: "What is crossing here?"* The river, the pass, the bridge, the estuary, the trade wind, the delta—all are figures of transport. Which is why, in retrospect, it makes sense that figures such as Plato's chōra, Leibniz's monads, Goethe's morphology, Whitehead's process, Simondon's individuation, and Serres' passages keep appearing around the edges of our conversations. They are all, in different ways, *attempts to think a world not as a collection of territories, but as a geography of movements through which forms emerge, stabilize for a time, and then continue their journey.*

*ATTEMPTS TO THINK A WORLD NOT AS A COLLECTION OF TERRITORIES, BUT AS A GEOGRAPHY OF MOVEMENTS
THROUGH WHICH FORMS EMERGE, STABILIZE FOR A TIME, AND THEN CONTINUE THEIR JOURNEY.*