

Work story

In the work of art, I have gradually come to understand the ideas performed by methodology, which is a considerable part of it, from a narratological perspective. From my narratological point of view, an artwork is a more or less clearly composed (or edited) sequence of actions which can take the shape of, or result in, a more or less solid physical object, a time-based work (video or film), or an event which most often is documented.¹ This sequence of actions is fundamental to the understanding of the work – often this is the conceptual strategy – and it can be reproduced or retold. Within the art world, works of art are often mediated as stories and are allocated a place within circulation and reception first and foremost as a story of a series of actions. I call the account of these actions a *work story*.

According to my description, a work story is basically an account of action, a series of makings, but the story often also contains accounts of considerations and relational moments (to the situation where the actions were performed). Being a meta-activity – as any narrative – a construction in retrospect, the work story has elements of self-interpretation and self-reflection.

A work story is constructed, shaped and maintained in a system of talking, staging, performing, dissemination and circulation as well as re-contextualization. Adjacent to the mediated story of the making of art are the stories of reception, reaction and consequences of the work. Told and retold, these stories become a part of the work; i.e. fragments of the reception of the work are internalized in the work.

In terms of narration, I believe there are three different forms or layers in artistic practice (concerned with representation) and that the work story is activated in the last level. But in one way or another, they are all interconnected and interact with one another and sometimes coincide in a performative unit (even if not all of them are always present in one and the same work).

The first layer is the motif of the work, to the extent that the work is telling a story (something not all works do, obviously) or is suggesting a plot. “Motif” may be a suspect term here when considering the fact that many of the artworks of today do not operate primarily within the means of representation, but function as events, social interactions or as communicative acts. But even these works, sometimes inscribed in relational and participatory practice, seem to create models of the world where the demarcation of the work (through the art context) creates what resembles a “motif.”

The second layer is the factual orbit of the process. It is the very making of the work, the *potential narrative of the methodology* that can be deduced or extracted by observing, or by other means taking part of, a work. As described before with the examples of drawing, here the technique, combined with the performance as well as the sequence of actions that has led to (or constitute) the work, forms a self-sufficient narrative (which, as mentioned, also has mimetic and aesthetic dimensions). The methodology can be detected by cognitive means, for instance by observing the strokes of a brush or the style of lines in a drawing, and the ability to understand or capture the methods is very much due to the experience and knowledge of the viewer.²

¹ Sol LeWitt writes in his famous “Paragraphs on Conceptual Art” (*Artforum*, June 1967) that artistic ideas are “/.../ in a chain of development that may eventually find some form.” He also adds: “All ideas need not be made physical.” (<http://radicalart.info/concept/LeWitt/paragraphs.html>, 14/4 2010),

². In *The Politics of Small Gestures, Chances and Challenges for Contemporary Art* , (art-ist 2006), Mika Hannula speaks as

The third layer is the meta-layer. It is an account of the second layer, reconstructed and/or post-constructed. This is the *work story* which is performed by others and/or the artist him/herself. This third form is in constant transformation, is remodeled, displaced, reduced, or extended. Biographical contents are often added with various levels of mythologization. The second and the third layer are naturally at work in the discipline of artistic research.³

Actually, I realize that I lack first-hand experience of many of the artworks I know of and believe I can relate to. I know many of them from images and texts in printed matter, but in the case of several of them I have only heard of them in conversations, lectures, discussions, and seminars. Nevertheless many of these unseen works are active in my mind; they are imagined and visualized, sometimes probably also idealized. Through the medium of storytelling I have my own “experience” of these artworks (although I, in the process of reception, interpretation and imagination, sometimes might have partly or totally misunderstood their intention or physical appearance, distorted their concepts, and of course added to or reduced their meaning.)

The fact that the art world to a large extent is a place for stories points to its folkloristic aspect.⁴ In other words, the art world is a place for transmission: someone has seen or heard of someone who has done something. The story is told and retold. As in any other oral culture there are misunderstandings, details, displacements, and falsifications. In this “talk-talk community” there is a heavy dependence on “what is on everyone’s tongue.” Works that are difficult to talk about, for instance, run the risk of being neglected and disappearing. Sometimes an art practice escapes omission because of stories about the artist himself.

Whatever one may think of the oral circulation of art (often connected to the work story) – not least through chatting at bars and cafés – the narration could be recognized as a “place” for art distribution that is as important as the exhibition space and printed matter. A similar “place” has actually been recognized in literature and examined as an element in a hermeneutical analysis by Gérard Genette. A key function in his analysis is the term *paratext*. *Paratext* is informed by *peritex* – which consist of spatial and material aspects of a book as format, layout, title page, paper, cover design, etc. – together with *epitext* which consists of the author’s interviews, conversations, correspondence, diaries, seminars, presentations, and retrospective comments. *Paratext* is supposedly what Joseph Kosuth called an artist’s “total signifying activities.”

According to Genette, there is no clear border between the inner (text) and the outer (the world’s discourse surrounding the book). In analogy with paratext, he uses the expression of Philippe Lejeune: “/.../ a fringe of the

(an informed) viewer about the small but crucial gestures and instructions in the making of artworks: “/.../ these embedded gestures and choices that make the given work what it is; i.e. what makes it tick and what turns it into something special. They are gestures that make the work become special.” The knowledge and/or observation of these gestures in the process of making and performing trigger experiences of alternative ways of being with oneself and with one’s surroundings – “to becoming a place,” (p. 7).

³ Mieke Bal speaks about three layers in narration (which are not easily transferred to the three layers I use in this text): the fabula, the story, and the (narrative) text. A narrative text is a story told by an agent in a medium (composed of language signs). Mike Bal speaks about two types of fabula: a series of logically chronological events that are caused by and experienced by actors and a memorial trace that remains after the story has been received. See *Narrative Theory: Major Issues in Narrative Theory*, ed. Mieke Bal, Routledge 2004.

⁴ See also Bengt af Klintberg’s text on the connection between Fluxus art and folklore; *Fluxus Games and Contemporary Folklore: On the Non-individual Character of Fluxus Art*, Konsthistorisk Tidskrift 1993.

printed text which in reality controls one's whole reading of the text."⁵ This fringe, which always brings a comment of the author, "/.../" constitutes a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of *transaction*: a privileged place of pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that – whether well or poorly understood and achieved – is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it /.../."⁶

It is within different spaces of a similar “zone” in the art world that the oral tradition is happening and the stories that artists tell about their own work are delivered. It is under the pretext (or epitext) of collegial conversations, lectures, presentations (to curators), studio visits, and meetings with the press and audience that artists are constantly telling their stories.⁷ The stories of the artist are always changing to fit the present situation and audience, as well as his professional and personal development. The oral text of the artist is also changed with the spirit and tendencies of the time, including and excluding elements, emphasizing some parts and adding comments absorbed and internalized from the surrounding discourses. It is a continuously changing story: contingent and re-examining. Already in the sixteenth century, Michel de Montaigne wanted to incorporate such a *slight narrative* (Paul Rotha)⁸ in his writing process:

I must accommodate my history to the hour: I may presently change, not only by fortune, but also by intention. This is a counterpart of various and changeable accidents, and of irresolute imaginations, and, as it falls out, sometimes contrary: whether it be that I am then another self, or that I take subjects by other circumstances and considerations /.../⁹

The term “paratext,” used by Genette, and my own term “work story” both point towards factors and circumstances that effect the reading of (or viewing or talking part of) a work, and become an integral part of it. My own term is grounded in methodology, in making. The “instructive” stories about the making of an artwork are strongly connected to the history of conceptualism and performance art. The story about the making of a piece is, as mentioned above, crucial to the understanding of works in the conceptual and neo-conceptual tradition (as in the given example of *Flaga* by Simon Sterling, later on in this text) as well as process-based art of all kind. As in Fluxus art, the series of actions and makings that constitute a piece could be told as an

⁵ Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge University Press 1997, p. 2. He refers to Phillippe Lejeune, *Le Pacte autobiographique*, Seul 1975, p.45.

⁶ Ibid. See also Jonas J. Magnusson's objections to what he finds static and hierarchical of this concept: “(R)Ed. Est” in *OEI* nos. 37 & 38 2008, p. 194.

⁷ A number of artists have transformed public speaking about art into performance. Andrea Fraser made famous artists' talks as performances with different communicative strategies and different adopted roles. British artist Carey Young focuses in the filmed performance *Everything You've Heard is Wrong* (2008) on the very act of communication. Dressed in an impeccable business suit she gives an impassioned speech about successful corporate communication at Speaker's Corner in Hyde Park—the symbol for free speech, although today with an aura of anachronism.

⁸ Paul Rotha, “Some Principles of Documentary” in *A Paul Rotha Reader*, eds. Duncan Petrie & Robert Kruger, University of Exeter Press 1999, p. 149. The essay was originally published in 1935.

⁹ Michel de Montaigne's *Essays* in the beginning of chapter XIV (“Of Repentance”) <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl302/texts/montaigne/montaigne-essays--4.html#XIV>, (15/3 2010).

instruction, or as a score, which was the common term among Fluxus artists. Work story here seems to be identical with the score. But a work story is a meta-narrative, a commentary track, and includes elements of post-construction. Work story is not the orbit or trajectory of the making itself, it is a storytelling activity, something under construction and only partly controlled by the artist. Out of the hands of the artist, in circulation, it starts to live its own life.

Hence a score of Yoko Ono, for instance, is on the one hand a work story in the most “archaic” form (since it simply tells about the making of an artwork) and on the other hand an utterance that “out-writes” the work story and makes the meta-function redundant. The Yoko Ono scores have colonized language to the point that nothing else needs to be said and they occupy the temporal conditions: they are predict, offer, announce, inform at the same time as they have an aura of document. Paradoxically, the most humble and ethereal Fluxus piece becomes the most “total” art. Yoko Ono’s *Fly piece* (1963), consisting of one word consolidates this: “Fly” (followed by the words “Summer 1963”).

An institutional shift has opened up for a range of discourse-staging events within the public and private art institutions (often inspired by self-organized structures and artist group’s initiatives outside the institutions): workshops, seminars, screenings, discussions, think-tanks, debates, lectures, residency programs, etc. These activities sometimes function as side events, as main attractions of the exhibitions, or as “replacement” for exhibitions. They are most often public events, but not always.¹⁰ This institutional turn is often placed somewhere in the 1960s. With the advent of minimalism and conceptual art institutions “/.../ had to take the double process of the dematerialization of the art object on the one hand *and* the so-called expanded field of art practices on the other hand, into account.”¹¹

In fact, many of the institutions have just recently started opening up for working processes that do not just want to pose the question “What am I doing?” but also: “When am I doing? Where am I doing? And for whom?” (after having closed the structure by the end of the 1970s). The movement of the institutional structure towards the platform-function has enabled those artists whose work is content-driven (roughly speaking) to bring in expertise, to become involved in an interdisciplinary practice and deepen or widen the discussion of their subject-matter.

Other artists have come to work exclusively on the institutional structure itself. Institutions are here simultaneously able to incorporate institutional critique (and thus paradoxically institutionalize institutional critique). Yet other artists – Tino Seghal is a paradigmatic example – create performative works that play exclusively with the institutional structure, however not primarily as a critique, but rather as a way of rethinking and reinventing the structures and the agents acting there. Tino Seghal’s work is completely dependent on oral transmission in the art world since he doesn’t allow any of his performative actions to be documented.

¹⁰ Curator and editor Clémentine Deliss curated for instance *Tempolabor* for the Kunsthalle Basel in 1998. For one week 36 artists and art mediators gathered behind closed doors for discussions.

¹¹ Simon Sheik in *On Knowledge Production*, p. 184

The discourse-staging activities have become something much larger than an epitext. They must, as Simon Sheik has pointed out, be considered a cluster that constitutes a genre in its own right. Being a panellist is consequently “/.../ almost a possible occupation, besides curatorial and academic work.”¹²

Regarding this development we have to remember that the art world – or the art worlds – historically have been “talk-talk communities”. Many of the art historical and sociological studies of modernism, for instance of the surrealist and the dada movement, make it clear how these movements evolved around the social. What is seen as a contemporary dilemma: nepotism, male social bonding, elitism, is often viewed through a filter of romanticism when it lies in the past (“the circle around Breton,” “the circle around Picasso,” and so on). But the change of institutional policies in line with the expanded field of art practices, the increasing number of events for staging discourses¹³ (including artistic research) at institutions and at alternative spaces, the semiotisation of art, the increased level of theory and discussion in art education – together these factors have enhanced the social aspect of art (making) and art reception. Thus the basis for narration on art processes has become even more important. We encounter “/.../ the question of transmission and orality evoked to the reference to conversation” and also the question of “/.../ the nature of the human environment in which this transmission is produced.”¹⁴

Except for sketching these historical structural changes, I have no intention of analyzing the “new sociality” in art. My main interest has been the act of talking and writing about processes of art-making. With some examples from the history of conceptual art, I want to show a certain history of talking and telling about art from the artist’s perspective over the last 50 years. The video essay (and the essayistic film), just like the lecture or the reading, here has the role of an event, certainly with an absent living body, but nevertheless with the imaginary, situated body of a narrator in a place.

A story of *my art*, which consists of a line of *work stories*, has a lot in common with the story that you tell about your life. Both narrations share the same propagandistic and idealizing features. Disturbing/inconvenient elements are excluded: sidetracks, “unproductive” details, slips, episodes that are too odd, and the elements and events threatening one’s investments in an ideology or one’s principal identity.¹⁵ Paul Ricœur uses the term *emplotment* for the process in which stories achieve and maintain intelligibility for an individual:

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Unfortunately many of these events function more like group shows in theory and discourse and therefore favor the gathering of a winning team for a certain discourse rather than answering to keywords such as “heterogeneity”, “criticality” and “conflictual positions.” Irit Rogoff writes in her essay “Turning” (*e-flux journal* no. 11 2008): “And so the art world became the site of extensive talking – talking emerged as a practice, as a mode of gathering, as a way of getting access to some knowledge and to some questions, as networking and organizing and articulating some necessary questions. But did we put any value on what was actually being said? Or, did we privilege the coming-together of people in space and trust that formats and substances would emerge from these?”

¹⁴ Clémentine Deliss, in *Knowledge Production*, p. 58.

¹⁵ This propagandistic feature also concerns the production of texts for monographs of artists, exhibition catalogues, and press releases. The texts that accompany exhibitions move from description to admiration and applause. Even though art, in its self-image, appears as self-critical, questioning, and open to what is complex, nothing that could be interpreted as negative or questioning towards the artist’s work and his intentions, would ever be included in these texts.

/.../ an event must be more than just a singular occurrence. It gets its definition from its contribution to the development of the plot. A story, too, must be more than just an enumeration of events in serial order; it must organize them into an intelligible whole, of a sort such that we can always ask what is the ‘thought’ of this story. In short, emplotment is the operation that draws a configuration out of a simple succession.¹⁶

Work stories have various auras. Some seem to be mythological and other documentary, and both of them must have some verisimilitude to interest people. But work stories not only lay claim to representing reality, they also form the reality and the idea of the truth. And since work stories create imaginary works the moment they are told they have a possibility both to stage and reenact works of art into new shapes (works that even might be materialized or performed later on by the receiver of the story).

In the case of Joseph Beuys, it is evident how the life story or biography became a fundament for the understanding of all his diverse activities as an artist. The life story merges with the *work story*. In the often re-told mythology of his plane crash as a fighter pilot during World War II, one finds the key objects and themes reenacted in his performances and installations: felt, stretcher fat, milk, cold, death, survival, rescue, primitivism, and nomadism:

Had it not been for the Tartars I would not be alive today. They were the nomads of the Crimea, in what was then no man’s land between the Russian and German fronts, and favoured neither side. I had already struck up a good relationship with them, and often wandered off to sit with them. “Du nix njemcky’ they would say, “du Tartar,” and try to persuade me to join their clan. Their nomadic ways attracted me of course, although by that time their movements had been restricted. Yet it was they who discovered me in the snow after the crash, when the German search parties had given up. I was still unconscious then and only came round completely after twelve days or so, and by then I was back in a German field hospital. So the memories I have of that time are images that penetrated my consciousness. The last thing I remember was that it was too late to jump, too late for the parachutes to open. That must have been a couple of seconds before hitting the ground. Luckily I was not strapped in – I always preferred free movement to safety belts /.../ My friend was strapped in and he was atomized on impact – there was almost nothing to be found of him afterwards. But I must have shot through the windscreen as it flew back at the same speed as the plane hit the ground and that saved me, though I had bad skull and jaw injuries. Then the tail flipped over and I was completely buried in the snow. That’s how the Tartars found me days later. I remember voices saying “voda” (water), then the felt of their tents, and the dense pungent smell of cheese, fat and milk. They covered my body in fat to help it regenerate warmth, and wrapped it in felt as an insulator to keep warmth in.¹⁷

Tris Vonna-Michel, a contemporary storyteller in art, uses elements in his life story as starting points for long-

¹⁶ Paul Ricœur, *Time and Narrative*, Vol 1, p. 65.

¹⁷ Beuys quoted in Caroline Tisdall, *Joseph Beuys*, Guggenheim, 1979, pp.16-7.

term research and mythologization. In his audiopoems certain narrative phrases, which seem to be autobiographical, are repeated and linked together. During performances an egg timer gives a temporal frame and his voice is hectic although the stories go in circles and after a while become objectified. As “materialized” entities these stories are given a modular character, they can be used over and over again in different combinations, and they come to exist in a peculiar state between the discursive and non-discursive.¹⁸ The obscure sound poet, printmaker, painter, filmmaker, etc., Henri Chopin, was Vonna-Michel’s neighbor during a short period of his upbringing in Essex. When asking his father about the reason for being an Essex-boy the father’s response was: “Don’t ask me—ask Henri Chopin. All you need to know is that he loved quail eggs and lived in Paris...”¹⁹ In slide shows and monologues on speakers, the audience in his installations are offered to take part in his “journey and evolution of Finding Chopin.”²⁰ In the work and life of Chopin, he comes to seek the clues for his own work and life. Tris Vonna-Michel finally meets Chopin, brings him quail eggs, but he doesn’t seem to get closer to the mystery.

Another similarity between the work story and the life story is that the possible meaningfulness of the narrative is based on the acknowledgement of the limitations of the continuation of the narrative as well as the infinite number of entry points. If the field or material for artistic interrogation is too wide or open, the artist is terrorized by all the possibilities. At the same time, the actual material has to be as open as it allows a work or adaptation to be.²¹ Alasdair MacIntyre points out these limitations and the importance of a situated narrative in *After Virtue*:

I can only answer the question “What am I to do?” if I answer the prior question “Of what story or stories do I find myself a part?” We enter human society, that is, with one or more imputed characters – roles into which we have been drafted – and we have to learn what they are in order to be able to understand how others respond to us and how our responses to them are apt to be construed.²²

Mika Hannula discusses in a similar mode the concept of narration-in-life in *Politics, Identity and Public Space—Critical Reflections In and Through the Practices of Contemporary Arts*. A life story is here treated as something that is becoming a place in itself –“/.../ a place made and shaped within the structures of the social and political space of a process of an identity.”²³ Life story is, according to Hannula, a strongly situated and

¹⁸ Massimiliano Gioni connects Tris Vonna-Michel’s work (together with artists like Keren Cytter, Luke Fowler, Patricia Esquivias, and Ryan Trecartin) with what literary critic James Wood has called “hysterical realism” –“/.../ a form of narration peculiar to our time, based on an excess of storytelling and a hyperconnection between characters, stories and substories.” See Massimiliano Gioni, “We Are Too Many,” http://mediaspace.newmuseum.org/ytjpressmaterials/PDFS/WHAT_THE_CURATOR_ARE_SAYING/04_Gioni_Essay.pdf, (12/4 2010).

¹⁹ Taken from a leaflet for his exhibition at Tensta Konsthall (10/10 2009 –23/1 2010).

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ See Zagorka _ivkovi_, “Etik som reflektion och avgörande” in *Diwan* no. 3 1991.

²² Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, University of Notre Dame Press 1984, p. 216.

²³ Mika Hannula, *Politics, Identity and Public Space—Critical Reflections In and Through the Practices of Contemporary Arts*, Expothesis, Utrecht Consortium 2009, p. 69.

process-based concept, always involved in “/.../ negotiating and constructing its connectedness to where it comes from, where and how it is located now, and where it wants to move on.”²⁴ Hannula speaks about the process of negotiating these hermeneutical questions of temporality (past, present, future) between individual and society. The interpretation of this negotiation profoundly affects the choices and routes we are able to picture and try to follow, choices that are activated in the social imagination.

But according to Hannula, something is missing in MacIntyre’s concept of (or aim for) narrative unity and Ricœur’s idea of permanence in time, which “/.../ still remains attached to the hope and goal of unified life.”²⁵ “But why unity?” Hannula asks. Why not allow “the plurality, the messiness and the multiple stories to evolve and collide?”²⁶

The life story is not a linear story, Hannula says. Life stories do not make sense and guarantee no goodness. “We are emotional hooligans. We want more, and we are never satisfied. We are driven by our lack of balance and our inability to slow down.”²⁷ Our life story “/.../ is about navigating and negotiating through the mundane daily cruelty and stupidity, the ways to trying to learn how to lose, how to come to terms with one’s mistakes, shattered dreams and lack of energy /.../ it is more defined by its collapses and failures rather than by its victories and pleasurable closures.”²⁸

The “propagandistic” is fundamental to the conjoining function of narration – for instance being tolerant of incongruence and interlacing of different time planes – but it is at the same time also its “neurotic element.” The life story (as well as the work story) struggles to keep the self (the body of work) together and make it meaningful; Montaigne, on the other hand, deconstructs the ego into a manifold of possibilities (“I am then another self”). But actually, as Mika Hannula says, the individual’s struggle to keep the egological narrative together most often takes place in a more disadvantageous position. The mythomaniac not only invents an impressive arsenal of armor, weapons, and divertive maneuvers to maintain the coherence²⁹ of a narration-in-life, for example to blame fictive versions of the self by claiming that they have acted independently (the use of the ventriloquist’s puppet, a character in a blog or in a novel). Some people who sense the approaching loss, change their strategy and split openly, i.e. become schizophrenics or constitute multiple personalities. MacIntyre says: “When someone complains – as do some of them who attempt or commit suicide – that his or her life is

²⁴ Ibid., p. 69.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 74.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 75.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Mika Hannula speaks about the classical criteria for an utterance’s validity: 1) coherence and dissonance; 2) truthfulness; 3) ethical and existential commitment; 4) open and creative strategy; 5) authenticity. To these criteria one can add Maeve Cook’s metaphor of *self-authorship* as ethical activity: tentatively *responsible* and *accountable*, *independent*, *purposive-rational* and as a *strong evaluator*. “All this is enough to make any of us dizzy.” as Hannula says. “These are requirements that clearly nobody can fulfill, which any of us can only hope to have a slight chance to approach – and hope that something get transmitted and pushed forward.” Ibid. pp. 82–84.

meaningless, he or she is often and perhaps characteristically complaining that the narrative of their life has become unintelligible to them, that it lacks any points, any moments towards a climax or a *telos*.³⁰

On the other hand, for those who manage to keep the responsibility of the different egos, there are new structures of meaning to be developed from a polyphonic story of the self (and their body of work), a story in constant revision. American writer Lyn Hejinian wrote the first version of her autobiography *My Life* (1987) at thirty-seven. It consisted of thirty-seven texts, each of them with thirty-seven sentences. By the ages of forty-five and sixty-five she wrote new versions with chapters and sentences according to her age. Her biography and the mediating of a self became an ongoing project, a work in progress.³¹

For many others, the models of life stories seem magnificently demanding. But it doesn't mean that they are meaningless or impossible. Hannula proposes that we are cherishing the procedural character of the activity and thereby somehow realizing that the life story is performed in “/.../ the grey area of where things can become a place /.../” – the third space.³² It is important that we allow ourselves to see the incompleteness in the aim of achieving completeness. We can do so if we “/.../ find ways to stay closer and to stay put with the details of those small gestures within the daily life.”³³ We need to get closer to our practice and we need to “/.../ emphasize the necessity of defining the content of these aims and concepts in and through your daily experiences and the practice of what do you do when you do what you do.”³⁴

The dissemination of a life story and a work story is a sharing process that is directed not only to different more or less defined audiences but also back to the one telling the story. Work stories in combination with life stories are active in the context of artistic research and practice-based research since the sharing of and aim to create a transparency with the work process involves our biographies at the same time that it forces us to undergo an act of self-alienation – to look at oneself as another.

³⁰ Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, p. 217.

³¹ Furthermore a reader created a blog where her text is fragmented and distributed as daily notes in a diary starting 31/8 2003 (<http://mylifebylynhejinian.blogspot.com>, 10/8 2009). Lyn Hejinian, *Mitt liv*, Modernista 2004.

³² Hannula, *Politics, Identity and Public Space – Critical Reflections In and Through the Practices of Contemporary Arts*, p. 89. This is in analogy with Edward W. Soja's discussion of the third space. According to Soja it is a space where all social relations: “... become real and concrete, a part of our lived social existence, only when they are spatially ‘inscribed’ –that is, concretely represented – in the social production of social space. Social reality is not just coincidentally spatial, existing ‘in’ space, it is presuppositionally and ontologically spatial. There is no unspatialised social reality. There are no aspatial social processes. Even in the realm of pure abstraction, ideology, and representation, there is a pervasive and pertinent, if often hidden, spatial dimension.” (*Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*, Wiley, John & Sons, Incorporated 1996, p. 46)

³³ Hannula, *Politics, Identity and Public Space – Critical Reflections In and Through the Practices of Contemporary Arts*, p.88

³⁴ *Ibid.* p. 89.