

## VOCABULARY EXERCISE FOR A DISCOURSE ON METHOD

JOSÉ M. MIRANDA JUSTO

**MURMURING** | In 1991, Pedro Cabrita Reis put on exhibition his work called Conversation Piece. Exactly ten years have gone by. Of course nobody has ever heard any of the words in that conversation. But it is still possible to listen to it, to listen to the endless murmuring. One could say it is “the Rustle of Language” in the absence of words.

**SENSES** | It is well known that PCR’s work always deals with observation, i.e. with sight, hearing and touch. It involves capturing, apprehending, affection (as philosophers used to say centuries ago). Yet... Sight, far from being only a gaze, sight is a watchful eye in the middle of the night. Hearing is straining to listen in an overwhelming silence. As for touch, it is that of the blind, of clairvoyants; it could be said to be a Homeric groping. Therefore, without a doubt, what is involved are the senses. Nevertheless, it is not enough to say that the senses are involved because PCR, in fact, deals with problems to do with efficiency – building, understanding, orientation – which use the senses as a metaphor of the method (or of part of the method), although always by means of a hyperbole.

**DISPLAY** | The hyperbole of the senses involves at least three possibly superimposed layers: a sharpening of the senses, an intelligence of the senses and a display of the senses. Let us see a little of what happens with what I call the display of the senses – for want of a better term. Firstly, displaying the senses means neither harnessing the senses under a topic nor simply exciting them. For example, Conversation Piece displays the possibility of hearing what is, in fact, not heard so that we may hear what the noise at the surface of the words stops us from hearing. Thus, it is not our ear that hears. Rather, it is our intelligence that listens by means of displaying the auditory metaphor. Or, for instance, when PCR brings into play light, colour, reflection, or, in other words, looking, it is not precisely that the eye is excited but that the intelligence of looking is called upon by means of displaying the metaphor of looking. All this naturally demands a methodology of display, contrived in the strictest sense: bringing things into play, or rather placing tensions at opposite extremes, concentrating upon the essential, but also de-contextualising and duplicating the world diagrammatically. A diagram of emotions and a diagrammatic of the senses.

**DETOUR** | Is the same black paint, on one or the other side of a glass pane, still the same black colour? Of course not. Our eyes know this. Our eyes tell us that the same is something else. That the same is a species of the other. The intelligence of the senses works through this kind of knowledge that causes a detour.

**SHARPENING** | If a light shines from deep within the ground, from within open furrows in the floor, we say it is a sharp light. If a light shines from fluorescent tubing heaped in a corner of a doorless corridor, likewise, we say it is a sharp light. In both cases, though, what we say is arbitrary and unwarranted. Nonetheless, once the sharpness of light has been pronounced, it fits into these displays of light quite well. Whereby we may conclude that it is not the light that is sharp, but the idea of sharpening which has made the light sharp. A certain light. The same thing happens with the senses.

**GARDENING** | Flowers and gardens. We need to intersect two concepts here: amplification and striking. Once again, in both cases what they entail is duplicating and transfiguring. Amplifying to the extent of making only the invisible of a “flower” visible. Or rather, an inner, fleeting darkness. If the departure point lies outside the process, then the process is one of inclusion. Striking of an angle. Projecting a vertical over a horizontal. Coloured glass striking a space specially prepared for the effect. If the departure point lies within the process, then the process has a multiplying effect. The quest for totality is achieved by intersecting inclusion and multiplication. At least sometimes. Very often.

**POET** | House shade tree brick wall door window. Just like that: no commas, no hyphens. Exact juxtaposing in which previously established rules are limited to the barest minimum. The sparseness of rules is the method. The method – as poetic knowledge, or rather, as knowledge that makes, that carries out – is then bestowed with the maximum rigour: prescience and circumspection.

**ALMOST** | Parallelisms. There are many of them. But even so, it is always a quasi-parallelism of the parallelism that matters. It would be appropriate to deal with this almost as being a rigorous operation.

**DUPLICATION** | Duplication and parallelism. I am a little perplexed about how these two aspects of the method are articulated. One could try to establish a sort of pendulum swing between the two things. However, this seems to show a very narrow understanding of things. There is so much of the obstinate, the intentional or the final in this work that the idea of any back-and-forth swinging would always be too precarious. If it is to help at all, then it would always be as passing concept, something provisional. Strictly speaking, a provisional concept is no concept at all. Perhaps this forces me to think about parallelism as a kind of echo of the duplication itself. Or maybe the parallelism at the level of presenting/exhibiting as a counterpart to the duplication at the level of appropriating/building. But therein lies the risk of applying a grid of symmetries (or dichotomies), which I most certainly cannot do to this work. Assuredly:  
(a) duplication is asymmetrical;  
(b) parallelism is asymmetrical;  
(c) in PCR’s work, giving and receiving (giving to see by making the object, and receiving on the part of the one looking at it) coexist in radical asymmetry.

**GIVING** | I feel like calling this last asymmetry, the asymmetry of generosity. From a hermeneutic (romantic) perspective, the reader is always far better equipped than the author. (Only thus are we able to understand that later on the author is absent – or dies. Etc.) What happens here is completely different. The author, the subject of the conception, of the constitutive action, build-up and production of the piece of work is the giving... He is not even the giving person. It is giving itself that makes the object. This being the case, it is also the act of giving that makes the person – which is only relevant to the extent that it makes the person part and parcel of the work of art. Not the Duchampian life constructed as a work of art anymore, but – more radically – he person becoming part of the work of art. Better still, as we shall see: the person as a species of the gender, which is the work of art. As for receiving, far from entering into any symmetry with giving, it would always be infinitely less than such giving. But only insofar as the one who receives is not completely transformed by means of yet another giving. His own.

**RECURRENCE** | This being the case, obstinacy, intent and finality are, primarily, inherent to giving. They are not even characteristic features of giving. Strictly speaking, they are modalities in which the giving is manifested. There is, therefore, a teleology recurring in the giving.

**DESTINY** | I intend to come back to this question some day. But for the meantime, I can formulate it thus: when giving enunciates itself, it may only do so in prophetic language. As a result, giving is destining. There is, therefore, a theology inherent in the giving.

**FRAGILITY** | Two chairs. Side by side. Both covered. As if their occupants have been away for a very long time. Forever, most certainly.

On either one of the chairs, and placed on the cloth dust covers, we have two plaster-of-Paris parallelepipeds. Placid, inert, the two aligned blocks take on the shape of a long wait, an emptiness, a sort of pure place. A geometrical configuration, nevertheless fairly transitory, perhaps indifferent to what may eventually be inscribed on them; therefore available, like pieces of blank paper.

The two chairs stand, a little aback, on top of a sheet of glass. Unlikely, on this fragility. A copper tube circuit is partially visible through the glass, suggesting that some liquid or gas could flow between the two places. As far as we can make out, the circulation system is organised by means of a set of different sized parallels between the segments of the tube.

The amount of descriptive detail contained in the method is variable. Its exact measure in each case is given in the efficient working of the metaphor, which is achieved with the description.

**COUNTER-SENSE** | When approaching these objects, the eye needs to follow a sequence in its viewing. For example, yet once again, in Conversation Piece. When we look at this composite object, when we turn our attention to it, we are unable to take everything in at one sweep of the eye. At one time. There is no place here for what in traditional philosophical terms was called the “immediacy” of an “intuition”.

It is inevitable to start with the chairs, move on to the plaster-of-Paris blocks and then right afterwards look at what is happening below. From then on, we are in a position to see the object as a whole. But not before. If there is any “intuition” – as I once wrote – then it is an indirect, discursive intuition, an intellectual intuition, which would act as counter-sense to the classical, enlightened theory of knowledge. PCR’s work and thought deliberately deal with this kind of counter-sense. Or, better, they deal with what the identification or the diagnosis of such counter-senses are unable to capture, unable to see or understand, unable to show. For instance, a sudden, fleeting intuitive flash whose very existence, nonetheless, is the outcome of a process of multiple linkings in time.

**UP-TO-A-CERTAIN-POINT** | There are three layers. Up to a certain point they overlay each other. Up to a certain point they interact. But only up to a certain point. And afterwards, afterwards there is the parallelism. Cutting through all the layers.

Nota bene: when you manage to understand the parallelism and the up-to-a-certain-point perception at one and the same time, you will have discovered the principle governing all the diagrams.

**MACHINES** | I like thinking about these objects – Conversation Piece and many others made during the same period or even ones coming much later on – as if they were machines. They are made up of parts, all scrupulously calculated, fitting in to each other, having circulation tubes and power sources. They have intermeshing sub-systems in a workable, rigorously efficient whole, irrespective of our knowing whether or not they produce anything more than what they are as machines. True, they are silent machines but it is precisely because they go against our immediate grasp of them, that they are discursive. They move. Obviously, they move because our intelligence refuses to allow them to stand still. But they are the ones demanding movement from our intelligence, they are the ones, in a manner of speaking, which begin working as soon as we walk into the room, when our gaze falls upon them and refuses any state of “contemplation”.

If they work, it is because each part is a metaphor, each sub-system is a metaphorical field and the combined whole is a self-sufficient system enabling the transposition between metaphorical fields. Even when – as is the case with some of the most recent installations – everything seems to happen in a strictly sensory way. Mainly there.

**METAPHORS** | PCR realised a long time ago – as any poet-poet would – that metaphors are not second-hand images, images of this or that, which could be said in another way, for example, telling a story or putting forward a theory. Metaphors are a way of getting us to come face to face with something unknown, with access to meaning, with the hunger and thirst we have for meaning overwhelming us and making us strive for what lies beyond all reasonably clear knowledge. (Everything begins with this “wound”, as PCR has already said and written several times, quoting other specialists on wounds, gashes or fissures and on healing and suture.) Metaphors are transpositions, it is true, but not of the known to the known. Sometimes they are from the known to the unknown. At other times, they are from the unknown to the unknown. Whatever the case, what matters in the first place, is that they are effective in producing obscurity.

As regards each of the three layers in an object such as Conversation Piece, therefore, the question does not fall into the category of: what are the chairs, the blocks and the tubes a metaphor of? The relevant questions to ask would rather be of the type: What discomfort is caused in me by the metaphor about absence? Or silence? What is this

strangeness I feel, being struck by a metaphor about fluid communication that nevertheless runs silently, wordlessly underground? What unlikelihood do we have here that hangs two chairs in space? What kind of frailty or fragility is this, connecting them? What displacement of worlds is this where the words I have at my disposal do not seem to make any effect? What sort of disparity do I perceive between the order I use to regulate my affairs and the order I am unable to read? What darkness has fallen upon me when only a moment ago it was daylight? And what steps will I be taking in the morning?

Diacritical note: It should not be forgotten that: the relevant questions are not nostalgic. It could be said then, as a corollary: there is a type of joy specific to melancholic questions.

**DUPLICATING** | Everything is so near to be what it seems to be. Therefore, so close to being nothing. Tables, chairs, houses, rooms, staircases, wells, brick walls, sheets, tubes, lights, windows, doors. And the tables are tables, the chairs are chairs, the brick walls are really brick walls... and so it goes. There is no doubt that all this involves a duplication of the world, a repetition. The question is finding out whether the repetition in this case is fundamental. Or, on the contrary, merely a means. And if it is a means, to what purpose?

There is a more obvious side to it. Duplicating, repeating the world is precisely the opposite of representing the world. Representing something is creating a sign of the thing that is presented instead of the thing itself. When you decide to duplicate something instead of representing it, you are choosing a different paradigm. And in choosing this paradigm you displace the break-off point with the world. Representation – despite the way semiology usually sidesteps the issue – has always been basically iconic and possessed of a political nature: it cuts itself loose from the represented object so as to hide the representation behind a mask and allow the represented object to be used, thus becoming an exercise in manipulative power. It has been this private power of representative images that has always infuriated the iconoclasts. In opposition, when it comes to repetition, there is no break-off with the object itself but rather with its functionality. The object's primary use is stripped and the object is exposed to a kind of functional nudity: it keeps a functional significance (or the memory of what is signified) but loses its use. Upon losing its use, it becomes open to other uses. The metaphor may only really work as from this point.

A diagram is then defined in the following way: duplicating an object according to some modality of functional nudity.

**CELEBRATION** | As for the iconoclasts, it is worth remembering that they are iconoclasts for two different reasons. On the one hand, they replace the representation by the exclusive nature of the celebration. On the other hand, it is because they hate everything large, whether it is applicable to size or time.

We need to think about a celebration capable of loving what is large so that we may understand how an iconoclasm of giving may be possible.

**ORDER** | Because we are dealing with method, any kind of ordering is acceptable.

Demonstration at the first level: if the method is a totality, any one of its components leads to this totality.

Demonstration at the second level: if the method obtains a totality with the chaos it – supposedly – emerges from, any of its ingredients provides a sufficient enough picture of the totality of chaos and the method.

Demonstration at the third level: if the chaos is a retrospective construction of the method itself, any suggestion of disorder, of chaos, is merely a pale, far-off picture of the immeasurable productivity of the method.

Corollary: The distance, the paleness, are qualities, not of the method or the method's discourse (the wordless discourse pronounced by the method itself, or as we have seen, pronounced by the giving) but of the discourse on method, i.e. of the words.

**MULTIPLE SYNTAX** | However, in losing function, another possibility is also offered. It involves articulating objects, which in their normal current uses, have no relation to one another. In other words, the duplication – or reiteration – of the object provides the chance to set up open-ended systems of syntax. The metaphorical machines are multiple syntax true to this type.

**MULTIPLICATION** | The most intriguing thing about this process, however, lies in another aspect. Because they are not symmetrical processes, the representation and duplication do not affect each other in the same way. If the representation makes its reappearance during the process, it is drastically affected by the duplication. Some say that representation is inevitable, that it always returns no matter how you wish to get completely rid of it, no matter how badly you want to clear the ground for pure pictorial (or musical, etc.) "abstraction". I have certain reservations about these assertions, about the essentialist (if not mentalist) vein in which the issue is addressed. I prefer handling concepts and ideas in a less ambitious fashion so as to be able to understand how a work of art – itself – may become radically ambitious. I therefore prefer thinking about whether the representation will reappear, not always (owing to some kind of psychological duty), although sometimes, perhaps quite often. And when it reappears, it may indeed do so because not enough attention has been paid or because atavistic forces are at work, but it may also reappear because of a need to include everything, or not to exclude anything. It is this desire for totality – from the perspective of the work of art itself – that theorising has no right to subsume under universal or anthropological categories.

I am thinking of PCR's "self-portraits", of some of his recent "landscapes", of a certain "bird" collection and also, perhaps, of his "flowers". I am mindful, above all, that such work going back to representation cannot be seen separately from what has been a prolific multiplication of the directions his work has taken – or from the "languages" he has used, as one would tend to write in a more pedagogical manner – mainly over the last ten years. I see various plausible angles of reflection in this multiplicity: not only the desire for totality, but also the game based on certainty, the question of the difference-indifference of means, the move towards de-compartmentalising things, the building of a centre-free centre.

**SIMPLICITY** | The desire for totality has various facets. From incorporating languages to reconverting history, from capturing daily objects to capturing the heart of personal signs.

The method goes like this: unfolding itself ad infinitum so that it becomes simple. Infinitely simple.

**RUINS** | Every time they appear in PCR's work, his ruins seem to be neither chance occurrences owing to an accident or damaging, nor are they the mere result of passing time; and neither are they the simple decayed vestiges

of a splendid past which he would like to evoke or recall in some way. On the contrary, it becomes quite clear that his ruins are a conceptual instrument, a mental tool, and make an intricate part of his working methodology. Archaeological material, without a doubt, but something that may only be understood as some kind of archaeology of the future. Or even more succinctly put: the archaeology of a timeless time. (In fact, the Greek concept of "arché" may only be interpreted out of a time context!)

As a methodology, the ruins are the real departure point. Or rather, they are far from being the traces of another departure point, lost in time, rooted in the past, where they have to be rebuilt, re-interpreted, restored to what they once were or what they once meant. They are a diagram, a project, which provides a beginning. It is useful to develop this idea much further: ruins allow us to start from zero. But this zero is not nothingness. More than anything else, it is not a feeling of emptiness. It is a mathematical zero, it is the sort of zero that is called the origin in a co-ordinated system. And in a co-ordinated system, the origin does not exist without the coordinated system. It only makes sense when placed within the diagram. If it is a feeling, a zero of this kind would only be a feeling of plenitude. What this means to say is, that by resorting to his methodology of ruins, PCR has found an exacting way of dealing with the problem of ex nihilo creation. From an experiential, or rather, empirical and existential, point of view, nothingness does not exist: we are always a body weighed down by a multi-secular, multi-personal burden, by accumulated experiences, studied notions, ideological effects, small and great conditioning factors, contingencies and determining factors. However, from a conceptual point of view – that is, transcendental, to use Kant's terms – it is in fact possible to cut with contingency and seek a radical origin.

The move is very simple, but only becomes understandable through an analogy with mathematics. It is enough to say: it does not matter what was there before the ruin, what its history is; the only thing that matters is what may be done with it, what may be built on the basis of its diagrammatic nature. Or according to the shadow it casts. And this implies that what is possible, in a mathematical sense, is everything.

**ELEGANCE (RUINS II)** | In a recent interview, PCR referred to this complexity by using an allegory. When he was asked whether his work was not an exercise in destruction, and whether the construction he produces would not be accomplished by means of de-constructing, he answered elegantly by telling a short story. He said he preferred seeing himself as someone working with "ruins" and added: "As an artist I am at the rear of a caravan collecting the remnants deposited by all those who have gone before me. It is with these remains that I construct an image, something akin to a shadow, an ephemeral image, but one of the highest circumspection". But he went on, introducing into the continuity depicted by the image of the caravan, the element causing the breach, one that radically revolutionises the sense of it. "Someone in the desert at night [...] moves away from the caravan and loses his way [...]. He simply isolates himself, leaves the caravan and his footsteps trace their own path soon to be erased by the wind. [...] He has the capacity not only to put astronomical orientation to a different use, not only to see, but he can also record and establish his own geography. He knows what he has to do".

What in fact is important here, is the "circumspection" and the "moving away". It is the link between these two factors that tells us exactly what the role is of a methodology of "ruins" (or "remains").

But because it is the "moving away" that opens the way to "circumspection", it is necessary to start off by examining the former. Let us see how. History is a "caravan in the desert". What this picture tells us in its own clear way, is remarkable. We have a pre-defined sojourn from one point to another; we have a trail which is always the same over and over again; we have a guiding system in the stars, which allows the caravan to make its way in this repetition without getting lost; but above all, we have the immensity of the desert all around us, or rather, we have the inexhaustible indeterminacy of all the possibilities around the trajectory chosen by history. The remains left along the way by the caravan are, without doubt, the signs of its passing, of its trail and of those who have made it. But they are also something else: as they are the refuse, the wastes of history, as they do not matter, as no one wants them and they are of no use to anyone, the remains are exactly the picture of what history did not wish to be. A kind reverse image of what history could have been but was not. They have no exchange value, they have lost the use they once had and therefore the whole value of their use has disappeared. As a result, they are suitable for everything else that history was not. They are, in fact, at zero-point.

The person drawing up the tail end of the caravan has, in his collection of remains, the possibility of glimpsing at innumerable variations of history, which never quite became part of history. In moving away, in taking another path, he does not only choose his own variation of history. In moving off, he chooses another history of mankind. (In choosing thus, would it mean something fleeting? Yes, because everything that is not eternal is ephemeral. And this line of thought is not founded in any nostalgia for eternity.)

**MUSICALITIES** | Before we go onto what "circumspection might be, it still seems necessary to examine the decision to "move away": the one who moved away from the caravan, moved off precisely because "he knows what he has to do". The formula PCR uses when speaking about "moving away" does not exactly have the ring of decision-making about it, expressing an individual will. It is more in tune with the narrative musicality of the formulae about a destiny or a calling, which is characteristic of mythical language.

I prefer to think that such words as destiny, calling – vocation – should be understood as signs at a second level. Not as if we could believe in the semantics of the words themselves, but as signs of what these terms fail to say directly but which they imply obliquely. They imply – and here is the first aspect – that they reject any kind of explanation based on cause, be it more sociological or more psychological, of what leads an artist to become an artist. And they therefore reject any sort of enlightened explanation of everything that happens from then on. They likewise imply – and here is the second aspect – a certain kind of finality: only from the horizon aimed at, or in other words, only with regard to a knowledge revealed, can certain acts, certain procedures, certain decisions obtain their sense. There is however, a third aspect: such signs imply a radical certainty that has no yardstick against which to be measured. This certainty may perhaps seem the same as will, the sense that will imprints upon acts. However, as of late, I have begun to doubt my own somewhat vitalistic – certainly Nietzschean – understanding of PCR's aesthetic thinking. I have begun to see in this certainty the marks of an operation of analogy with theology. The will might provide personal certainty. But, what we are dealing with here, as we have seen, does not have to do primarily with the person.

**THEOLOGY** | "Seek and ye shall find!"

It does not say how we should search or what we should search for. Which is the same as saying: “plunge deeply into the darkness of chance and the certainty is all yours”. The certainty is certainly out there, somewhere in the darkness, perhaps even at the centre of chance. Perhaps, for sure.

What is a theology if not a theory of suturing, a (post-mythical) rationality, which is there for stitching up the wound of irrationality, the interminable unliveable gash of uncertainty. What is important for the workings of the analogy here is that theology is carried forward not by denying the denial (the will, Nietzsche’s “yes to life” is a methodology of pathos against pathos, denying another denial which is the metaphor of death), but within the denial until, through a sudden detour impossible to demonstrate, at the darkest point of the denial, the certainty of affirmation is found.

This is what is implied by “moving away” from the caravan trail. Plunging into the haziest of chance occasions of all that history could have been but was not, and finding there, in the darkest of the darkness, the certainty of another history – or of another “geography” as PCR also says – which, once it has been found, allows for a total view of everything around.

But we should not forget: the one looking around, the one undertaking this “circumspection”, is not the person but the giving.

**DOORS** | Upon a door frame, leaning against it, is a sheet of painted glass. Thus placed, the glass tells me of (a) non-transposition; (b) a rigorous surface; (c) fragility; (d) a reflected image of me to myself.

When Narcissus sees himself mirrored in the water, he does not only see himself. He also sees the sky, the clouds, the branch of a tree, the entire universe. He sees what cannot be seen if not through this instrument of observation: I, myself in the universe as a whole. In the end, Narcissus turns his gaze away from his own reflection so as to use the mirrored surface of the water as an instrument. As an instrument giving him, as the “I”, to the entire universe.

This being the case, the reflected image entails a turning away of one’s gaze. Or the turning away of one’s body.

Relocating one’s body so that this motion is the means by which to see the entire transfigured universe.

Narcissus knows about non-transposition, interdiction. There is another side to the door. However, the interdiction does not reside in not being allowed to go through it. It lies in the impossibility of coming back.

But Narcissus also knows that the mirror in the water is fragile. This is why his gaze is sometimes frozen, resting only on the surface, seeking to retain it. Attracted by the water’s pure reflexive quality, the gaze loses its focus on the reflected images in order that it might hang onto another image: a crystal surface. This is the wound-free surface.

**QUOTATION** | One day, a long time ago, a man who had dedicated the greater part of his labour to the most complicated philosophical questions about language, told me: “Words don’t really matter.”

Even today, I am still discovering plausible meanings of this statement.

(I would love to have been able to write this essay in just this way. On the far side of the superficiality of words. Something to be heard without bothering about the words.)

**DENIAL** | A psychoanalyst may be tempted to interpret some statements in PCR’s interviews as a form of denial. For example, what he says about “suicide”, “death”, “rivers”, “quaysides”, “departures”. And maybe also about “staging”. But psychoanalysis, which has a lot of theory about mirrors, has very little theory about mirror-doors. It would have to acknowledge the non-return.

**ENERGIES** | If we wish to look for energies that set a great piece of art into motion, we would always have to do two things: the first is to look sideways, transversally, obliquely; the second would be to join together the extremes.

**DISTURBANCE** | Looking sideways is a necessity that becomes more obvious materially when we are standing in front of a plate glass that reflects our own image. Our presence, in front of the object, disturbs it.

However, it is useless to want to do away with our reflection. What we should do is start seeing through the eyes of our reflection.

**EXTREMES** | Joining together the extremes does not mean adding them together. And it certainly does not mean making them symmetrical. Movement and rest are not symmetrical. The same may be said of extremes that are only dichotomies in appearance, such as life/death, war/peace, light/dark, subject/object, and many others.

(Join the extremes thus: the sky and the bottom under the water.)

**RULE** | A useful rule for thinking as thinking-that-seeks: where you find a dichotomy, test the gender-species relationship. Examples. Try to understand light as a species of darkness. Try to see peace as a species of a gender, which is war. Try to understand the beautiful as a species of a gender that would be ugliness, or harmony as a species of conflict. Affirmation as a species of denial.

Likewise, though, try to understand negation and denial as a species of affirmation. If you do so, you will always see more than you did before.

**ENDS** | Health would be a species of sickness, or could it be that sickness is a species of health? How to decide which of the extremes of a dichotomy is the gender and which the species? What is interesting in determining the gender-species relationship is that it implies a direction of one’s thoughts. Direction is orientation leading somewhere, to something. This being the case, before I decide on the relationship, I first have to know where I want to get to.

What I want to do. The end I have in mind has to tell me whether A is the gender where species B may be found, or if B is the gender where species A may be found. If there are two ends in sight instead of only one, the case may arise where the relationship is valid from A to B and at the same time, from B to A. If the two ends I have in mind are not contradictory, the contradiction between the A-B and B-A relationships is illusive.

Furthermore: the relationship’s inverted duplication expresses the unity of the ends.

**ABILITY** | What PCR has been constructing for a long time is a method able to deal with all things. Nothing has the privilege of being left outside, untouched.

Outside is a species of the gender that he has called “the place-of-the-inside”.

**HISTORY** | To tell the truth, I started off here: history is a species of the gender that is the history of art.

**PROCESSES** | Some speak of an artist's work by using architectural metaphors, such as a building, foundations, platforms, cupolas, etc. I prefer other metaphors, more organic ones, or more chemical, or more mechanical, or more economic, or more warlike, or more political, or... This is why I speak of energies. It matters very little what the actual results are, the ergon. The result does not speak, it imposes itself. If it speaks, it does so afterwards. As an interpretation, as an explanation. It is demagogic. What matters are the processes. Processes and procedures. It is there that the energeia is legible. Not the processes which may lie behind the work of art. Not the making of it, not the technique, not the fingers at work. Above all, not the psychology. The processes matter, yes, but the processes in the work of art... Whatever it means. "Giving" is the word that I found for this processing feature in the work of art.

**PASSIONS** | For a long time, the subject was excluded from art. It has returned today. The subject is coming back everywhere. Not only in art, but also in philosophy, science, history. In philosophy, it is fairly clear that the subject has returned not so much as the topic of the subject, but above all, as philosophy-as-subject. For this to have happened, it is, in fact, necessary to study the passions, the passive face of activity. The subject is not the one that does, that says, organises, creates, perceives, etc. The subject has become that which, being the subject to something, for this very reason, confers otherwise lacking legitimacy to that which it is subject to. Giving is passion par excellence. Giving, therefore, is the subject which confers us legitimacy.

**HOUSES** | At times it dawns upon me that they, the houses, mainly when they are impenetrable, when they climb up walls or when doors and windows become opaque, when they are wrapped in waterproof sheeting and tar, are the most perfect image of a centre without a centre.

**WORDS** | Not all the terms in a vocabulary without a centre, therefore, suffer from the same lack of centrality.

© 2003 All rights reserved.

Originally published in "Pedro Cabrita Reis", by Hatje Cantz Publishers, 2003