Prologue:  
Pre-Positions

If, following cultural critic Mieke Bal’s definition, ‘art-writing’ is a mode of criticism which aims to 'put the art first', then Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism aims to put the sites of engagement with art first. These include the sites – material, emotional, political and conceptual – of the artwork’s construction, exhibition and documentation, as well as those remembered, dreamed and imagined by the artist, critic and other viewers. Site-Writing explores these sites of engagement through five different spatial configurations each one both architectural and psychic.

In conducting ‘close readings’ of specific artworks, Bal recognizes the important role that architecture plays in encounters with art. In her book on Louise Bourgeois’ Spider, in which she coins the wonderful phrase ‘the architecture of art-writing’, from which this book draws its subtitle, she approaches the ‘architecturality’ of the work through narrative. In a discussion around her more recent essay on artist Doris Salcedo, Bal has referred to architecture’s role in creating the context for art. Site-Writing extends these tempting propositions into the construction of texts – essays and installations – architectures of art criticism – that write the sites of this critic’s encounters with artworks by artists as diverse as Jananne Al-Ani, Elina Brotherus, Nathan Coley, Tracey Emin, Cristina Iglesias and Do-Ho Suh.

With a background in architectural design, followed by research in architectural history, and then a period teaching public art, my writing has evolved through examinations of particular interdisplinary meeting points – feminist theory and architectural history, conceptual art practice and architectural design, and most recently art criticism, psychoanalysis and autobiography. Although my aim remains constant – to articulate the position of the writing subject and her choice of objects of study and subject matters, processes of intellectual enquiry and creative production – over time my methods have transformed from writing a feminist marxist critique of the
gendering of architectural space in nineteenth-century London to my current site-writing project where the boundary between subjects and objects is more porous and arguments are not only made directly, but indirectly, through association and implication.

*Art and Architecture: A Place Between* marked a transition, where, through the process of writing *about* critical spatial practice – a theorized account of a series of projects located between art and architecture – I realized that the changing positions I occupied in relation to art, architecture and theory – physical as well as ideological, private as well as public – informed my critical attitude. I concluded *Art and Architecture* by arguing that criticism is a form of critical spatial practice in its own right. *Site-Writing* picks up where *Art and Architecture* left off, shifting the focus from a place between art and architecture to the sites between critic and work.

*Site-Writing* explores the position of the critic, not only in relation to art objects, architectural spaces and theoretical ideas, but also through the site of writing itself, investigating the limits of criticism, and asking what it is possible for a critic to say about an artist, a work, the site of a work and the critic herself and for the writing to still ‘count’ as criticism. *Site-Writing* is composed of a series of texts developed over the last ten years, some newly authored, others radically transformed for this volume. The culmination of this research is set within an inter-, or perhaps intra-, disciplinary framework that reinvigorates the concepts, processes and subjects of art criticism through the use of spatial terms – psychoanalytic concepts and architectural conditions. While a number of critics have written about situated practice, including site-specific art, as well as the importance of location in feminist and postcolonial art, this book argues for and attempts to produce a form of art criticism which is *itself* a form of situated practice.

Situated Criticism
Over the past twenty years feminism, postcolonial studies and human geography has increasingly focused on issues of identity, difference and subjectivity. With words such as ‘mapping’, ‘locating’, ‘situating’, ‘positioning’ and ‘boundaries’ appearing frequently, the language of these texts is highly spatialised. Discussions of new ways of knowing and being are articulated through spatial terms, developing conceptual and critical tools such as ‘situated knowledge’ and ‘standpoint theory’ for examining the relationship between the construction of subjects and the politics of location. The work of feminist philosopher Rosi Braidotti exemplifies this attitude beautifully, for her the figure of the ‘nomadic subject’ describes not only a spatial state of movement, but also an epistemological condition, a kind of knowingness (or unknowingness) that refuses fixity.

In art, while minimalism brought to the fore the role of the viewer’s perception in producing the work, since minimalism, art, notably that which derives from feminism and postcolonialism, has developed a more sophisticated understanding of how the viewer’s experience varies according to cultural identity and geographic location, and has an intimate as well as public dimension. Most recently what has been termed relational or dialogical art has focused on how the viewer’s interaction, participation and collaboration is central to the production of art’s aesthetic dimension. However, debates around the position of the critic as a specific kind of art viewer are only just beginning to be worked through.

Umberto Eco in his classic essay from 1962, ‘The Poetics of the Open Work’, argued that the ‘poetics of the work in movement … installs a new relationship between the contemplation and the utilization of a work of art’, so setting in motion the important notion that a work might be used as well as contemplated. The interesting relation between viewing and using that Eco’s proposition provokes is played out differently depending on the art form in question. For example, it comes as no surprise to a discipline like architecture, where, due to its role as a social art, and emphasized by the
functionalist discourse of modernism, use has long been established as the dominant form of engagement with a building.\textsuperscript{xiv}

That Eco’s comments come out of his reflection on music helps to explain his adoption of the terms performer and interpreter in this text. In a footnote he notes that, ‘For the purposes of aesthetic analysis, however, both cases can be seen as different manifestations of the same interpretive attitude’,\textsuperscript{xv} It is precisely this difference in interpretative attitudes and their performative manifestations, which interests me in \textit{Site-Writing}, produced as they are, according to the distinctive locations of interpretation and the varying distances and conditions of responsibility interpreters and performers have to authors and audiences. This observation is of special relevance to art criticism today since it draws attention to the various types of art interpreter and performer and the specific sites of their engagement with art, from the curator to the collector, from the critic to the invigilator, from the viewer who has visited the work once to the user who has read the catalogue a thousand times from a million miles away. In \textit{Site-Writing}, I consider the critic to be a particular kind of art \textit{user}, since for me this term suggests a more active and inherently spatial role, one which includes the optic but which is not driven solely by the visual and which involves both interpretation and performance.

In arguing that the history of installation art needs to be based on the viewer’s experience, art critic Claire Bishop has drawn attention to specific kinds of viewing subjects. She describes the tension between the activated spectator who in engaging with the work is understood to politically interact with the world, and the centred experience favoured by feminist and post-colonial artworks as a critique of dominance, privilege and mastery.\textsuperscript{xvi} Bishop suggests that it is the ‘degree of proximity between model subject and literal viewer’, which may ‘provide a criterion of aesthetic judgement for installation art’.\textsuperscript{xvii} Although she does refer in passing to the processes of writing criticism in terms of the implications of not experiencing the work first-hand,\textsuperscript{xviii} Bishop does not discuss the critic as a precise category of viewing subject. I suggest, however, that with his/her responsibility to ‘interpret’ and ‘perform’ the work
for another audience, the critic occupies a discrete position as mediator between the artwork and Bishop’s viewing and model subjects.

This is a point I will return to and elaborate later in relation to the work of psychoanalyst Jean Laplanche, but for now I would just like to draw attention to the specificity of criticism’s modes of viewing and using art and the part situatedness plays in determining the performance of that interpretative role. For my part, I am interested in criticism’s spatial potential, in examining the kind of writing that emerges from acknowledging the specific and situated position of the critic. I shall now go on to explore how the special aspect of the critic’s position as interpreter and performer of the work for others has been addressed in spatial terms.

When art critic Hal Foster discusses the need to rethink critical distance, he points to the different distances produced by the optical and the tactile, but warns of the dangers of both dis-identification and over-identification with the object of study. Foster rejects those who lament the end of ‘true criticality’ as well as those who see critical distance as ‘instrumental mastery in disguise’. However, despite advocating the need to think through questions of critical distance, Foster still proposes that the critic’s role is to judge and make decisions without fully examining how these modes of operation are spatially conditioned.

Also drawing attention to critical distance, but in response to literary works, Isobel Armstrong has closely examined the differences between close and distant reading. Armstrong distinguishes between a criticism of affect and one of analysis, but rejects the tendency to use a binary model to divide feeling and thought. Instead, Armstrong calls for affect to be included within rational analysis:

The task of a new definition of close reading is to rethink the power of affect, feeling and emotion in a cognitive space. The power of affect
needs to be included within a definition of thought and knowledge rather than theorized as outside them, excluded from the rational.xxii

Using highly spatialised language, Armstrong argues that it is the feeling/thought binary which itself installs a form of critique where the subject is located in a position of power ‘over’ the text as other, producing a form of distant, rather than close reading. She states that this form of reading rests upon an account of the text as ‘outside, something external which has to be grasped – or warded off’.xxiii

Howard Caygill’s study of the writings of Walter Benjamin presents a view of criticism that mobilizes spatial terms such as ‘external’ to examine how discriminations and judgements may be both partial and performed. Following his own reading of philosopher Immanuel Kant, Caygill asserts that: ‘It is axiomatic for immanent critique that the criteria of critical judgement be discovered or invented in the course of criticism.xxiii For Caygill, ‘strategic critique shares with immanent critique the refusal to judge work according to given criteria’ but rather to ‘make discriminations while deferring judgement’.xxiv Caygill maintains that there is ‘no position outside the work from which the critic may judge it’ rather a critic ‘must find moments of externality within the work – those moments where the work exceeds itself, where it abuts on experience’ xxv These moments for making discriminate judgements are, although Caygill does not develop this aspect of his argument, intrinsically spatial:

Strategic critique moves between the work and its own externality, situating the work in the context of experience, and being in its turn situated by it.xxvi

In the introduction to his edited collection of essays After Criticism, Gavin Butt argues for something very similar. xxvii Following Jacques Derrida’s oft-quoted remark that ‘there is no outside to the text’, Butt claims that since there is no ‘anterior vantage point set apart from criticism’s object from
which the task of critique could be launched’ the postmodernist critic is ‘always already imbricated in the warp and weft of the cultural text’. Butt’s book ‘calls for the recognition of an “immanent” rather than a transcendent, mode of contemporary criticality’ which, for Butt, following the work of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, is ‘apprehended within – and instanced as – the performative act of critical engagement itself’.

Critics from feminist and performance studies have also expressed an interest in the performative qualities of criticism. Amelia Jones and Andrew Stephenson, for example, take issue with the tradition that the interpreter must be neutral or disinterested in the objects, which s/he judges, and posit instead, with reference to spatial mobility, that the process of viewing and interpreting involves ‘entanglement in intersubjective spaces of desire, projection and identification’:

> Interpretation is, we would argue, a kind of performance of the object ... Interpretation, like the production of works of art, is a mode of communication. Meaning is a process of engagement and never dwells in any one place.

Jones, following feminist critic Jane Gallop, proposes that criticism is an invested activity, a rebellious response against the object’s power, involving a desire to install superiority over a ‘needy’ object.

In a recent edited volume, *The State of Art Criticism*, where a wide range of critics interrogate such questions of judgment and distance, Michael Schreyach’s introductory essay argues that we have reached a position where self-reflective criticism is the norm and, making use of the spatial and visual term ‘frame’, he suggests that critics are able to recognize and acknowledge the frame in which they write. However, in Schreyach’s opinion, since ‘admitting ones own preferences and investments is self-exposure not self-criticism’, this frame is one of which critics are only ‘partially conscious’. His stance is that the task of criticism should be to set up an equivalence
with an artwork, which does more than simply ‘mirror its object’, and instead converts the first experience, the authentic or original experience of an encounter with an artwork, into one with a value for other perspectives. Schreyach holds that one of the key criteria for judging the success of such criticism is derived from how the critic communicates his/her encounter with the work to the reader and ‘handles the vertiginous shifts in perspective (authorial, historical, social) afforded by the indeterminacies of writing’.

These commentaries on the operations of criticism make use of spatial terms, such as distance, frame, externality and outside, to explore conceptual issues governing the relation between critic and artwork. As stressed by cultural critic Irit Rogoff, artist and film-maker Trinh T. Minh-ha has drawn attention to the significance assigned to the shift in use of prepositions, particularly from speaking ‘about’ to speaking ‘to’. Following Minh-ha Rogoff underscores how, by ‘claiming and retelling narratives (“speaking to”), we alter the very structures by which we organize and inhabit culture’. Adopting the preposition ‘with’ rather than ‘to’, Rogoff discusses how the practice of ‘writing with’ is a ‘dehierarchization’ of the social relations governing the making of meaning in visual culture.

Instead of ‘criticism’ being an act of judgment addressed to a clear-cut object of criticism, we now recognize not just our own imbrication in the object or cultural moment, but also the performative nature of an action or stance we might be taking in relation to it.

I have also explored the use of prepositions, especially ‘to’, in order to investigate how position informs relation so altering the terms of engagement between critic and artwork as two equivalent entities. Initially this followed feminist philosopher, Luce Irigaray’s insertion of the term ‘to’ into ‘I love you’ producing ‘I love to you’ in order to stress the reciprocity and mediation – the ‘in-direction between us’, and Michel Serres’s focus on the transformational aspect of prepositions:
That’s prepositions for you. They don’t change in themselves, but they change everything around them: words, things and people … Prepositions transform words and syntax, while pré-*posés* transform men.xli

More recently I have considered the possibilities of prepositions through Laplanche’s notion of an enigmatic signifier – a message which signifies to rather of – which I discuss in detail later in this *Prologue: Pre-Positions*, as well as in *Configuration 3: A Rearrangement* and *Configuration 5: Decentering/Recentering*.

A shift in preposition allows a different dynamic of power to be articulated, where, for example, the terms of domination and subjugation indicated by ‘over’ and ‘under’ can be replaced by the equivalence suggested by ‘to’ and ‘with’. In an early attempt to define the intentions of site-writing, my own impulse was to ‘write’ rather than ‘write about’ architecture, aiming to shift the relation between the critic and her object of study from one of mastery – the object *under* critique – or distance – writing *about* an object – to one of equivalence and analogy – writing *as* the object.xlii The use of analogy – the desire to invent a writing that is somehow ‘like’ the artwork – allows a certain creativity to intervene in the critical act as the critic comes to understand and interpret the work by remaking it on his/her own terms. In the next part of this *Prologue* I go on to investigate the value of insights derived from psychoanalysis concerning the relation of one to another for art criticism, before discussing how writing the object or the encounter with the object is rather like one of the main aims of the psychic function, according to psychoanalyst André Green: ‘not only to relate to object but to create them’.xliii

Relating to an Other

If criticism can be defined by the purpose of providing a commentary on a cultural work – art, literature, film and architecture – then criticism always has an ‘other’ in mind. The central task of criticism might then be considered
as: how does one relate to an ‘other’? As psychoanalyst Jessica Benjamin writes, this question of ‘how is it possible to recognize an other?’ has been a key concern of feminism, while in her view the central task of psychoanalysis is the ‘double task of recognition: how analyst and patient make known their own subjectivity and recognize the other’s’. Benjamin’s interest is in pushing beyond reversal, ‘by contemplating the difficulty of creating or discovering the space in which it is possible for either subject to recognize the difference of the other’. Grounded in the object relations theory of D. W. Winnicott, while well versed in feminist theory influenced by the work of Jacques Lacan, Benjamin argues that psychoanalysis requires both an intrapsychic focus to examine relations between the self and the internalized other as object, and an intersubjective approach to explore the relationship between subjects and externalized others.

Andreina Robutti, coming from a Milanese group of psychoanalysts also working with Winnicottian concepts, outlines how an interpsychic approach attaches greater importance to the patient’s inner world, with the analyst as merely the container of projections, while an interpersonal approach places greater importance on the ‘relationship unfolding in the here and now’. For Robutti, ‘the analytic encounter… is … a complex “two-way affair”’, where the intrapsychic worlds of both patient and analyst, with their defence mechanisms, compulsions to repeat and unconscious phantasies, occur in both directions.

Such theoretical perspectives suggest that objects exist both internally and externally and are mediate inner and outer worlds. In visual and spatial culture, feminists have drawn extensively on psychoanalytic theory to think through relationships between the spatial politics of internal psychical figures and external cultural geographies. The field of psychoanalysis explores these various thresholds and boundaries between private and public, inner and outer, subject and object, personal and social in terms of a complex understanding of the relationship between ‘internal’ and ‘external’ space. Cultural geographer Steve Pile has described it like this:
While inner life is distinct, there is continuous exchange between the internal and external, but this ‘dialectic’ is itself interacting with the transactions between ‘introjection’ and ‘projection’.

The psychic processes of introjection and projection, as well as identification, provide a rich source of conceptual tools for exploring the complex relationships made between subjects and others, and between people, objects and spaces. Benjamin argues that once we start to think in terms of relationships between subjects, or subjectivity, we have no choice but to consider these intraphysic mechanisms of relation, most importantly identifications: ‘Once subjectivity is embraced’, she says, ‘we have entered into a realm of knowledge based on identifications, hence knowing that is intrapsychically filtered.’

Feminist theorist Diane Fuss also states that identification is ‘a question of relation, of self to other, subject to object, inside to outside’; it is, she writes, ‘the psychical mechanism that produces self-recognition’. While Fuss outlines how identification involves the interrelationship of two processes each working in different directions: introjection, the internalization of certain aspects of the other through self-representation, and projection, the externalization of unwanted parts of the self onto the other, visual theorist Kaja Silverman has explored identification in terms of cannibalistic or idiopathic identification where one attempts to absorb and interiorize the other as the self, and heteropathic identification where ‘the subject identifies at a distance’ and in the process of identification goes outside his/herself.

A psychoanalyst who trained with Jacques Lacan, Laplanche is best known for his re-examination of the points at which he argues Freud went astray. This includes most famously Freud’s controversial abandonment of the seduction theory, and his turn to the child’s fantasy to explain seduction, thus at some level avoiding thinking-through the complex interplay of inner and outer worlds between the child and what Laplanche calls ‘the concrete other’.
Laplanche maintains that this early scene of seduction is of key importance to psychoanalysis as it works to de-centre the position of the subject in its articulation of the formation and role of the unconscious. For Laplanche, it is the embedding of the alterity of the mother in the child, which places an ‘other’ in the subject; this other is also an other to the mother – as it involves her unconscious. Thus the message imparted to the subject by the other, for Laplanche, the mother or concrete other, is an enigma both to the receiver, but also to the sender of the message: the ‘messages are enigmatic because … [they] are strange to themselves’.

The reason why Laplanche’s writing is of such interest to me is because he does not confine his discussion of the enigmatic message to psychoanalysis, but suggests instead that transference occurs not first in the psychoanalytic setting to be applied in culture, but the other way around: ‘maybe transference is already, “in itself”, outside the clinic’.

If one accepts that fundamental dimension of transference is the relation to the enigma of the other, perhaps the principle site of transference, 'ordinary' transference, before, beyond or after analysis, would be the multiple relation to the cultural, to creation or, more precisely to the cultural message. A relation which is multiple, and should be conceived with discrimination, but always starting from the relation to the enigma. There are at least three types of such a relation to be described: from the position of the producer, from that of the recipient, and from that of the recipient-analyst.

For Laplanche then, the critic or recipient-analyst is involved in a two-way dynamic with the enigmatic message: s/he is, ‘caught between two stools: the enigma which is addressed to him, but also the enigma of the one he addresses, his public’.

In more recent work, Laplanche has supplemented his concept of the enigmatic signifier with an account of seduction that emphasises the
importance of inspiration, or the role of the other as muse.\textsuperscript{lx} In this investigation Laplanche inverts the traditional model of creative self-expression outlined in Freud’s ‘Creative Writers and Daydreaming’ (1908), arguing that the ‘moment of address’ should be inverted from its narcissistic aspect, where it moves from the creator’s self expression to a receptive public who are expected to provide a beneficial response to the public, whose expectation provokes the creative work:

The Ptolemaic-narcissistic movement of creation is undeniable; but beyond it, and together with it, an inversion takes place: it is the public’s expectation, itself enigmatic, which is therefore the provocation of the creative work … There would thus be an opening, in a double sense: being opened by and being open to – being opened up by the encounter which renews the trauma of the originary enigmas; and being opened up to and by the indeterminate public scattered in the future. \textsuperscript{lxii}

In recognizing the importance of the enigmatic message sent ‘to’ its addressee, the location of transference and counter-transference outside the clinic in culture, as well as the specific position of the critic as recipient analyst, positioned between work and audience, provoked by both, the writing of Laplanche is key to conceptualizing questions of relation in criticism.\textsuperscript{lxiii} It is interesting to compare his approach to a more traditional usage of psychoanalytic theory in art and literary criticism, which has, following Freud, tended to ‘psychoanalyse’ an artist or a work,\textsuperscript{lxiv} aiming to use psychoanalytic theory to ‘explain’ the intention of an artist and to unravel the ‘unconscious’ aspects of a work. If we follow Laplanche, the critic occupies not only the position of recipient analyst but also the analysand, paralleling an earlier suggestion put forward by André Green, and picked up by Laplanche, that: ‘In applied psychoanalysis … the analyst is the analysand of the text.’\textsuperscript{lxv}
Green closely compares the processes of interpretation carried out by the literary critic and the psychoanalyst.\textsuperscript{lxv} He suggests that in ‘reacting to the text as if it were a product of the unconscious. The analyst becomes the analyzed of the text.’\textsuperscript{lxvi} When ‘confronted’ with a text, the analyst ‘performs a transformation’ which involves rigorous but also ‘loose free-floating reading’.\textsuperscript{lxvii} Green notes how the ‘analyst is captivated, when the work ... has touched, moved, or even disturbed him’, and that the work of criticism which occurs next, does so in response to the analyst’s initial reaction. Criticism, for Green, is a ‘request that can only come from within’, and is the result of a ‘need to analyse’ – ‘The analysis of the text is an analysis after the fact.’\textsuperscript{lxviii}

Green maintains that since ‘psychoanalytical interpretation involves a process of deformation of the subject’s conscious intentions’ it is not the author who is the analysand but the analyst himself.\textsuperscript{lxix} In his view ‘the analyst-interpreter becomes that critic who is the privileged interlocutor, the mediator between reader and author, between the text as writing and its realization as reading.’\textsuperscript{lxx} Both Green and Laplanche position the critic as mediator, between author and reader in Green’s account and between work and audience in Laplanche’s case. However, if for Green the critic is a reader whose analysis of the text comes from within, in Laplanche’s later formulation, the critic is always responding to another reader, an otherness that comes from without, following the poet Stefan Mallarmé, from ‘the indeterminate public scattered in the future’, but also from the original enigma of the past:

… analysis, sometimes, maintains a type of opening-up: and it is precisely this that is its mark of original, its being marked by the origin. This opening-up can be maintained, transferred into other fields of otherness and of inspiration. This is what must indeed be called the transference of the transference ... the transference of the relation to the enigma as such.\textsuperscript{lxxi}

Green’s account of the process which occurs when a psychoanalyst analyzes a literary text rather than a person, raises important questions concerning
the distinction between the two relationships – analyst and analysand, on the one hand, critic and work, on the other. My intention in *Site-Writing* is not an attempt to psychoanalyze artworks, but rather to develop an understanding of art criticism’s spatiality through psychoanalytic concepts. The psychoanalytic space of the setting, that place which frames the encounter between analyst and analysand and the processes of transference and counter-transference that occur between them, provides a useful reference point.

In psychoanalytic theory, the terms ‘frame’ or ‘setting’ are used to describe the main conditions of treatment, which following Sigmund Freud, include ‘arrangements’ about time and money, as well as ‘certain ceremonials’ governing the physical positions of analysand (lying on a couch and speaking) and analyst (sitting behind the analyst on a chair and listening). Freud’s ‘rules’ for the spatial positions of the analytic setting, were derived from a personal motive – he did not wish to be stared at for long periods of time, but also from a professional concern – to avoid giving the patient ‘material for interpretation’.

I insist on this procedure, however, for its purpose and result are to prevent the transference from mingling with the patient's associations imperceptibly, to isolate the transference and to allow it to come forward in due course sharply defined as a resistance.

In a discussion of Freud’s method, Winnicott distinguished the technique from the ‘setting in which this work is carried out’. In his view, it is the setting which allows the reproduction of the ‘early and earliest mothering techniques’ in psychoanalysis. While Italian psychoanalyst Luciana Nissin Momigliano describes how Winnicott ‘defined the “setting” as the sum of all the details of management that are more or less accepted by all psychoanalysts’, Argentinian psychoanalyst José Bleger redefined Winnicott’s term setting to include the totality of the ‘psychoanalytic situation’ – the process – what is studied, analyzed and interpreted – and the non-process or frame – an
institution, which he argues provides a set of constants or limits to the ‘behaviours’ that occur within it. Other analysts have used slightly different spatial terms to describe the setting, for Laplanche, a double-walled tub, and for Green, a casing or casket which holds the ‘jewel’ of the psychoanalytic process. Green, as I describe in more detail in *Configuration 1: Triangular Structures with Variable Thirds*, considers the setting a third space homologous to the analytic object created between analyst and analysand. In *Site-Writing* there are two analytic objects, the artwork that lies between the critic and the artist, and the critical essay or text, which is located between critic and reader.

The concept of the psychoanalytic setting is indispensable for exploring the spatial relationship between critic and artwork, certainly, following Bleger, in investigating how the non-process or frame in which the critic encounters the work influences the process of criticism. The frame may include the site in which the critic encounters the work – completed, with the curator in the gallery; in process, with the artist in the studio; and documented and accompanied by another critic’s essay in a publication. It may also involve the brief which plays a determining role in defining the commission or invitation to write – including its place of publication, the role of the editor, curator, gallery, and artist, in influencing (implicitly and explicitly) its content, and, of course, the fee. Additionally in an authored book, where the critic chooses the artworks to be discussed, his/her own conceptual agenda operates even more strongly as a framing device.

Psychoanalyst Christopher Bollas has noted that Freud’s clearest account of his method outlined in ‘Two Encyclopaedia Articles: A. Psycho-Analysis’ suggests that psychoanalysis takes place if two functions are linked – the analysand's free associations and the psychoanalyst's evenly suspended attentiveness. In ‘On Beginning the Treatment’ Freud explains how, in including rather than excluding ‘intrusive ideas’ and ‘side-issues’, the process of association differs from ordinary conversation. Bollas defines free association as that which occurs when we think by not concentrating on
anything in particular, and where the ideas that emerge which seem to be the
conscious mind to be disconnected, but are instead related by a hidden and
unconscious logic.lxxxv In order to achieve evenly suspended attentiveness
Bollas explains that the analyst also has to surrender to his own unconscious
mental activity; s/he should not reflect on material, consciously construct
ideas or actively remember.lxxxvi Bollas connects the relation between free
association and evenly suspended attentiveness to the interaction between
transference and counter-transference,lxxxvii as does Green, who describes the
role of transference as creating an ‘analytic association’.lxxxviii

According to literary critic Elizabeth Wright, ‘free association’ brings to
aesthetics, not the emergence of the truth of the unconscious as she holds
that the surrealists believed, but rather the overruling of the censorship
between conscious and pre-conscious. In her view, it is in the process of
analysis that the revelation of unconscious defences, allows, not the ‘direct
expression of the impulse of the drive’, but ‘the idea or image which has
attached itself to it’. It is only by ‘working through’ this material, that the
unconscious fantasy can be pieced together.lxxxi

Present in Freud’s later writings, where he distinguishes between
construction and interpretation as different forms of analytic technique, is the
indication of the creative aspect of the analyst’s work:

‘Interpretation’ applies to something that one does to some single
element of the material, such as an association or a parapraxis. But it
is a ‘construction’ when one lays before the subject of the analysis a
piece of his early history that he has forgotten ... xc

Green also proposes that analyst uses a form of ‘conjectural interpretation’;xcì
And psychoanalyst Ignes Sodré, in a conversation with writer A.S. Byatt,
asserts that in ‘offering the patient different versions of himself’ the analyst
operates as a story-teller, suggesting an inventive aspect of interpretation.xcìi
Laplanche, however, has been strongly critical of the ‘putting-into-narrative’
or story-telling approach to analysis. This understanding of narrative with its own ‘driving power’, for him, ‘privileg[es] the construction of a coherent, satisfying and integrated story’, and as such works against the aim of analysis which is to recollect the past.xciii French psychoanalyst Didier Anzieu, who has described ‘interpretation’ as the analyst’s most crucial tool, has been somewhat more radical in his proposition that ‘twofold interpretative work’ occurs between analyst and the analysand.xciv In this volume, I propose that the critic in occupying the positions of both analyst and analysand, combines associative and attentive modes of writing, including forms of interpretation which construct, conj ect and invent.

T. J. Clark’s adventurous book The Sight of Death: An Experiment in Art Writing does just this. Arriving at the Getty Institute for a period of study leave to examine Picasso’s work between the wars, Clark decides instead to write about two paintings by Nicolas Poussin, which happen to be exhibited in the gallery. Returning to view the same paintings every day, at least in the first six months of the research,xcv Clark intends his book ‘to be about what occurs in front of paintings more or less involuntarily, not what I think ought to occur’.xcvi He keeps returning to a detail in the painting, where finally through an act of free association, he is reminded of a gesture of his mother’s, and later in turn, by a haunting image of her face in death:

I go back and back to the space between the two figures, therefore, because one voice (or eye) within my unconscious goes on telling me that the distance in question is infinite, and the woman’s expression and gesture are precisely what make it so; and always an answering voice (or eye) refuses to accept this, and tells me to look at the interval again.xcvii

Literary critic Mary Jacobus has described ‘the scene of reading’ in terms of a relation, perhaps a correspondence, which exists between the inner world of the reader and the world contained in the book.xcviii Taking up this insightful observation I suggest that criticism involves such a double movement back
and forth between inside and outside: works can take critics outside themselves offering new geographies, new possibilities, but they can also return critics to their own interiors, their own biographies. Although the critic is expected to remain ‘objective’ or exterior to the work, at the same time s/he is invited inside – to enter the world of the artist. As well as its physical position outside the critic, the work also occupies the site of the critic’s psychic life igniting interior emotions and memories. This pair of two-way movements between critic and work suspends what we might call judgement or discrimination in criticism, and instead, through what I call the practice of ‘site-writing’, traces and constructs a series of interlocking sites, one relating critic, work and artist, and the other, critic, text and reader.

Art Writing
Although art criticism operates through the medium of writing, little attention has been paid to the textual construction of the critical essay. Since the publication of *Artwriting* in 1987 the work of David Carrier has been an exception. In *Writing about Visual Art*, he argues:

> In the literature of art, it is impossible to absolutely separate or entirely distinguish, the arguments of an art writer from the literary structures used to present the arguments.

Carrier asks how a written artefact describes art, and whether it is possible create a written artefact that is able to both perform an equivalence ‘with’ art, as well as articulate an interpretative position. Yet while providing a clear account of how writing operates in particular pieces of art criticism, the implications of his interesting observations, that art writing is an object, and, following J. L. Austin, that ‘art writing performs actions’, are not investigated through his own writing style, nor by developing his mode of analysis to deal with the question of ‘viewpoint’ from a literary and therefore more textual perspective.
The question of viewpoint has been explored in depth by Bal, who, as Norman Bryson has pointed out, considers visual art through narrative and structures her own texts through processes of 'focalization'. Starting out as a literary critic, this disciplinary trace is evident in her more recent writing on art. Following her desire for critical writing to bring one closer to art, Bal places the artwork at the centre of her texts, arguing that:

Writing about art is not a substitute for the art. Rather than standing for the visual objects, texts about them ought, in the first place, to lead the reader (back) to those objects.

But in leading the reader back to the object, Bal tends to underplay the role of her own texts in constructing meaning. In order to examine this issue a little further, I shall draw briefly on some key points concerning positionality and textuality coming out of literary criticism. For example, in the work of Italo Calvino who has explicitly explored the relationship the writer has to his/her writing in terms of position – where a writer stands – inside and/or outside a text:

Maybe the critical analysis I am looking for is one that does not aim directly at the 'out-of-doors' but, by exploring the 'indoors' of the text and going deeper and deeper in its centripital movement, succeeds in opening up some unexpected glimpses of that 'out-of-doors' – a result that depends less on the method itself than on the way one uses the method.

Calvino has also discussed the places writers occupy in relation to their writing in terms of their different identities as subjects or ‘I’s:

And in these operations the person ‘I’, whether explicit or implicit, splits into a number of different figures: into an ‘I’ who is writing and an ‘I’ who is written, into an empirical ‘I’
who looks over the shoulder of the 'I' who is writing and into a mythical 'I' who serves as a model for the 'I' who is written. The 'I' of the author is dissolved in the writing. The so-called personality of the writer exists within the very act of writing: it is the product and the instrument of the writing process.\textsuperscript{cvi}

And Roland Barthes has described his choice of authorial voice in terms of four regimes: including an 'I', the pronoun of the self, a 'he', the pronoun of distance and two forms of 'you', as a pronoun which can be used in a self-accusatory fashion and to separate the position of the writer from the subject.\textsuperscript{cvii} The structuralist linguist Emile Benveniste, much admired by Barthes, had also emphasised that 'I' is a pre-existing position in language that is always taken up in relation to a 'you'. He argues that the terms 'I' and 'you' are terms which cannot be conceived separately, they are complementary and reversible:

Language is possible only because each speaker sets himself up as a subject by referring to himself as I in his discourse. Because of this, I posits another person, the one who, being, as he is, completely exterior to 'me', becomes my echo to whom I say you, and who says you to me.\textsuperscript{cviii}

Feminist and post-colonial critics have drawn on the possibilities offered by multiple subject positions and voices as well as languages, genres and modes of writing to produce texts that have spatial qualities, developing notions of 'subject to subject encounter' through linguistic constructions.\textsuperscript{cix} Some have woven the autobiographical into the critical in their texts, exploring the politics of location through positions adopted in language, and combining poetic practice with theoretical analysis to articulate hybrid voices, such as the groundbreaking work of Gloria Anzaldúa.\textsuperscript{cx}
The autobiographical aspect of feminist writing has been particularly resonant in literary criticism since the late 1970s, developed through the radical work of writers such as Nancy K. Millar and Gayle Rubin Suleiman. Reflecting on the wider implications of feminism’s autobiographical passage for contemporary scholarship, Tess Cossett, Celia Lury and Penny Summerfield, the editors of a collection of essays entitled Feminism and Autobiography, state that:

What is happening now is less a search for the correct epistemology than a methodological concern to reveal the complex autobiographical underpinnings of feminist research. If as feminists have argued, all research is situated, and pure objectivity is a pretence, it is ethically and politically right that feminist researchers should lead the way in coming clean on the way research is produced and lived by those producing it.

Cossett, Lury and Summerfield note that this might involve detailing what is usually hidden, for example, personal investments in a subject area, intellectual affiliations and their influence on the choice of research frameworks adopted, as well as an examination of the relationship between the research and the private life of the researcher.

In art criticism, there are a few brave writers, namely Lynne Tillmann and Jeanne Randolph who, in bringing autobiography into art criticism, have reworked the genre by blending fact and fiction. Through a form of writing she calls ‘ficto-criticism’, Randolph’s work blurs ‘the distinction between the objective and the subjective realms’ something ‘widely accepted in genres such as science fiction or mystery writing’ but which ‘remains taboo in the realm of critical writing and theory’.

The autobiographical approach to Peggy Phelan’s commentaries on performance art have developed a mode of writing criticism that declares its own performativity and the presence of the body of the critic in the writing as
‘marked’.\textsuperscript{cxvi} In drawing attention to the conditions of its own making at the level of the signifier, not only the signified, much autobiographical writing is performative. In Della Pollock’s highly informative discussion of the key qualities of performance writing, she includes being subjective, as well as evocative, metonymic, nervous, citational and consequential as exceptional aspects of this type of writing.\textsuperscript{cxvii} And in Butt’s edited volume, referred to earlier, the attempt by critics and practitioners to ‘renew criticism’s energies’ occurs specifically through a ‘theatrical turn’.\textsuperscript{cxviii}

Across the arena of experimental writing, new possibilities are being invented, sometimes autobiographical, often performative, usually both, which question the distanced objectivity of academic writing styles.\textsuperscript{cxix} Those operating at the intersection of art and writing include artists producing text-based works,\textsuperscript{cxx} writers exploring the poetics of criticism,\textsuperscript{cxi} as well as performance writers,\textsuperscript{cxxii} poet-artist practitioners,\textsuperscript{cxxiii} and philosophers who question subjectivity through alternative visual writing forms.\textsuperscript{cxxiv} I draw inspiration from this intensely creative and theoretically rigorous strand of speculative criticism, yet within it I am also trying to do something quite particular – to enhance criticism’s spatial qualities and in so explore the ‘position’ of the critic through the textual qualities of writing.

As I have outlined above, art critics are also beginning to consider the possibilities that the medium of their work affords, but as yet although many have written about the spatial potential of writing, fewer have actively exploited its textual and material possibilities, the patterning of words on a page, the design of a page itself – its edges, boundaries, thresholds, surfaces, the relation of one page to another, or wondered what it would mean for criticism to take on new forms – those of art, film or even architecture.\textsuperscript{cxxv} Each medium has an architectonics – a series of procedures for the material organisation and structuring of space. Literary critic Mary Ann Caws’s concept of ‘architexture’ is helpful here in allowing us to take texts, structures which are not buildings, as architecture, a move which is rather more closely guarded against in architecture itself, where the
professional view still tends to dominate. A term that refers to the act of reading rather than writing, for Caws, architexture ‘situates the text in the world of other texts’ drawing attention to the surface and texture of the text as a form of construction. In the discipline of architecture itself, several writers have engaged with the potential of writing architecture. In her wonderful *Atlas of Emotion*, Guiliana Bruno sets forth an aim that the form of the book she is writing will follow the design of the building in which she works, while Katja Grillner has been exploring the possibilities for a writing that is architectural, by, for example, situating herself as a subject in a landscape, among those she writes about. Karen Berman’s reflection on Anne Frank’s diary describes the spaces provided by writing while hiding as a ‘mobile homeland’, articulated by a hybrid text fashioned through spatial details and conditions. But perhaps the written projects of architect and critic, Jennifer Bloomer have been the most influential in their attempt to build architecture. Spatially structured, Bloomer’s texts operate metaphorically to explore imaginative narratives and employ metonymic devices to bring the non-appropriate into architecture. For Bloomer, different modes of writing construct architecture through the intimate and personal, through sensual rather purely visual stimulation.

**Site-Writing**

I am interested in constructing an architecture of art criticism – in how writing operates to reflect one set of relations while producing another. *Site-Writing* creates architectural texts out of this critic’s use of a number of artworks, extending the spatial aspects of Bal’s exploration of ‘art-writing’ as a form of architecture, and adopting and adapting Caygill’s notion of strategic critique where the criteria for making judgements are discovered or invented through the course of criticism. Combining differing genres and modes of writing in art criticism, whose critical ‘voices’ are objective and subjective, distant and intimate, this approach develops alternative understandings of subjectivity and positionality. From the close-up to the
glance, from the caress to the accidental brush, *Site-Writing* draws on spaces as they are remembered, dreamed and imagined, as well as observed, in order to take into account the critic’s position in relation to a work and challenge criticism as a form of knowledge with a singular and static point of view located in the here and now.

This enactment of art criticism as a critical spatial practice occurs through the five configurations of *Site-Writing* in different ways. In each one, the relation between interior and exterior is investigated and arranged through the spatial qualities and architectural dimensions of particular psychic conditions, drawn from the work of Sigmund Freud, and revisions of his material by André Green and Jean Laplanche, namely the transitional space of the setting, the back and forth movement across the frontier between conscious, preconscious and unconscious, the rearrangement of words and things, the folded memory of *déjà vu* as that secret which is covered but keeps coming back, and the recentering and decentering devices of the Ptolemic and Copernican revolutions. The intention is not to ‘apply’ spatial concepts to psychoanalyze certain artworks, but to adopt certain psychoanalytic ways of working – free association, conjectural interpretation and construction for example – to write the sites of this critic’s engagement with specific artworks.

*Configuration 1: Triangular Structures with Variable Thirds* looks at Green’s description of the triadic structure of the setting, to order to examine the shifting psychic vantage point adopted by the subject in relation to both others and objects, as well as Benjamin’s understandings of the potential third in the dyad. The configuration’s three parts are structured through three voices, each of which articulate different positions in relation to questions of architecture and subjectivity. In the first part, three voices perform the doing, undoing and overdoing of an architectural space. In the second I explore how, in Tracey Emin’s exhibition *You Forgot to Kiss My Soul* (2001), the viewer or user of the work is positioned in a triadic relation to the artist and her mother, her father and an alterative version of herself, and actively
involved in the construction of psychic architecture. Based on a text-based
installation, the third part explores through voices drawn from autobiography,
psychoanalytic theory and building specifications, to show how a
'confessional construction' conceals rather than reveals the 'I' of the author.

Referencing Anzieu’s work on the skin-ego, while also drawing on the
differing spatial relations between conscious, preconscious and unconscious,
and ego, id and superego, in Freud’s first and second topographies,
Configuration 2: Back and Forth, explores movement across the boundary.
Materially present in artworks by Nathan Coley and Jananne Al-Ani, screens
and veils are considered to separate and join critic and artwork. Sited at
particular positions in relation to the artworks, the texts play with a changing
fluctuation of 'I', 'you' and 's/he' back and forth across the threshold.
Referencing the repetitive play of fort/da, one piece of site-writing returns in
another, to be re-worked finally in a two-part text installation: An

In Configuration 3: A Rearrangement, the Freudian concepts of screen-
memory, word- and thing-presentations inform an exploration of the role of
nostalgia, longing and yearning in the writing of art criticism, looking at how
remembered and imagined scenes presented through objects, images and
words operate in the work of artists but also feature in critics' essays as sites
for both reminiscence and day-dreaming. The configuration begins by
describing a series of screen memories, arrangements of words prompted by
a set of things. One scene is then rearranged along with two others in
response to Elina Brotherus’s artwork Spring (2001), and then again to form
a final rearrangement of words and things in a three-part installation, Les

Configuration 4: That Which Keeps Coming Back draws on Freud’s
understanding of déjà vu as a category of the uncanny, as well as
Christopher Bollas’s notion of the aesthetic moment as a déjà vu
experience, in order to explore spatial aspects of déjà vu through the fold of
the cover-up and the secret – that which keeps returning. Stimulated by Cristina Iglesias’s discussion of her 2003 show at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, London as 'some things you see will remind you of others', the configuration connects Passages (2002), her final piece in the exhibition, to Sharon Kivland’s works on the passage of women through arcades and the uncanny aspects of urban exploration. The final part of the configuration takes the title of a work by Kivland, ‘She is walking about in a town which she does not know’, drawn in turn from Freud’s discussion of Dora’s second dream, as the guiding principle for a site-writing, which, written for the group show Elles Sont Passées Par Ici (2005), blends the imagined and anticipated with a memory that keeps coming back.

Finally Configuration 5: Decentering/Recentering forms a series of movements of recentering and decentering in relation to Laplanche’s concept of the Copernican revolution. In the first part ‘Somewhere Else She is Told’ accounts of three cross-cultural encounters are discussed in relation to notions of (dis)locatedness and hybridity put forward by cultural critics such as Susan Stanford Friedman and Homi Bhabha. Through the work of Do-Ho Suh a subsequent essay explores the role of biography in recentering and decentering viewer and critic in relation to an artwork. In the next part, ‘Everywhere Else’, a site-writing composed in response to the group show Ausland (2002) domoBaal contemporary art, London, questions the ‘centre’ of art criticism by locating the viewer somewhere else – in spaces outside the gallery as well as those overlooked within its frame. The configuration ends with a series of détournements, sites of battle during the colonization of India and in the current war in Iraq create a topographical mapping which displaces the position of the public sculptures, including Mark Quinn’s Alison Lapper (2005) situated at the centre of London’s Trafalgar Square.

In the Epilogue: Alien Positions, I return to a question introduced at the start Site-Writing, to reflect on what it means to ‘use’ an object – a theory, an artwork, even perhaps an artist. Following my reading of Juliet Mitchell’s discussion of Winnicott’s concept of ‘using’ rather than ‘relating’ to an object,
and her desire to ‘use’ theory, I came to realise that throughout the process of writing this book, I had been presenting a form of criticism, which ‘used’ artworks, while continuing to relate to theoretical concepts. At this last moment, in response to the work of artists Bik Van Der Pol, the theory is finally recognised and so used and therefore destroyed, thus transforming the relationship between the critical subject and her objects – artworks, essays and theories.

*Site-Writing* configures what happens when discussions concerning situatedness and site-specificity extend to involve art criticism, and the spatial qualities of writing become as important in conveying meaning as the content of the criticism. My suggestion is that, in operating as mode of a practice in its own right, this kind of criticism questions the terms of reference that relate the critic to the work positioned ‘under’ critique, and instead proposes alternative positions for the critic to adopt – in relation ‘to’ the work and through the use ‘of’ the work. This process of configuration writes the sites between critic, work and artist, as well as critic, text and reader, and in so doing constructs an architecture of art criticism.
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