

Artistic Research and Literature

Corina Caduff, Tan Wälchli (Eds.)

Artistic Research and Literature

Wilhelm Fink

Die Druckvorstufe dieser Publikation wurde vom Schweizerischen Nationalfonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung unterstützt.



This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the prevailing CC-BY-NC-ND License at the time of publication, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided no alterations are made and the original author(s) and source are credited.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30965/9783846763339>

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

© 2019 Wilhelm Fink Verlag, ein Imprint der Brill Gruppe
(Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, Niederlande; Brill USA Inc., Boston MA, USA; Brill Asia Pte Ltd, Singapore; Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn, Deutschland)

www.fink.de

Cover image: Konrad Bayer, *flucht (lesensäule)* (1964). © bpk / Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Archiv

Cover design: Evelyn Ziegler, München

Proof reader: Margret Westerwinter, Düsseldorf

Production: Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn

ISBN 978-3-7705-6333-3 (hardback)

ISBN 978-3-8467-6333-9 (e-book)

Content

Contributors IX

Introducing Literature in the Discourse of Artistic Research 1
Corina Caduff and Tan Wälchli

Literary Self-Reflection

Writing Cannot Tell Everything 13
Jan Baetens

The Writing and the Doing—about Artistic Research through a
Writing Practice 23
Fredrik Nyberg

A Letter to Foucault 35
Maya Rasker

Writing in Art and Artistic Research

Minor Literature in and of Artistic Research 49
Christa-Maria Lerm Hayes

Writing Scripto-Visual Costumes and Columns of Air 63
Redell Olsen

No Assignment for Cowards: What Is to Be Gained through
Interdisciplinary Research? 81
Maria Fusco

Something More and Something Else: Language as Excess and
Material [3] 85
Daniela Cascella

Writing Sonic Fictions: Literature as a Portal into the Possibility
of Art Research 99
Salomé Voegelin

The Knowledge of Literature

Practice-Based Literary Research as Activated Inquiry 113

Vincent Broqua

NOW is Always. NOW is Never. On the Immediacy and Mediation
of 'Message' in Poetry 125

Ferdinand Schmatz

Poetics of Understanding: Language Arts and Artistic
Research 135

Alexander Damianisch

Aspect Change and Poetic Charge as Tools for Artistic Research
in Literature 145

Tine Melzer

Models and Precursors

Who's Peaked? Chris Kraus's Writing Performances as a Case Study
for Twenty-First Century Writing Culture 161

Anneleen Masschelein

Translation Laboratory: Oskar Pastior's Applied Translation
Research 173

Thomas Strässle

Phantasmagorical Research: How Theory Becomes Art in the Work
of Roland Barthes 185

Kathrin Busch

The Vienna Group's 'Research for' the Language Arts: Konrad Bayer,
"karl ein karl" (1962) 195

Tan Wälchli

List of Illustrations

- Fig. 4.1 Imprint of a child's foot in a an ancient tile, near a ziggurat, Iran.
Photo: Maya Rasker. 40
- Fig. 4.2 Diego Velazquez, *Las Meninas o La familia de Felipe IV* (1656), oil on canvas.
©Photographic Archive Museo Nacional del Prado. 42
- Fig. 5.1 Dora García, *The Joycean Society* (2013). Still from Video.
Image courtesy: Dora García and Ellen de Bruijne Projects. 58
- Fig. 5.2 Brian O'Doherty, ed., *Aspen 5+6* (1967). Arrangement: Mary Ruth Walsh,
Photo: Fionn McCann. 59
- Fig. 13.1 Lambertus Lambregts, *Het extragegeven*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij De
Harmonie, 1974, cover. 154
- Fig. 17.1 Konrad Bayer reading his poem "franz war" during the Vienna Group's first
literary cabaret, Dec. 6, 1958. A monograph on the Habsburg monarchy lies
on the table. Photo: Franz Hubmann. ©Imagno / picturedesk.com. 203

Contributors

Jan Baetens

is professor of Cultural and Literary Studies at the University of Leuven. His research focuses on word and image studies as well as on contemporary French poetry and literature. Some recent publications are: *Pour en finir avec la poésie dite minimaliste* (2014), *A Voix haute. Poésie et lecture publique* (2016), and *The Graphic Novel* (2015), co-authored with Hugo Frey. He is also a published poet, author of some fifteen collections, among which *Ce Monde* (2015) and *La Lecture* (Fantin-Latour, 1870, 1877), co-authored with Milan Chlumsky. His first novel, *Faire sécession*, has appeared in 2017.

Vincent Broqua

is professor of North American Literature and Arts at the University of Paris 8 Vincennes Saint-Denis where he teaches in the English department as well as in the Creative Writing MA. He is co-head of the research programmes “Poets and critics” and “Translating performance/performing translation.” He published *A partir de rien: esthétique, poétique et politique de l'infime* in 2013. He is the co-editor in chief of *Revue Française d'Etudes Américaines* and *Quaderna*. Relevant for this publication is his co-edition of an issue of *Formes poétiques contemporaines* on “Contemporary critical forms.” His creative books include *Récupérer* (Petits Matins, 2015), *même=same* (Contrat Maint, 2013), and *Given* (Contrat Maint, 2009). He translated the works of artists and experimental poets such as David Antin, Jim Dine, Claude Rutault, and Anne Waldman.

Kathrin Busch

is professor at the Berlin University of the Arts. She studied philosophy, art history, and literature in Hamburg and was awarded a PhD at the Ruhr University of Bochum for her thesis on Jacques Derrida. She was subsequently junior professor at the University of Lüneburg and taught as professor for Art Theory at the Merz Academy in Stuttgart. Her research focuses on contemporary French philosophy and aesthetics, mainly on questions of artistic research and theories of passivity. Selected publications: *Andrea Winkler* (Köln, 2017, ed.), *Anderes Wissen* (München, 2016, ed.), *P – Passivität* (Hamburg, 2012), *Geschicktes Geben. Aporien der Gabe bei Jacques Derrida* (München, 2004). <https://www.udk-berlin.de/personen/detailansicht/person/kathrin-busch>

Corina Caduff

studied German Literature in Zurich and received her PhD on Elfriede Jelinek in 1991. She then worked as a journalist for radio and as a scholar at the University

of Zurich with guest lectureships in Amsterdam, Berlin, and Chicago. The habilitation on “Literarisierung von Musik und bildender Kunst” took place in Berlin in 2001. 2004–2017 she was Professor at Zurich University of the Arts. Since 2018 she has been vice-rector research at Bern University of Applied Sciences as well as a cultural scientist at Bern University of the Arts. Research interests include the relationship of arts, music, and literature; artistic research; death and dying. She is co-editor of the volume *Art and Artistic Research* (Zurich 2010) and author of several articles about artistic research. Moreover, in recent years, she published three volumes of essays (*Land in Aufruhr*, 2007; *Kränken und Anerkennen*, 2010; *Szenen des Todes*, 2013). <https://corinacaduff.ch>

Daniela Cascella

is an Italian writer. She is the author of *Singed. Muted Voice-Transmissions, After the Fire* (Equus Press, 2017), *F.M.R.L. Footnotes, Mirages, Refrains and Leftovers of Writing Sound* (Zero Books, 2015), and *En Abîme: Listening, Reading, Writing. An Archival Fiction* (Zero Books, 2012). She edits *Untranslated at Minor Literature(s)* and has published in international magazines such as *The Los Angeles Review of Books, Music and Literature, Gorse, 3:AM Magazine*. An independent researcher, she has taught in institutions such as the Bergen Academy of Fine Art and Design, Goldsmiths University of London, Oxford Brookes University, and she is an associate lecturer in the MA Sound Arts at LCC/University of the Arts London. www.danielacascella.com

Alexander Damianisch

is director of the “Zentrum Fokus Forschung,” a research centre at the University of Applied Arts Vienna, as well as the head of the department “Support Art and Research.” He was inaugural manager for the Programme for Artistic Research at the Austrian Science Fund. He studied literature and history at the Universities of Vienna and Paris (Sorbonne), concluding his studies with a doctoral degree. Additionally, he holds a Master of Advanced Studies in Arts Management (University of Music and Performing Arts Vienna). He is a re-elected member of the executive board of the Society for Artistic Research. He is a delegate to the Austrian Science Fund and vice president of ARTist, a society supporting postgraduates.

Maria Fusco

is Professor of Interdisciplinary Writing at Northumbria University, previously Director of Art Writing at Goldsmiths, University of London. Her latest work *ECZEMA!* (National Theatre Wales, 2018) is a lifelong argument between a man

and a pipe organ. *Legend of the Necessary Dreamer* (London: Vanguard Editions, 2017) was described by Chris Kraus as “a new classic of female philosophical fiction” and of *Give Up Art: Collected Critical Writings* (Los Angeles, CA, Vancouver: New Documents, 2017) James Elkins has written “After a book like this, most nonfiction seems curiously unaware of what writing can be.” *Master Rock* is an experimental radio play performed and recorded inside a mountain, commissioned by Artangel and BBC Radio 4, and has been experienced by more than 2.5 million listeners. Maria’s other solo-authored books are *With A Bao A Qu Reading When Attitudes Become Form* (Los Angeles, CA, Vancouver: New Documents, 2013), *Gonda*, 2012 and *The Mechanical Copula*, 2011 (both published Berlin, New York, NY: Sternberg Press) and she is editorial director of *The Happy Hypocrite*, a cross-genre journal for and about experimental writing. She was the inaugural writer-in-residence at Kadist Art Foundation (Paris), Lisbon Architecture Triennale, and Whitechapel Gallery (London).

Christa-Maria Lerm Hayes

is professor and chair of Modern and Contemporary Art History at the University of Amsterdam. She studied at the Universities of Heidelberg, London, and Cologne, where she gained her PhD in 2000. It was researched with a James Joyce Foundation Scholarship in Zurich and followed by a post-doctoral fellowship at University College Dublin. She has curated exhibitions internationally. Her research focuses on word and image studies, particularly the visual legacies of (Irish) writers (Joyce, Beckett, Sebald), also considering performance, the historiography of art (Warburg, Giedion-Welcker) curation (literary art exhibitions) and artistic research. Rooted in Joseph Beuys studies, she has an interest in sculpture, performance, social practices, as well as post-war art histories.

Anneleen Masschelein

is associate professor in Literary and Cultural Studies at the University of Leuven. She teaches cultural semiotics, literary theory, and cultural studies. Her book *The Unconcept. The Freudian Uncanny in Late-Twentieth-Century Theory* appeared in 2011 with State University of New York Press and presents the first genealogy of the Freudian ‘Unheimliche’ in French, English, and German theory. Since then, she has published on a wide range of topics such as the literary interview, writing manuals for detective fiction, auto-biography, Sophie Calle, and Patti Smith for journals like *Poetics Today* and *Life Writing*. She is currently preparing a book on literary advice culture and a special issue on the literary interview for *Biography*.

Tine Melzer

is an artist and researcher with a focus on language. She studied fine arts and philosophy in Amsterdam and was a resident at the Rijksakademie van beeldende kunsten. She received her PhD from the University of Plymouth, UK, in 2014 after researching Ludwig Wittgenstein meeting Gertrude Stein. Tine Melzer taught at the Gerrit Rietveld Academie, Amsterdam and various academies and universities throughout Europe since 2004. She teaches at the transdisciplinary Y Institute of the HKB (Bern University of the Arts), at the MA Contemporary Arts Practice and the Fine Arts department, and commenced a research project at the HKB in 2017. Her work has been exhibited and published internationally. Rollo Press published *Taxidermy for Language—Animals—A Book on Stuffed Words* by Tine Melzer, which was selected as one of “The Most Beautiful Swiss Books” 2016.

Fredrik Nyberg

is a writer and text-sound-artist who since his debut in 1998 has published seven collections of poetry and under the name MonoMono three records with sound poetry. The latest poetry collection, *Slingorna & undergången (The Loops & the Extinction)*, came out in 2015. In 2013 he defended his thesis on the topic ‘literary composition’, *Hur låter dikten? Att bli ved II (What is the Sound of the Poem? Becoming Firewood II)* at the University of Gothenburg. Fredrik Nyberg is currently completing a research project with musician/composer Sten Sandell that revolves around pause and silence in the poetic and musical events. The project is part of “Bernadotteprogrammet” and supported by The Royal Swedish Academy of Music. Fredrik Nyberg works as a lecturer in Creative Writing at the Valand Academy at the University of Gothenburg.

Redell Olsen

is a poet and text-based artist. *Film Poems* (Les Figues, 2014) collects the texts for her films and performances from 2007–2012. Some of her previous books include: *Punk Faun: A Bar Rock Pastel* (Subpress, 2012), *Secure Portable Space* (Reality Street, 2004), *Book of the Fur* (rem press, 2000), and, in collaboration with the book artist Susan Johanknecht, *Here Are My Instructions* (Geneva, 2004). From 2006 to 2010 she was the editor of *How2*, the international online journal for Modernist and contemporary writing by women. In 2013 and 2014 she was the Judith E. Wilson visiting fellow in poetry at the University of Cambridge. She is currently professor of Poetry and Poetics at Royal Holloway, University of London. redellolsen.co.uk and filmpoems.wordpress.com/

Maya Rasker

turned her ambition to writing essays, journalism, theatre, and scenario after a career as a creative producer in the film industry. Since her prize-winning debut *Unknown Destination* (2000), her work has been published in the Netherlands, the United States, Spain, Russia, Germany, Hungary, and Turkey. In 2012 she completed her Master in Artistic Research (Universiteit van Amsterdam) with a thesis on the position of the author after publication of the work. As guest lecturer at the Master Film in Amsterdam and other MA and BA art institutes, she designs and teaches courses on writing and (artistic) research, on the transformation of the autobiography, and on the notion of ‘the beginning’ in art production and research. From 2015–2017 she was appointed research coordinator for the School of Media at the University of the Arts Utrecht. A PhD candidate for Leiden University (Academy for the Creative and Performing Arts), Rasker focusses on ‘creative’ writing strategies within artistic research practices.

Ferdinand Schmatz

writes poems, prose, essays, and radio plays. Since 2012 he has been a professor at the University of Applied Arts Vienna, where he directs the Institute for the Language Arts (Creative Writing). His most recent publications include *das gehörte feuer. orphische skizzen* (2016), *auf SÄTZE. Essays zur Poetik, Literatur und Kunst* (ed., 2016); *quellen: gedichte* (2010), and *Durchleuchtung. Ein wilder Roman aus Danja und Franz* (2007). He was awarded the Ernst Jandl Prize in 2009, the H. C. Artmann Prize in 2006, and the Georg Trakl Prize in 2004.

Thomas Strässle

studied German literature, philosophy, and musicology in Zurich, Cambridge, and Paris. He received his PhD from the University of Zurich with a dissertation on Baroque literature in 1999 and his habilitation with a study on the symbolism of salt in European literature in 2008. In addition, he studied the flute with Aurèle Nicolet and earned his concert diploma with distinction. Today he is Head of the interdisciplinary “Y Institute” at Bern University of the Arts and teaches German and Comparative Literature at the University of Zurich. He is president of the Max Frisch Foundation at the ETH Zurich and member of the “Literaturclub” on Swiss TV. His publications include *Gelassenheit. Über eine andere Haltung zur Welt* (Munich: Hanser, 2013) and *Salz. Eine Literaturgeschichte* (Munich: Hanser, 2009).

Salomé Voegelin

is an artist and writer engaged in listening as a sociopolitical practice of sound. Her work and writing deal with sound, and with the world sound makes: its aesthetic, social, and political realities hidden by the persuasiveness of a visual point of view. She is the author of *Sonic Possible Worlds: Hearing the Continuum of Sound* (Bloomsbury, 2014) and *Listening to Noise and Silence: Towards a Philosophy of Sound Art* (Continuum, 2010). Together with Thomas Gardner, she has co-edited *Colloquium: Sound Art – Music* (ZeroBooks, John Hunt Publishing, 2016). As an artist, she works collaboratively with David Mollin in a practice that focuses on invisible connections, transient behaviour, and unseen rituals, and responds to particular architectural, geographical, or conceptual sites. Voegelin is a reader in Sound Arts at the London College of Communication, UAL.

Tan Wälchli

teaches at the Zurich University of the Arts. At the University of Basel, he is currently completing his *Habilitationsschrift* entitled “Kein Reich dieser Welt,” which examines figurations of the theological-political in fantastic narratives by German Romantic authors. His publications include a monograph on Freud and tragedy (2010), a volume on artistic research co-edited with Corina Caduff (2010), as well as scholarly articles on E.T.A. Hoffmann, Heinrich von Kleist, Achim von Arnim and others.

Introducing Literature in the Discourse of Artistic Research

Corina Caduff and Tan Wälchli

The discourse of artistic research emerged in anglophone and Scandinavian countries in the 1990s, initially being established in the Visual Arts departments of art schools. In the wake of the Bologna Process, it spread to many other countries and reached the fields of design, theatre, film, music, and dance. The unification of so many different artistic disciplines under the roof of one discourse represents a great achievement. After long debates about procedures, methods and outcomes of artistic research, and after terminological discussions about *embodied* and *tacit knowledge* as well as *research into art*, *for art*, and *through art*, the field is well-established, both theoretically¹ and institutionally.² It provides rich ground for countless individual works and methodologies, employing a variety of epistemological models as well as trans-disciplinary, collaborative, and participatory practices.³

- 1 See Christopher Frayling, *Research in Art and Design. Royal College of Art Research Papers* 1:1. London: Royal College of Art, 1993; Annette Balkema/Henk Slager, *Artistic Research*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004; Mika Hannula et al., *Artistic Research: Theories, Methods and Practices*. Helsinki: Academy of Fine Arts, 2005; Robin Nelson, "Practice-as-Research and the Problem of Knowledge," in: *Performance Research* 11: 4 (2006), pp. 105–116; Dieter Lesage/Kathrin Busch, eds., *A Portrait of the Artist as a Researcher. The Academy and the Bologna Process*. Antwerp: MuHKA, 2007; Tom Holert, "Being Concerned? Scattered Thoughts on 'Artistic Research' and 'Social Responsibility,'" in: Florian Dombois et al., eds., *Intellectual Birdhouse. Artistic Practice as Research*. London: Koenig Books, 2012, pp. 23–39; Henk Borgdorff, *The Conflict of the Faculties. Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2012; Janneke Wesseling, *Of Sponge, Stone and the Intertwinement with the Here and Now. Methodology of Artistic Research*. Amsterdam: Valiz, 2016.
- 2 James Elkins, *Artists with PhDs. On the New Doctoral Degree in Studio Art*. Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing, 2009 gives an overview on PhD programmes in visual arts around the world and discusses some methodological discrepancies. An overview of institutional achievements in the German language area is provided by Sandra Buck et al., "Künstlerische Forschung unter Bildungsperspektive: individualisierte Studienprogramme?", in: *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung* 10:1 (2015), pp. 52–73, <http://www.zfhe.at/index.php/zfhe/article/view/802>, date of access: 17 Sept. 2018.
- 3 The online *Journal for Artistic Research*, established in 2011, provides insight into the scope of contemporary practices in the field. Cf. <http://www.jar-online.net>, date of access: 17 Sept. 2018. For a broad view on various methodological approaches, cf. Jens Badura et al., eds., *Künstlerische Forschung. Ein Handbuch*: Zurich: diaphanes 2015. For some recent participatory tendencies, cf. Corina Caduff, "Artistic Research: Methods – Development of a

Considering the international success story of artistic research throughout the various artistic disciplines, it appears somewhat striking that the discipline of literature has so far not participated in the discourse. The reasons for this seem to be primarily of an institutional nature. While creative writing programmes are available as a type of professional literary training analogous to studies in photography, film, painting, music, theatre, etc., such programmes are usually embedded within the humanities; in the United States of America and Great Britain, traditionally within English departments.⁴ Only in exceptional cases—and during the last decade—have creative writing programmes been established at art academies, art universities, and art schools.⁵ Therefore, creative writing programmes are seldom related to other forms of arts education. And this explains why discussions about artistic research, still generally taking place at art schools, rarely include literature.

Writers and Scholars In-Between

Although literature as a discipline is not represented in the artistic research discourse, numerous individual writers and scholars have ties to a variety of institutional constellations in which overlaps between literature, art, and research become manifest:

- Writers who teach their literary practice in new institutional contexts. In addition to the new creative writing programmes at art schools, a few recently set up programmes also foster specifically conceptual and transdisciplinary modes of ‘art writing’ at universities.
- Writers who are increasingly employed by art schools to teach thesis writing classes. As a result of the establishment of artistic research and especially in view of PhD programmes, thesis writing is gaining importance already at MA level.
- Transdisciplinary writers who are active in several fields of the arts, and who are also teaching their particular crossover practices to younger colleagues.

Discourse – Current Risks,” in: Kirsten Merete Langkilde, ed., *Poetry of the Real*. Basel: FHNW 2017, pp. 311–323.

4 On the rise of creative writing programmes in anglophone countries, cf. Paul Dawson, *Creative Writing and the New Humanities*. London, New York, NY: Routledge, 2004; Mark McGurl, *The Program Era. Postwar Fiction and the Rise of Creative Writing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

5 Such as the BA in Literary Writing at the University of the Arts, Bern (since 2006); the BA Language Arts at the University of Applied Arts, Vienna (since 2009/2010); and the MFA Literary Composition at the Valand Academy, University of Gothenburg (since 2014).

- Literary scholars who teach creative writing or ‘theory’ classes at art schools.
- Art historians and cultural historians who inquire and observe the emergence and development of artistic research as a discipline.

This volume comprises the work of 16 such writers and scholars who are institutionally located in nine Western European countries. They expand on their methodological approaches as well as their practice, and they analyse exemplary case studies. Presenting their points of view next to one another might allow the delineation—albeit provisionally—of the meandering boundaries of a future field of practice-based ‘literary research.’ This will quite likely not be a homogenous field, but one constituted by a variety of activities and institutional allocations. Nevertheless, the different areas are interconnected and do participate in a common discourse. In this sense, the volume aims to compile an inventory of prevalent observations, overarching questions, and shared challenges. A number of these concern the status, form, and function of a written thesis in practice-based research. Others derive from debates about various kinds of knowledge that such research might bring about.

Literary Self-Reflection

As mentioned before, the current exclusion of literature from debates on artistic research is primarily due to the embedding of creative writing programmes in the humanities, in the field of monolingual cultural and literary studies. Nevertheless, some of these programs inevitably raise questions about the conditions and requirements for practice-based research in literature, since they offer ‘third circle’ studies leading to a PhD degree. The starting point for this debate is the stipulation, common in the other arts, that an accompanying, explanatory or reflective text should be added to the artistic research work—even though the proportion of such additional texts varies greatly between different countries and curricula.⁶ As a consequence, there is a tendency in the

6 Early debates on artistic research revealed considerable disagreement over the necessity and role of an explanatory text. For opposing positions, cf., for example, Christoph Schenker, “Kunst als Forschung,” in: Peter Emch et al., eds., *Kunstklasse: Studiengang Bildende Kunst, Hochschule für Gestaltung und Kunst Zürich: Inserts, Texte, Statements*, Zurich: Hochschule für Gestaltung und Kunst, 1998, pp. 21–29; here p. 28; and Hannula et al. (2005), *Artistic Research*, p. 165. In December 2016, the ELIA ‘Florence Principles in the Arts’ were published: http://www.elia-artschools.org/userfiles/File/customfiles/1-the-florence-principles20161124105336_20161202112511.pdf. According to these principles, a “discursive component” alongside the artwork is required: “The project consists of original work(s) of art and contains a *discursive* component that critically reflects upon the project and documents the research

field of creative writing to demand two texts for an artistic PhD: in addition to the literary work, a supplementary, explanatory text in which the writer methodologically reflects and contextualises their working and writing.

In the history of literature, such explanatory treatises have long formed the genre of poetology. It includes reflections on literature and language by writers, who—often in pieces that supplement their creative texts—deal with the philosophical premises, historical reference points and linguistic procedures of their work. It is the detachment from the actual artwork or the autonomisation of the poetological component respectively which institutionally constitutes artistic research today, and which, of course, leads to further questions: Can such a detachment be both mandatory and theoretically justified in the field of creative writing, or is it rather an obstructive antinomy (Jan Baetens, University of Leuven)? And how precisely can an institutional requirement become productive in the context of creative writing PhD programmes at art schools (Fredrik Nyberg, Valand Academy, Gothenburg)? In other research contexts at art schools, too, writers find themselves motivated to explore the possibilities of separate, poetological text experiments (Maya Rasker, University of the Arts, Utrecht).

Writing in Art and Artistic Research

Because artistic research in general often requires a supplementary text component for reflection and contextualisation, artists from all disciplines increasingly see themselves obliged to write. In a variety of practices, they employ language as a medium of reflection, as a mediator of the artwork, as a component of transdisciplinary practices, etc. However, such ‘artistic’ practices of writing are not an entirely new phenomenon. Through the avant-garde movements and since, language has, in the course of the 20th century, been integrated into other artistic forms in diverse ways. While at first serving as an artistic medium of expression alongside others, for example in text and image collages or in the formulation of artistic programmes and manifestos, in the second half of the 20th century the writing of texts in the context of conceptual art advanced to become a valid artistic mode of its own.

In hindsight, this historical development can be viewed as a prerequisite for the emergence of artistic research. Particularly in the aftermath of Marcel Duchamp’s and the various permutations of conceptual art, artists were

process.” (p. 7), date of access: 17 Sept. 2018 [emphasis added by us]. The term “discursive” eventually leaves it open to being an oral or written component.

able to enter universities and starting to undertake ‘research,’ which sometimes granted them a degree of financial security they hadn’t previously had access to (Christa-Maria Lerm Hayes, University of Amsterdam). Meanwhile, the inclusion of texts in the artistic practice of feminist artists of the 1960s and 70s served to assert a new, by then female-attributed skill, and brought about early forms of documentary-researching procedures (Redell Olsen, Royal Holloway, University of London). In all cases, the new artistic text productions expanded the established literary genres— such as prose, drama, and poetry—and they brought about productive interactions between the disciplines. Recently, an even stronger and more diverse proliferation of conceptual writing has been developing across all artistic disciplines (Maria Fusco, Northumbria University). In the narrower area of the politically and institutionally defined artistic research, meanwhile, the question has arisen as to which forms and procedures are suitable for a complementary, reflective text. Should artists who write a PhD or an MFA thesis adhere to the standards of, for example, academic, theoretical, or critical texts? Or shouldn’t they rather develop their own, idiosyncratic writing methods in order to textually express the specifics of their respective work (Daniela Cascella, University of the Arts, London)? A revealing example of this is the challenge of making the speechlessness of a visual work perceptible without subjecting it to an analytical language of interpretation (Salomé Voegelin, University of the Arts, London).

The Knowledge of Literature

Current reflections on the production of knowledge in practice-based art research follow the debates about *tacit* and *embodied knowledge*, as mentioned earlier, and they explore epistemological considerations regarding the peculiar kinds of knowledge accessible to the arts—in contrast to the sciences, for example.⁷ Such discussions may also be instructive for literary research since one can equally ask what kinds of knowledge are produced and passed on in a work of literature. For example, in the last fifteen years the knowledge gained from literary metaphors, procedures, or narratives has been examined from a

⁷ The discussions on “Artistic Knowledge, Part 1” and “Artistic Knowledge, Part 2” in: James Elkins, ed., *What Do Artists Know?* University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012, pp. 39–45 and pp. 47–57, provide examples for the ongoing debates about epistemological categories and various kinds of *tacit knowledge*, respectively. From a philosophical vantage point, Dieter Mersch, *Epistemologies of Aesthetics*, translated by Laura Radosh. Zurich: diaphanes, 2015 [2015] develops criteria for distinguishing artistic forms of knowledge from scientific ones.

scholarly perspective, and literary references to other disciplines of knowledge have been revealed.⁸ Along these lines, practice-based literary research, too, might examine the knowledge contained in various forms of speech and writing, or it might experiment with including material from archives, encyclopaedias, and scientific research in the fictional text. In any case, in the interest of artistic research, it is important to ensure that the research questions are recognisable and comprehensible and that a knowledge gain is clearly identifiable.

In various contemporary writing practices the examination of linguistic phenomena from everyday language is pursued as a fruitful strategy for the production of new knowledge. For example, political and military language rules can be analysed in terms of their functions and modes of action by making use of literary and documentary methods (Vincent Broqua, University Paris 8). When everyday language rules exert formative societal influence, their literary examination may lead to a critical analysis of social norms (Ferdinand Schmatz, University of Applied Arts, Vienna). And as the linguistic representation of the world is hardly to be separated from seeing and knowing the world, new linguistic procedures often create new views of the world (Alexander Damianisch, University of Applied Arts, Vienna). In a Wittgensteinian perspective, finally, literary research might explore different ‘aspects’ of everyday words, metaphors or linguistic imagery, thereby highlighting various functions of language that remain unexplored in everyday use (Tine Melzer, Bern University of the Arts).

Models and Precursors

While the essays in the previous chapter present contemporary conceptions of literary knowledge production, the question can also be approached from the rather scholarly vantage point of cultural history. Historical instances of literary knowledge production that were consciously and strategically developed as artistic experiments—sometimes in exchange or in coincidence with innovations in the humanities or the natural sciences—might be instructive for understanding certain strategies of ‘artistic research’ *avant la lettre*. Again, such methodological considerations of identifying historical precursors or models are also common in the more general discourse on

8 Cf. Sigrid Weigel/Bernhard Dotzler, eds., „fülle der combination“. *Literaturforschung und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. München: Wilhelm Fink, 2005; Michael Wood, *Literature and the Taste of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005; John Gibson, “Literature and Knowledge,” in: Richard Eldridge, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 467–485; Roland Borgards et al., eds., *Literatur und Wissen. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2013.

artistic research,⁹ and again they can be re-considered for the field of literature. Without providing an overview or a representative selection, the last four contributions to this volume examine exemplary cases from the second half of the 20th century.

Chris Kraus's novel *I Love Dick* (1997)—blending autobiography, French Theory and art criticism with performative and experimental elements as well as older forms such as the epistolary novel and the diary—has become an influential role model for contemporary transdisciplinary forms of writing. In her own kind of 'research' practice, Kraus thoroughly re-considered the form of the novel as well as the precarious position of the female intellectual at the end of the 20th century (Anneleen Masschelein, University of Leuven). At around the same time, Oskar Pastior worked on his 'organised' translations of Charles Baudelaire. Exploring various ways of staying true to the sounds and rhythms of poems, while mostly ignoring semantics, he examined the conflicted relations between original and translation, speech and writing, French and German (Thomas Strässle, University of the Arts, Bern). In the late 1970s, Roland Barthes developed new writerly forms situated in between essay and novel, critique and narration, which resulted from and reiterated some of his scientific findings about the role of the author, various kinds of artistic languages, semiology, etc. (Kathrin Busch, Berlin University of the Arts). Another twenty years earlier, Vienna poet Konrad Bayer combined linguistic methodologies of his time with inquiries into the lasting imprint of National Socialism in German language (Tan Wälchli, Zurich University of the Arts). Taken together, these scattered examples indicate that literary 'research' strategies *avant la lettre* resulted from very different incentives—biographical, cultural, political, etc.—and aimed to produce new knowledge about various aspects of language and literary forms as well as their historical contexts and conditions.

Multi- and Monolingualism

Not least the examples from the final chapter might also serve as reminders that literary practices are inextricably bound to national languages: English, French, German, etc. This equally applies to contemporary creative writing

9 A prime example from the visual arts are the painterly innovations by Paul Cézanne. Since Merlau-Ponty's influential treatises—*Le doute de Cézanne* (1945) and, in particular, *L'oeil et l'esprit* (1960)—Cézanne's new ways of painting have often been regarded as coinciding or competing with innovations in the scientific understanding of vision and perception, and therefore as an example of artistic research *avant la lettre* (cf., for example, Michael Cobussen, "The Intruder," in: Corina Caduff et al., eds., *Art and Artistic Research*. Zurich: Scheidegger & Spiess, 2010, pp. 46–54; here pp. 48–49).

training including related methodological discussions. Since each language produces its own specific poetic aspects, their discussion and treatment require the same language and are not easily transferable to any other. For this reason alone, an international discourse on 'literary research' will hardly ever be homogeneous. While the international debate about artistic research in general, which can be considered as a metadiscourse, is usually conducted in English, any future field of practice-based literary research will always be characterised by differences grounded in multilingualism that demand recognition.

Bibliography

- Badura, Jens et al., eds., *Künstlerische Forschung. Ein Handbuch*. Zurich: diaphanes, 2015.
- Balkema, Annette/Henk Slager, *Artistic Research*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004.
- Borgards, Roland et al., eds., *Literatur und Wissen. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2013.
- Borgdorff, Henk, *The Conflict of the Faculties. Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2012.
- Buck, Sandra et al., "Künstlerische Forschung unter Bildungsperspektive: individualisierte Studienprogramme?", in: *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung* 10:1 (2015), pp. 52–73, <http://www.zfhe.at/index.php/zfhe/article/view/802>, date of access: 17 Sept. 2018.
- Caduff, Corina, "Artistic Research: Methods – Development of a Discourse – Current Risks," in: Kirsten Merete Langkilde, ed., *Poetry of the Real*. Basel: FHNW, 2017, pp. 311–323.
- Cobussen, Michael, "The Intruder," in: Corina Caduff et al., eds., *Art and Artistic Research*. Zurich: Scheidegger & Spiess, 2010, pp. 46–54.
- Dawson, Paul, *Creative Writing and the New Humanities*. London, New York, NY: Routledge, 2004.
- Elkins, James, *Artists with PhDs. On the New Doctoral Degree in Studio Art*. Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing, 2009.
- Elkins, James, ed., *What Do Artists Know?* University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Frayling, Christopher, *Research in Art and Design. Royal College of Art Research Papers* 1:1. London: Royal College of Art, 1993.
- Gibson, John, "Literature and Knowledge," in: Richard Eldridge, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 467–485.

- Hannula, Mika et al., *Artistic Research: Theories, Methods and Practices*. Helsinki: Academy of Fine Arts, 2005.
- Holert, Tom, "Being Concerned? Scattered Thoughts on 'Artistic Research' and 'Social Responsibility,'" in: Florian Dombois et al., eds., *Intellectual Birdhouse. Artistic Practice as Research*. London: Koenig Books, 2012, pp. 23–39.
- Lesage, Dieter/Kathrin Busch, eds., *A Portrait of the Artist as a Researcher. The Academy and the Bologna Process*. Antwerp: MuHKA, 2007.
- McGurl, Mark, *The Program Era. Postwar Fiction and the Rise of Creative Writing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Mersch, Dieter, *Epistemologies of Aesthetics*, translated by Laura Radosh. Zurich: diaphanes, 2015 [2015].
- Nelson, Robin, "Practice-as-Research and the Problem of Knowledge," in: *Performance Research* 11:4 (2006), pp. 105–116.
- Schenker, Christoph, "Kunst als Forschung," in: Peter Emch et al., eds., *Kunstklasse: Studiengang Bildende Kunst, Hochschule für Gestaltung und Kunst Zürich: Inserts, Texte, Statements*. Zurich: Hochschule für Gestaltung und Kunst, 1998, pp. 21–29.
- Weigel, Sigrid/Bernhard Dotzler, eds., „fülle der combination“. *Literaturforschung und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. München: Wilhelm Fink, 2005.
- Wesseling, Janneke, *Of Sponge, Stone and the Intertwinement with the Here and Now. Methodology of Artistic Research*. Amsterdam: Valiz, 2016.
- Wood, Michael, *Literature and the Taste of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Literary Self-Reflection



Writing Cannot Tell Everything

Jan Baetens

Abstract:

This chapter addresses the topic of the *mixte* (English: the *mixt*), a type of writing that combines very different, sometimes perhaps even incompatible types of writing, such as fiction and non-fiction or, in a more singular manner, fiction and writing on fiction (the term of *mixt* has been coined by author and theoretician Jean Ricardou). However, the present chapter does not just present or examine Ricardou's theory and practice of the *mixt* but takes it as its starting point to reflect on the status of the author's self-commentary in a research-oriented fictional practice. More precisely, the chapter makes a plea, not for the merger but the articulation (and thus the relative separation) of fiction and writing on fiction in practice-based artistic research.

Limits and Pitfalls of Creative Writing as Practice-Based Research

As clearly argued by Corina Caduff, the theory and practice of artistic research remain underdeveloped in the field of literature. The opening claim of her 2009 contribution to the debate still holds today:

In its beginnings in the 1990s the artistic research discourse centered mainly on the visual arts from which it arose. In recent years, however, an increasing number of relevant studies have appeared from the fields of design, theater, and film—joined increasingly by music and dance—in the context of artistic research. . . . In what follows, a field will be discussed that, to the best of my knowledge, has yet to be raised in the debates about artistic research: literature.¹

The following pages should be read as a brief comment on this observation from the geographic and cultural perspective of France, where contrary to most of the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian countries discussed by Caduff there is hardly any tradition of PhD programmes in creative writing. Things are changing, true, but slowly, and the aim of my remark is of course not to suggest

¹ Corina Caduff, "Literature and Artistic Research," in: Corina Caduff et al., eds., *Art and Artistic Research*. Zurich: Scheidegger & Spiess, 2009, pp. 98–105; here p. 98.

that there is no tradition of artistic practice in literature in France. What I would like to make clear in this contribution is the importance and originality of a particular French theoretical and practical intervention in the debates on literary creativity, which concerns the need to shift from the traditional idea of the author as a genius to the modern, explicitly democratic idea of the author as crafts(wo)man and producer. This is related to less academic forms of theorising practice, another key dimension of French literary life, where ideas on literature and how to write have always been less determined by academic gatekeepers than by the authors themselves, who like to elaborate their personal claims and convictions in treatises.²

In more general terms, the tradition of practice-based research can be said to be both well established and poorly recognised in the literary field. On the one hand, literary writing has, for a long time, often been practised as an experiment relying on a wide set of models, hypotheses, and techniques. This is what many authors do intuitively, as demonstrated for instance by Gustave Flaubert, whose letters contain countless reflections on the art of writing,³ or Henry James's prefaces to the edition of his complete novels eventually republished under the title *The Art of the Novel*.⁴ In quite some cases, authors even work with an explicit programme, which they either illustrate or put to the test when starting to write. Edgar Allan Poe's *Philosophy of Composition*,⁵ Raymond Roussel's *How I Wrote Certain of My Books*,⁶ Oulipo's use of literary 'constraints' or preformatted rules that steer and foster the literary imagination,⁷ these are all examples of the many ways in which authors foreground the mutual involvement of theory and practice. On the other hand, there is also a strong resistance to link theory and practice. The current difficulties with understanding or reshaping creative writing as a form of artistic research—that is of the rational and methodologically enhanced production of new insights and new knowledge—is a symptom of this resistance. This is why creative writing, as it

2 A famous case for this was Sartre's *What is Literature?*. Jean-Paul Sartre, *What is Literature?* (1948), translated by Bernard Frechtman. London: Methuen, 1950.

3 Gustave Flaubert, *The Letters of Gustave Flaubert, 1857–1880* (1887–1893), translated and ed. by Francis Steegmuller. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1984.

4 Henry James, *The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces* (1909). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2011.

5 Edgar Allan Poe, "The Philosophy of Composition" (1846), in: *The Complete Poetry of Edgar Allan Poe*. New York, NY: Signet Classics, 1996, pp. 503–512.

6 Raymond Roussel, *How I Wrote Certain of My Books* (1935), translated by Trevor Winkfield. Cambridge, MA: Exact Change, 2005.

7 Warren F. Motte, *Oulipo: A Primer of Potential Literature*. McLean, IL: Dalkey Archive, 1986.

is generally practised and theorised today either inside or outside academia,⁸ isn't necessarily the best answer to the ongoing developments of practice-based research and PhD programmes, as will become clear in the remainder of this chapter.

Is creative writing in itself a form of practice-based research? In theory, the answer should be *yes*, provided this type of writing does what research is supposed to do, namely establishing a productive interaction with a given theory, selecting an adequate method, defining one or more research questions and, last but not least, producing a set of falsifiable answers to these questions while equally giving a meaningful feedback on method as well as theory. Nevertheless, in practice, most existing creative writing programmes do not comply with such an approach to research. To pursue it, they have to be changed radically. On the one hand, it will prove necessary to dismantle the separation of creative writing and (literary, critical, and cultural) theory, which belong to completely different curricula with different staff and different students addressing completely different questions. In other words, what has to change is the very *input* of the creative writing programmes: the individual project of the student is no longer sufficient; he or she will also have to address more general and therefore more theoretical issues. On the other hand, it will be no less imperative to also enlarge the programmes' *output*: instead of only delivering a work of fiction (or creative non-fiction), the student of the creative writing programme will have to complement this production with a second text, a theoretical and methodological supplement in which he or she reflects upon both the process and the result of the creative work. This is what generally happens when creative writing programmes plan to enlarge their course offerings in order to include practice-based PhDs. To quote just one but very representative example:

The PhD in Creative Writing provides the capstone to the postgraduate Creative Writing programme at Edinburgh, offering students graduating from the MSc in Creative Writing an opportunity to undertake work at a higher level, aimed towards the production of a substantial, publishable piece of creative writing, accompanied by a sustained exercise in critical study.⁹

8 Anglo-Saxon creative writing programmes are mostly located within academia, while the continental tradition of *ateliers d'écriture* or literary workshops doesn't necessarily rely on academia. Cf. Mark McGurl, *The Program Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

9 <http://www.ed.ac.uk/literatures-languages-cultures/english-literature/postgraduate/phd/creative-writing>, date of access: 17 Sept. 2018.

The changes in *input*, which are mainly institutional, are easier to handle than those in *output*, which concern the very heart of practice-based research in literary writing. Even if the gap between theory and creative writing is very deep, the design of a new, mixed curriculum is certainly not impossible. The simultaneous articulation of creative writing and critical study, however, raises very different questions, given the radical difference in nature between both types of writing. The combination of creative writing and critical study is a challenging, risky task, and can even prove harmful in more than one regard.

Firstly, one might ask whether it is possible to catch the specificity of literary writing in a supplementary text that is not itself literary, but didactic, informing, instructive, etc. Even if one rejects the outdated romantic idea that a literary text can only be experienced and not explained, the fundamental question remains whether it is possible to provide such an explanation in a non-literary text. Should the critical supplement rather be a piece of writing itself? Examples for this kind of problem might be, for instance, the poetics of allusions or irony, for as soon as one makes explicit the mechanism of allusion or the functioning of irony, one also destroys their effect. And yet this issue might not be equally grave in all kinds of texts. For instance, in texts that Roland Barthes, in 1970, called *lisible* texts—which do not specifically challenge the reader's habits and expectations—the unpacking of allusions or of irony is less problematic than in what Barthes called *scriptible* texts: in the former, the disclosing of the hidden reference is welcomed as a useful help to the reader, in the latter, the same intervention may destroy the reader's creative struggle with the writing.¹⁰

Secondly, and provided one succeeds in turning the critical supplement into a real literary text, one may ask whether such a transformation does not jeopardise the 'scientific' character of the commentary, which must be transparent to all and open to intersubjective debate and remediation. Will the literary version of critical commentary be able to provide new objective knowledge, or will its gain in knowledge depend on mere intuition and subjective interpretation, both on the part of the author-researcher and the reader? To discuss this problem it might be helpful to remember Ricardou's distinction between *lecturable* and *lisible* texts, presented some ten years after Barthes's discussion

10 Barthes's terms are usually translated as *readerly* and *writerly* texts, although a more literal translation would be 'readable' and 'writable.' While the former term refers to rather conventional texts that do not confront the read with any challenges, the latter means a kind of textual practice that challenges the readers, while also giving them a special kind of pleasure and bliss. Cf. Roland Barthes, *S/Z. An Essay* (1970), translated by Richard Miller. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1974 and *The Pleasure of the Text* (1972), translated by Richard Miller. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1975.

of the *lisible/scriptible* distinction. For Ricardou, *lecturable* refers to what can be clearly understood in a text (*lecturable* is a neologism one could translate as ‘technically understandable’), while the latter term, *lisible*, refers to what pleases the reader (*lisible* is a very general term which takes here the special meaning of ‘pleasant to read’).¹¹

According to Ricardou, any text can always be framed through the double lens of the *lecturable* and the *lisible*—since all texts teach us something we like or dislike in some way—and this necessary intertwinement can explain why any straightforward transformation of the critical analysis into a second piece of creative writing is dangerous: while creative writing cannot but emphasise the importance of the *lisible*, critical analysis has to foreground the role of the *lecturable*. Another difficulty is that the implicit sequential arrangement of both parts—first comes the writing, then comes the analysis—does not always reflect the actual process, which can include many feedback loops. The analysis can precede the writing or interrupt and change it, for example, which complicates the very distinction between both text types.

The Articulation of Writing and Criticism: Towards a Writing of the *mixt*

Given the various difficulties one encounters when one supplements the literary text with a didactic, informative supplement *and* when one tries to present this critical supplement in a literary form, it is understandable that advocates of practice-based research have tried to radically merge both aspects in one single text. Either they make the analysis part of the writing or they set out

¹¹ Cf. Jean Ricardou, “Éléments de textique (I),” in: *conséquences* 10 (1987), pp. 5–28: here p. 17. At first sight, one may have the impression that the tandem *lecturable/lisible* is a reformulation of Barthes’s *lisible/scriptible* distinction, but the differences are more significant than the similarities. In Barthes, the competing terms designate two different text types (a text, or a fragment of a text, is either *lisible* or *scriptible*), whereas the Ricardolian terms describe a more dialectic relationship, according to which each text can be read as both *lecturable* and *lisible*. Moreover, the relationship between both reader reactions is anything except direct and linear. One might think, for instance, that very *lecturable* texts are also very *lisible* (for we tend to like more what we understand) or, the other way round, that very *lisible* texts are also *lecturable* (for we read better when we like what we read). In practice, this is not always the case: On the one hand, certain readers are emotionally triggered by cognitive thresholds, so that a problem in *lecturabilité* can prove a springboard for *lisibilité*. On the other hand, texts that are *lisible* do not always engender good critical readings (this is perhaps what we say by stating that reading for fun and reading for criticism are seen as mutually incompatible).

from the analysis but tend to transform it into the writing practice itself. The second traditionally happens in the various forms of the *ars poetica* genre, where text and programme, creative output and theoretical input, aim at coinciding as seamlessly as possible. But there are many other ways in which a creative text can be given a self-revelatory twist. A good point in case is the countless occurrences of the *mise en abyme*—a technique that establishes a mirror effect between part and whole of the text—thus making a certain detail reveal one or more aspects of the complete text like the play within the play in *Hamlet*.¹² In modernist texts, this internal didacticism can tend to complete self-referentiality. In that case, the work is composed in such a way that all its elements mirror its own structure. This happens in certain types of conceptual poetry (we all know examples of poems stating that ‘this text is made of seven words’, for instance) as well as in avant-garde novels. (The French New Novel, in particular, has often been analysed in this perspective.)

One of the most detailed and sophisticated examples of such a take on writing has been proposed by Ricardou, who published a piece of writing, *La Prise de Constantinople* (1965), which aspired at complete self-referentiality.¹³ More than a dozen years later, he complemented his novel with a very long critical analysis in which he made explicit the implicitly designated rules of the production, structure, and functioning of the work.¹⁴ This *a posteriori* critical analysis obviously betrays the failure of the initial programme. If it is necessary to add such a long commentary, this implies that the original text did not reach its own objective to self-reflexively render its composition transparent. In other words: If it was actually possible to read in Ricardou’s novel what it claims to display and demonstrate, namely the mechanisms of its own genesis and composition, then the subsequent production of a critical analysis could only be seen as an attempt to remediate the novel’s flaws.

Similar problems occur when the blurring of the boundaries between creative writing and critical analysis is not pursued at the level of the piece of writing, as in the case of *La Prise de Constantinople*, but sets out from the theoretical analysis itself. The desire to conceive one’s own critical and theoretical discourse as a form of (creative) writing is certainly not new, as demonstrated by the stylistic ambitions—and qualities!—of many critics. Yet it has become one of the fundamental characteristics of French poststructuralist critical

12 Lucien Dällenbach, *The Mirror in the Text* (1975), translated by Jeremy Whitely. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.

13 Jean Ricardou, *La Prise de Constantinople* (1965), in: *L’intégrale Jean Ricardou. Tome 2: La Prise de Constantinople et autres écrits. 1962–1966*. Brussels: Les Impressions Nouvelles 2018, pp. 139–351.

14 Jean Ricardou, “La Fiction à mesure,” in: *Nouveaux Problèmes du roman*. Paris: Les Éditions du Seuil, 1978, pp. 244–351.