Formal Notation System for Dialog – Choreographic

Version: 2.0 (November 2025)

Author: Timo Weil, www.timoweil.de

License: This document may be freely used for academic, educational, and artistic purposes. Attribution is appreciated.

Contents

Notation System

Base Symbols

∿ = Opening Force (questioning, divergence)

◉ = Centering Force (grounding, coherence)

⟨⟩ = Resonating Force (affirming, echo)

| = Delimiting Force (perimeter)

⊗ = Dividing Force (differentiating)

⇝ = Connecting Force (synthesis, volte)

◊ = Condensing Force (crystallizing)

↺ = Reflecting Force (self-reference)

※ = Singularity (awe, rupture)

∅ = Null Force (silence, reset)

Extended Symbols

⇄ = Mirroring Force (repetition with variation)

⟩⟩ = Accelerating Force

⟨⟨ = Decelerating Force

⋯ = Pausing (suspension)

⋈ = Metaphorizing Force (transversal)

Intensity Modifiers

Single symbol	= low intensity
Double (⊗⊗)	= medium intensity
Triple (⊗⊗⊗)	= high intensity

Critical Additions

Some symbols are still missing:

1. Interrupting Force

⊠ = Breaking, aborting, discarding

When a dialogue suddenly breaks off – not through pause, but through active rupture.

When I say: "No, that's not right. Let's start over."

This is not Ø (Null Force, reset). This is active negation.

2. Transferring Force

⇉ = Delegation, displacement

When a dialogue shifts levels – not through synthesis, but through displacement.

When I say: "This isn't a technical question, but an ethical one."

This is not ⤳ (synthesis). This is transfer.

3. Waiting Force

○   = Enduring, holding open

When a dialogue consciously doesn't proceed – not through pause, but through active endurance.

When I say: "I don't know. Let's linger here."

This is not ⋯ (pause). This is active waiting.

4. Tipping Force

×   = Reversal, inversion

When a dialogue tips – when resonance becomes dissonance, or vice versa.

When suddenly the opposite holds true.

This is not ⊗ (differentiation). This is reversal.

Notation in Time

But one dimension is still missing: time.

The notation shows sequence. But it doesn't show duration:

- How long does a ∿ (question) last?

- How quickly does ◉ (grounding) follow ∿?

- How much time passes between ◊ (condensation) and ※ (singularity)?

Proposal

We could use length marks:

∿——   = long question

◉–   = short grounding

◊———   = very long condensation

Or spacing in the notation:

∿ → ◉   = long pause

◉→⟨⟩   = immediate resonance

This would make the notation spatial. Not just as metaphor, but as visible time.

Notation in Time – Alternative Extension

Expression	Meaning	Example
Symbol–	Short duration (momentary movement)	◉– = brief grounding
Symbol——	Medium duration (process)	◊—— = sustained condensation
Symbol———	Long duration (continuum)	∿——— = extended questioning movement
→	Immediate succession	◉→⟨⟩ = grounding with direct resonance
→	Delayed succession	∿→◉ = question, then slowly following grounding
(spacing)	Latency, gap	◊ ↻ = condensation, long reflection pause
//	Overlay (simultaneity)	◉//↻ = grounding thought during reflection

This now allows notation of temporal sculptures – movements in which duration itself becomes an epistemic parameter.

Energetic Polarity

If we want to make temporal sculptures more energetically legible, we could (optionally) add a polarity marker that describes the fundamental direction of movement:

Symbol	Meaning	Example
↑	Ascending energy (opening, unfolding)	∿↑——
↓	Descending energy (concentration, closure)	◊↓–
↻	Circular energy (return, resumption)	↺↻——

This would encode duration and direction simultaneously, similar to how in musical notation dynamics (crescendo, decrescendo) and direction coexist.

To keep symbols legible and modularly combinable in longer sequences, we could add a simple notational topology:

Level	Description	Example
Force Symbol	Movement or energy form	∿, ◉, ↺
Modifier	Intensity	◉⊗⊗
Temporalization	Duration and rhythm	∿——→◉–
Metaphase	Modulation or transition	(∿——→◉–)⤳↻

This would make the entire system recursively connectable – each sequence can itself become a higher-order symbol. Thus, an entire dialogue could be read as a single "temporal sculpture" whose internal energy flows remain recognizable.

Proposal for Minimal Formal Grammar

To enable digital development (e.g., for parsers, visualization, simulation), we could formulate a simple syntax rule:

Sequence ::= (ForceSymbol [Intensity] [Duration] [Polarity]) { Transition ForceSymbol ... }

ForceSymbol ::= ∿ | ◉ | ⟨⟩ | | | ⊗ | ⤳ | ◊ | ↺ | ※ | ∅ | ⇄ | ⟩⟩ | ⟨⟨ | ⋯ | ↘ | ⊠ | ⇉ | ○ | ×

Intensity ::= ⊗ | ⊗⊗ | ⊗⊗⊗

Duration ::= – | —— | ———

Polarity ::= ↑ | ↓ | ↻

Transition ::= → | ⟶ | // | (spacing)

This would allow each movement to be formally unambiguous while remaining poetic.