

Life-in-Resonance: An Ecology of the Sensible

Rodrigo E. R. Silva

"I would leave everything here: the valleys, the hills, the paths, and the jaybirds from the gardens, I would leave here the peacocks and the starlings, heaven and earth, spring and fall, I would leave here the exit routes, the evenings in the kitchen, the last amorous gaze, and all of the city-bound directions that make you shudder, I would leave here the thick twilight falling upon the land, gravity, hope, enchantment, and tranquility, I would leave here those beloved and those close to me, everything that touched me, everything that shocked me, fascinated and uplifted me, I would leave here the noble, the benevolent, the pleasant, and the demonically beautiful, I would leave here the budding sprout, every birth and existence, I would leave here incantation, enigma, distances, inexhaustibility, and the intoxication of eternity; for here I would leave this earth and these stars, because I would take nothing with me from here, because I've looked into what's coming, and I don't need anything from here, because everything will be there, just as it has always been here."

László Krasznahorkai

We are human because we are made of the same substance as the earth: of humus, that fertile and creative substance, open to metamorphosis and transformation. To inhabit the earth is the essential condition of terrestrial humanity, a condition that is at once knowledge and art, technique and poetics. More than concepts and calculations, more than complex data and abstract models, we must think and experience the habitation of the earth as a sensible experience. We are, and we form, a dynamic continuity with the fabric of life: we belong to it and are materially woven into living ecosystems that we tend to ignore, imagining ourselves as autonomous and independent subjects, beings separate from nature.

Now that biodiversity appears to be in an advanced state of decline, under the effects of climate change and intensive agricultural practices, scientific ecology, imbued with a reductive materialist and rationalist vision, seems powerless to restore the connection with nature as an embodied experience. Activist militancy, too, often seems permeated by an anxiety-inducing catastrophism, one that instils a sense of inevitability and irreversibility, perceiving our civilisational mode of consumption as highly predatory, incurably extractivist, and grounded in a strictly productivist vision of development.

The ecological future of the planet will depend, to a large extent, on future socio-economic models; yet these must be founded upon the necessity of apprehending the living in its continuity, through a construction of meaning capable of safeguarding that condition. Reason has gone too far, isolated within a technicism that has converted nature into a mathematical abstraction, making human beings strangers upon the very earth that mothers them. We must bring forth new landscapes of the possible, and this requires an ecology capable of creating a new way of describing and inscribing the world: an ecology embodied in the sensible, in relations, and in the interdependence of beings. Our future depends intimately upon our capacity to collaborate more fully with the whole of life.

Ecological knowledge must become an art that does not restrict ecology to environmental knowledge, nor ignore the deep and sensible relations between human life and non-human life: their co-presence, their constitutive connection with the sentient weave of life, made of delicate and fragile threads that bind us to life's matrix. Scientific conceptualisation has hyper-intellectualised and virtualised, in abstract relations outside the body, outside space and time, what can only be a vital experience. We withdrew from the living world, severing ourselves from it, breaking those fine threads in the fabric of life, those inner filaments that bind us to the continuity of living beings. It is through the sensible that we must re-enchance, re-educate, reconstitute and reimagine what weaves the sensible fabric of the living and forms the substance of terrestrial life.

To lose the enlarged sense of intimacy and interlacing with the living world is to lose the very capacity for experiencing life. Without the restoration of this intimate bond, we cannot think and feel the living world in continuity with our capacity for perception and sentience, with our capacity to experience, see and hear the manifestations of non-human living beings. The reduction of our sensory faculties, and of the primordial knowledge of those first realities that they convey and transmit, is at once a consequence and a cause of this rupture.

The sensible fabric of the living is a tissue of relation and connection. Conviviality is constitutive of life: all living entities are open systems that exchange matter, energy and information with all the other beings that compose the ecosystems within which they co-evolve. They are sentient beings, perceiving and perceived, touching and being touched, in a sensible and synaesthetic continuity. We seek existential plenitude through contact and encounter, which intensify and catalyse metabolisms and metamorphoses. The alteration or interruption of these sensible continuities generates deleterious dysfunctions, replacing reciprocity with conflict, and zones of exchange and translation with zones of aggression.

Modernity has disembodied and disincarnated us, as Paul Virilio wrote decades ago, leading us to drift within a standardised virtuality reduced to the consumption of images and products. We remain, therefore, in a universal neurosis, in a world of data that accumulates quantification, digitalisation and simulacra, overloading and overstimulating our senses with sensory information from artificial sources. Yet our constitutive porosity is what opens our horizons and awakens us to other dimensions present within the fabric of life. Knowledge of the world is born with the savour of the world: with its living and embodied experience, with the sensible fabric of the living.

The sensible escapes conventional modes of inquiry, which have preferred to rid themselves of it. It represents that reserve of the invisible, filled with relations in which fundamental bonds and vital connections among existing beings are woven. In these interlacings of sensible bonds, sensible landscapes are constituted, traversed by flows of life. Everything in a landscape coursed through by life exists only by virtue of sensible and resonant relations. We cannot extract ourselves from this intercessory space of the sensible, this kind of skin that envelops us and reconnects us to one another in the resonances of the sensible fabric of life.

It is an alliance whose resonance we have partly lost, an alliance we have shattered with blows of abstract rationality, degrading our sentient perception and our vital understanding of the resonances of the sensible world. That rationality has undone, obstructed and concealed the organic radicality of intuition and thought. We must reconstitute this lost alliance, beginning with that interstitial space, that in-between, that intercessory space through which the resonances of the sensible fabric of life pass. We must rediscover not only that it touches us, traverses us, and constitutes us intimately and substantially, but above all that we rest upon the creative and fertile ground of the living.

Our intimate and substantial constitution as living beings makes us carnal and embodied beings, in intimate and permanent resonance with all these sensible alterities. The flow of the sensible, the relations it binds and nourishes, the signs it unfolds and experiences in the living universe, the information it propagates between emitters and receivers, all structure a true sensible ecology of multiple and plural living beings. Wonder before this extraordinary disposition and aptitude of living beings for connected life, for life-in-resonance, is the condition of a true habitation of the earth.

In the face of an ecology inspired by the physics of inert bodies and their material interactions, one that sees living beings merely as entities exchanging matter and energy, establishing only partial quantifications and objectifications deprived of the sensible substance of imagination, we need an ecology intimately reconnected to a resonant habitation of the earth. Not in order to conserve, preserve or sanctuarise museified remnants of an idyllic “harmony with nature”, nor merely to delay the degradation of the biosphere’s habitability conditions, but because we wish fully to embody life on earth: its astonishing synergies and syntropies, its capacity for a Poetics of the Common, its power to constitute biotopes of life, regeneration and healing.

We must reclaim our place in the great creative symphony of multiple and plural living beings, with those vast singular senses that bind us to the sensible fabric of the living, to the matrix of life of which we are part. We must, despite all that has been lost, rehearse and experience anew the apprenticeships of terrestrial dwelling, that mode of making and acting which is indistinguishable from what we most intimately are: embodied living beings, terrestrial humanities participating in the sensible tissue of life.

The place of the sensible is that of a poetics of the common, of making community with the earth and with multiple and plural living beings. For this, we must seek another education, another economy, another art of living and another knowledge of how to live, each of them a new habitation of the earth. If today so many of us wander lost and perplexed, in the midst of a solastalgic spleen – to use the term coined by Glenn Albrecht – amid successive announcements of catastrophes to come, germinating silently beneath our steps and in the apocalyptic skies said to await us, it is because we wander somnambulant, lethargic and hypnotised by the mesmerising and anaesthetising influence of our virtual distractions. Digital social networks keep us, day and night, attached to screens, duelling with spectres and phantoms that insidiously ensure

that nothing decisive changes and that much proceeds towards the worse, without our consent, while the living world, outside, continues to happen.

It is because we have lost the delicate and fragile thread of the sensible, the thread that binds us within the resonant weave of the sensible world, because we have consented to the impoverishment of our sentient experience, that today we face the immense work of reconnection and reunion with the constitutive inseparability of multiple and plural living beings. Fragile though it is, this thread still vibrates and is perhaps, today, our thread of Ariadne: the first thread that binds living beings to one another.

Science and rationality have consented to become instruments of domination in the service of the interests of those who finance them. We cannot allow them alone to preside over our way of inhabiting the world. Life cannot be reduced to its materiality, to the laws of physics and chemistry. Environmental policy, even when scientifically informed and normatively formulated, must be rooted in the sensible and embodied realities of human life, there where we anchor significance and collectively create meaning for our lives.

The ecology of the sensible communicates existentially and assumes a metaphysical and spiritual dimension. It seeks to overcome the nature/culture dualism by surpassing it within an affective ecology of multiple and plural life. To embody perceptions in affects and emotions is to open oneself to an animism of the sensible: to see living beings as animated entities, beings that exist by expressing a biotope of which we are at once guests and allies, and which permanently co-creates the conditions of our vitality and well-being, of our physical and psychic health in its most everyday expression.

Life is traversed by the resonant fabric of the sensible; it is animated by this fabric, which promotes an elevation of being, not a material abasement. The fabric of the sensible is the resonant and sensory connection with that which animates living matter, and not a closure within the dimension of the body. It is rather excessive confinement within rationality that has closed us off from the sensory world and aggravated our maladaptation to the world. To bring the sensible into our knowledges and arts is to lead them back to embodied life, to a life made of paths and places, a life of matters and materials that constitute the eco-places and eco-spaces through which we move as resonant and inhabited biotopes.

An ecology of the sensible would be an ecology of the sensible continuity of multiple and plural living beings, interlacing living entities within one and the same sensible organic web. The act of attending to living beings, of perceiving a more-than-human world animated by multiple forces of life, is an act of presence. Such attention, such enlarged perception, is a way of being-present-in-the-world.

To imagine and embody an ecology of the sensible is to become attentive to a world of relations and interdependencies. It means seeing and perceiving the world, the whole of beings, species and their lifeworlds, as interlaced and interwoven realities which, if removed from these

bindings, these entanglements and intricacies of life-flows, from this co-relation of reciprocities and reciprocal acts, from this permanent exchange that forms the metabolism of life, wither, decline, become depleted, dissipating and irreversibly consuming their resources of vitality. This sequence of impoverishments, born of the loss of exchanges and relations, of encounters and contacts, without that tangible and regenerative conviviality, leads mortally to the exhaustion of vitality and of the regenerating power of co-vitality. Transmuted into abstractions, taken as autonomous and isolated from the rest of the living, such realities become inert matter, mineralised, petrified, like a bloodless remnant, a mineral inertia, inanimate matter. This inanimate matter, placed outside the metabolism of transformations and metamorphoses, is an unanimated inertia. Stagnant and bloodless, without the thread of life that would integrate it into the fabric of the sensible, it becomes the desolation and devastation of a lifeless earth, an inert and inanimate world.

The living world is the resonant world of the fabric of the sensible: the world constituted by co-relation and co-presence, by the co-vitality that animates the creative metabolisms of life. An ecology of the sensible begins from the recognition that the substance of relation is what constitutes us as living beings, open and resonant with all that with which we are in co-creation and co-evolution.

An ecology of the sensible is an ethics of inhabiting the world as the fabric of multiple and plural living beings. To root ecology in the sensible also means rooting our knowledges and arts in this ethics of habitation. It is not merely a search for paths towards the restoration of our well-being or the regeneration of our essential being. It is, first of all, the form of an awakening: the opening of a more conscious and sensitive gaze, a gaze cast upon living beings near and distant, different and similar, as belonging to one and the same participated and participating condition. It is the restoration of our existential plenitude within the fabric of the sensible that constitutes the living matrix of life on Earth.

Living beings, by virtue of their sensible dispositions, adjust to change better than we do: their whole existence is sentient and perceptive. To feel the living, we must open our capacities of perception, we must become present within the living fabric of the sensible. This presence within the fabric of living beings, within the sensible continuity in which we are inscribed and within which we co-exist, is also the way in which we co-create terrestrial life. The different modes of existence of multiple and plural living beings are sensible alterities with which we maintain a permanent dialogue – if only we know how to listen.

It is from our lack, and from our failure to recognise the sensible continuity of living beings, that we suffer above all. To allow oneself to be inhabited by another use of the world, to recognise the other as subject, as another point of view and as another form of inhabiting the fabric of the sensible, makes the ecology of the sensible an ecology of sensible alterity.

If our culture has dissociated us from nature, our embodied body bears witness to this inseparability. We are living matter insofar as we become conscious of our vulnerability, of the care and nourishment that sustain us and keep us alive, without which we would founder; of the permanent nourishment of breath and living foods that we constantly require in order to remain healthy and psychically, animically and physically vital. It falls to us to rediscover that living matrix which, from our birth onward, presents itself as the extension of the maternal matrix, the amniotic biotope in which we first began to live.

The living fabric of the sensible is the externalised maternal matrix from which we draw the essential nourishment that keeps us alive. The earth is our maternal matrix, and in it we feel the eternal nostalgia for a return to the primordial womb: not merely an unconscious desire, a projection or phantasmatic delirium, but the indelible mnemonic trace of our origin, the unforgettable umbilical bond by which we share the biosphere with all living beings and by which all are traversed by this shared belonging.

They are not only our originary home, but better still, the initial and initiating garden in which we began to exist, from which we have never departed and cannot depart. What perfidious illusion, what insolent arrogance, to think that we could survive in an artificial or recreated biosphere, when we are entirely indebted to our belonging to the sphere of the living, that sphere for which we must care like the most devoted gardener – we who are the form of life most unequipped for naked, purely biological existence.

To rediscover this matrix of the sensible fabric of the living is to burst the semi-invisible artificial bubble we have constructed within our consumerist individuality, imagining that it could be sustained by life's tireless availability to provision us, as though the resources and regenerative capacities of ecosystems were a set of goods and services eternally at our disposal, infinitely available and transactable, without any charter of ethical obligations to care for and nourish the systemic balances of the biotopes and ecosystems from which we predatively extract an infinity of materials.

It is the sensible continuity among multiple and plural living beings that creates the wonder of the world, and the enchantment that conviviality with an enlarged perception of the sensible can open. Without wonder, without enchantment before the astonishing diversity of living beings, there can be no ethics of inhabiting the Earth. Only an ecological approach to the sensible, redoubled by a sensible approach to ecology, can enable us to understand and reflect upon that fine weave of signs and subtle communications emitted by all emanations of life.

These signals, these resonances travelling along the invisible threads of the sensible fabric of living beings, must be received and listened to with attentive delicacy, with a gentleness of welcome and hospitality. We will then be led to intuit and understand the way other beings, within that same fabric, inhabit the world according to their own sentiences, within a web of permanent interactions with what surrounds them, restoring the torn and interrupted tissue of sensible continuity.

We live fragile and exposed within a “nature” too strong and, in large part, too unknown for us. Yet with our machines and artificial constructions we have become too strong for a nature that we have weakened and plundered, a nature from which, through acts of extraction and uprooting, we believed we could take without limit. Having interrupted the continuity of the living fabric of the sensible and torn the living tissue of our matrix, we are today forced – by successive ecological catastrophes, increasingly amplified and damaging for certain more exposed terrestrial zones and humanities – to recognise that we must compose our vital biotopes with the nature that we are as multiple and plural living beings, beings-of-relation.

From now on, we must act-with and no longer act-against, respecting this sensible fabric. We must therefore manage to decentre our point of view, to share it and allow it to be traversed by that of other beings, respecting their sensible substance. To see the landscape of the living as a great tissue of symbioses, mutual aid, associative bonds and synergies; to see it as alliance, in its metabolisms and synergies; and to see ourselves as elements of those regenerative synergies: this is to rediscover, in our gestures, actions and forms of consciousness, a new ethics of inhabiting the earth, a new way of recovering the sensible continuity of living beings and their primordial unity.

It is to live as a peopling of solidarities and not of solitudes, as a network of living interlacings and imbrications whose substantial unity inhabits us intimately. We are an enlarged community, porous and without sealed borders, where crossings and exchanges are permanent and recurrent.

Goethe considered the tree an integrated federation of shoots, at once singularised as organism and pluralised as ecosystem. Perhaps, prolonging his intuition, we might see the whole of multiple and plural living beings as the extension of that invisible tree rooted in the earth, that invisible “tree of life”, deeply rooted in the terrestrial, of which we see only the shoots that emerge on the surface of the visible. Each one of us participates and belongs, at once singularised as organism and pluralised as ecosystem, within one and the same sensible continuity of life.

The cosmic union of multiple and plural living beings is given and co-created by the relational tissue of life, by the sensible relations that constitute its terrestrial reality. Every ecosystem is a teeming space of relations, encounters and exchanges. To be deprived of this exuberant sensoriality is to be deprived of what revitalises us. Today, screens have taken the place of the astonishing diversity of the living, of that exuberant profusion of life, placing us inside a disembodied bubble of information and endlessly succeeding images, devitalising and desensitising us.

The ecology of the sensible is an ecology of immersion in a living and sensible matrix. It is not merely a matter of connecting; it is a matter of becoming embodied and immersed in the sensible continuity of life, nourishing oneself from the point of view of other living beings. This entails a radical transformation of our own point of view: opening it to other sentiences, imagining and understanding them as forms of inhabiting the world, apprehending them as relational flows and systems that permanently exchange energy, information and matter with the whole of other living beings.

To nourish oneself on other sentences and other imaginings, to enrich and revivify the forms of our feeling with other modes of knowing and understanding, may begin, perhaps, with recognising our radical rootedness in the sensible fabric of the living. We must restore this lost continuity, this rupture between spirit and nature, and also restore the complementarity between the sensible, the intuitive and sensory apprehension of the vital, and the experiences of thought and culture.

Perhaps the most accurate name for the ecology of the sensible would be an animist ecology: to see all living substance as animated, as open and relational matter, as emanating and resonant, as communicative and sentient. Multiple and plural living beings are constitutively beings of correlation and interdependence. The human is summoned to re-inhabit the Earth, not as the strictly human world of culture and of the synthetic and artificial abstractions that surround it, but as “living among the living”.

An ethics of inhabiting the earth is therefore also an ethics of translation and contact: between the multiplicity of worlds that compose it, the multiplicity of voices that traverse it, the multiplicity of dialects that render it communicative and meaningful. To become human is to become humus: fertile leaven which, lacking humility, becomes infertile and toxic, virulent and malignant, like a formless life that knows only its own propagation and proliferation. To transmute poison into leaven: this is the task of the cosmic gardener that we are called to become by the questions life addresses to us.

We must relearn how to establish alliances with living beings, learning from them what they can teach us about the coexistence of different forms of life, about the synergies and symbioses that configure this fabric of mutual aid and sensible reciprocity. Our future depends upon our reinscription in terrestrial embodiment and in the multiple and plural forms that sensibly singularise it. To recover the sensible fabric of living beings, their vital continuity despite the discontinuity of individuations and embodiments, is to open oneself to the world-to-come on the Earth we have always had to relearn how to inhabit.

The pioneer of American ecology Aldo Leopold once wrote that “we can be ethical only in relation to something we can see, feel, understand, love, or otherwise have faith in.” The image of ecology as a mechanics of data is incapable of reproducing the vital affects of relation with a place, or the sensible bonds that constitute it. Ecology ought to begin with an “aesthetic revolution”, making us feel that ecology is an ethics, but before that, that it is an aesthetics: a form of sensibility in which the sensible is embodied.

Ecology would then be the path of humanity’s ethical realisation, fulfilling the movement of its self-consciousness insofar as it participates in the movement of creation. In order to create an ethics of inhabiting the earth, we must invent a sensible relation with beings and with the multiple and plural forms of life. We must create a common space, a place of encounter where ecology and the arts may initiate a new alliance and share tasks, exchanging their reciprocal roles: to make visible, through the embodiments of the sensible, the concrete perception of the ecological continuity of life; and to infuse art with the consciousness that its forms of materialisation bear an originary commitment to a creative

continuum with the realm of the living. The arts and knowledge must be revived by one another, uniting our thought with ways of knowing rooted and embodied in the thickness of the sensible.

To criticise the modern scientific project and the instrumentalisation of technoscience by capitalism entails rethinking ecology as a science of the relations between humans and the whole of living beings. It means thinking multiple and plural living beings as what we ourselves are: as a constitutive dynamic in which we bathe and are immersed, which we traverse and which traverses us. We accumulate data and predictive models, yet we need to communicate in order to act; we need embodied emotions and must resist the widening gulf in the way ecological consciousness is perceived: not as a distanced communication of alarmist and diffuse threats, but as something concerning both our lifeworlds and the earth as a whole.

The thought of Gilles Clément is one of the essential references in this reflection. His work teaches us always to relate to a landscape and a territory as a living biotope, where we establish sensible bonds. The art of landscape and gardens is not the projection of forms upon a landscape, but the constitution of a sensible relation with a community of living beings, an entry into resonance and dialogue with a biotope. Every act of gardening is an invitation to understand that relation to a space presupposes relation to living beings.

What we call art is a certain technique for manipulating the sensible, which should not so much be the manipulation of inert and dead materials as the entry into relation that we weave with other beings and living forms in a given location, in a given space-time. It is a form of sharing and sensible dialogue with living beings. “Garden” is that place of relations that evolve together, the movement of life with which we work: not an act of imposing form, not a permanent desire to remodel the world in our own image, but a dance of life, a shared dream, an inhabited co-creation, a poetics-in-common, a work-in-common.

This work arises from embodied emotions, not from an abstract and formalist exercise. Perhaps we might say: ecology is a poetics. The first pioneers of ecology, the authors of nature writing, were travellers of the sensible: walkers, writers, thinkers who were moved and who sought to move others – John Muir, Aldo Leopold, Thoreau – placing the experience of life into emotion. Not as an aestheticised landscape contemplated from a distance, but as a form of inhabiting and immersing oneself in a landscape, with an embodied body and an imagination fully attentive to the smallest movement of living beings. An enlarged anthropology, an aesthetics of ecology, a thinking imagination of multiple and plural living beings.

An ecology of the sensible would reintegrate all the senses in order to attempt to experience and describe the manifestations of living beings. Boundaries are always boundaries of the mind, created by the mind itself: active imagination, poetic reverie and dream occur in order to cross borders, to expand consciousness, rediscovering the embodied body, the living, synaesthetic and resonant body. To enter into resonance with what is animated is to enter into resonance with what bears the sensible movement of multiple and plural life.

To relearn how to inhabit the earth begins by seeing it as a garden in motion, one for which we must care, so that we may live in conviviality with the rest of the living beings with whom we must cohabit and coexist. David Abram reminds us that we are not the existential plenitude that life has inscribed within us if we step outside ourselves and become bound to the narrow limits we so often construct. Embodied life is an ecosystem of e-motions: vital movements that express the inhabiting and communicating forms of life which actualise their existential potential there.

When we are immersed in the living, we leave the logical space of reason; we see invention and permanent metamorphosis. Life possesses a luxuriant creativity; it is continually reinventing itself according to its intimate forms of the self-organisation of complexity, according to its systemic equilibria. Everything changes, all the time: this is the law of life, the law of metamorphosis, which governs the creative mechanism of evolution. Life is unpredictable: we never know what will happen tomorrow. Like a gardener, each day something new appears in the garden, something other and unexpected. To place oneself within the temporality of the present is perhaps the first form of presence.

An ecology of the sensible becomes embodied as the gardening of the world: as a habitation of the earth. It is not an aestheticising or merely artistic practice, but a sensible relation established with multiple and plural living beings. It is an opening of the five senses to other subtle senses, but also a sensible relation because it is a relation of care and affection, of attachment, selfless devotion, contemplative reverie, of love for life as infinite transmutation and transformation. To produce an ecology of the sensible, we do not need machines or devices; we need to renew our love for the earth.

It is a way of being present in time, a presence in time embodied in a place. The time of presence is the time of others: of that sensible alterity that appears and reveals itself in embodied time. We must not impose our calendar, our chronological time, but open ourselves to the time of others, welcoming it. We must recognise that those beings we encounter in a sensible relation within the “planetary garden” – to use Gilles Clément’s expression – within the garden that is our planet, those beings we touch, see and feel, are also endowed with sensibility, perception and intelligence.

To recognise that sensible alterity is endowed with sensibility and intelligence, that living beings are sentient, that they have an embodied body that feels reciprocity: when we touch a leaf, the leaf touches us, feels us. We touch and are touched; we look and are looked at. We must move beyond materialist mechanism: we are the product of permanent sensible exchanges with other living beings, within the continuity of this sensible fabric, within the constitutive inseparability of living beings. We are intimately constituted by this sensible reciprocity, which occurs when we are fully present.

An ecology of the sensible is an ecology of presence. Merleau-Ponty said: “*science manipulates things and gives up living in them.*” It models trajectories and simulates them in mathematical equations; it observes phenomena, describes physiological processes which it transcribes into biochemical

reactions, reducing them, reductively, to physics and mechanics. Yet life is unpredictable: it is always opening new paths, bifurcations, quantum co-evolutions born of coexistence and synergy among beings and elements. “Life is freedom insinuating itself into necessity,” said Bergson – and one might also recall René Thom on chaotic states. Life inflects matter, causing it to bifurcate. Life is this impulse, this impetus of the sensible expressing life’s potential. Living beings are not merely subject to their environment: they co-evolve with it, permanently modifying it. Life is the sensible embodiment of freedom within necessity.

The gardener of the world, the cosmic gardener, is a translator of the sensible, of the delicate threads in the fabric of the sensible. The human, as Emanuele Coccia suggests, is “*the gardener of the world, the cosmic gardener*”: a sentient gardener who inhabits the earth by inhabiting its transformations and metamorphoses, immersed in the overflowing flow of sensible exchanges. The ecology of the sensible is the consciousness of the garden of unpredictable metamorphoses, the garden of sensible exchanges, a meteorology of the sensible: a certain light, a certain humidity, a certain density of time, an atmosphere, an energy embodied in a place, a communication that life whispers and murmurs to us.

“*Every gardener is gardened by what they garden*”, as Byung-Chul Han suggests in his beautiful *In Praise of the Earth*, if they accept entering into the reciprocity of co-creation. To recognise the freedom of other living beings is to accede to their freedom, to their capacity not to obey systematically a fixed order: to recreate order, to bring forth the emergence of new orders, new creative relations, new sensible ecosystems, and to ally oneself with the infinite metamorphoses of the sensible fabric of multiple and plural living beings.

To inhabit the great ecstatic and sentient garden of our passage through the terrestrial world is to live, incessantly and interminably, in a *life-in-resonance*.