

We know that a text does not consist of a line of words, releasing a single (...) meaning (...), but is a space of many dimensions, in which are wedded and contested various kinds of writing, no one of which is original: the text is a tissue of citations, resulting from the thousand sources of culture

1.

Text means Tissue; but whereas hitherto we have always taken this tissue as a product, a ready-made veil, behind which lies, more or less hidden, meaning (truth), we are now emphasizing, in the tissue, the generative idea that the text is made, is worked out in a perpetual interweaving...

2.

lost in this tissue—this texture—the subject unmakes himself, like a spider dissolving in the constructive secretions of its web.

3.

... admit that writing is precisely working (in) the in-between, inspecting the process of the same and of the other without which nothing can live (...) a multiple and inexhaustible course with millions of encounters and transformations of the same into the other and into the in-between...

4.

For me, writing is choreography that remains in motion as it spills over and unfolds in multiple directions at once. Writing is something that has the ability to move, and as it moves, I move with it.

5.

[Texts are] acts encapsulated in time, 'enacted' every time they are spoken aloud or read silently. I like to think of them as performances and not as inert and 'dead' objects

6.

To write means to knead and mold the material of language, to search for words, to carefully build sentences and to invent new concepts. Writing is transforming thinking into text and prodding the text into existence. Somewhere during this process, the text will take over and start to 'speak' of its own accord.

7.

Whom are we writing for, anyway, in a given instance, and what work do we want our [writing] to do?

8.

Finally, what about us—the writers—in all of this? What do we want to get out of writing? Are there ways we might think differently about what and how we write that would give us more pleasure and a deeper sense of purpose?

9.

...what I want to call performative writing does not project a self, even a radically destabilized one, as much as a relation of being and knowing that cuts back and forth across multiple “divisions” among selves, contexts, affiliations such that (...) “the self is not simply put forward, but (...) is reworked in its enunciation”

10.

A celebration of the blurred boundary, mixed allegiance, and non-territoriality. Unrooted and uprooting. Reveling in deviation, hodgepodge, mishmash, digression, departure, dispersal, coalescence, miscellany, and diversity.

11.

The writer and the world's bodies intertwine in (...) intimate co-performance of language and experience.

12.

... challenging the boundaries of reflexive textualities; relieving writing of its obligations under the name of “textuality”; shaping, shifting, testing language. Practicing language. Performing writing. Writing performatively.

13.

The English with which I write is neither my “mother tongue” nor is it singular. It is an English cognizant of other languages. It is an English that activates its syntax through the syntax of both itself and others. It is an English that is increasingly interrupted by and intersected with other lexicons, with the “foreign” words it has assimilated over centuries, and with other sounds. It is an English that rejects any authority of “authenticity” and instead revels in its bastard status because my context has never been and will never be monolingual.

14.

Materializing possibility in and through a kind of writing that is distinctly performative: writing that recognizes its delays and displacements while proceeding as writing toward engaged, embodied, material ends.

15.

– At a certain point in your writings, you discuss what that writing means for you as a place to share thinking as a process, to witness that thinking in its messy and poetic burgeoning rather than in a final state.

– Yes, exactly.

16.

I am interested in the ontics and antics of significant otherness, in the on-going making of partners through the making itself, in the making of bodies lived in the game.

17.

the partners are precisely what come out of inter- and intra-relating of fleshy, significant, material-semiotic being

18.

For us it is writing for living and living for writing and becoming one with our affective and embodied writing as if the writing produced our existence as much as we produced writing.

19.

Writing is not the self-assertion of a rationally ordained imaginative subject, rather its eviction. It has to do with emptying out the self, opening it up to possible encounters with a number of affective outsides.

20.

The theoretical text is to be approached not as the written statement of truths sanctified by the authority of the author or proper nouns that signs it. It rather functions on the model of interconnection, as a navigational tool in a collectively shared cartography of discursive, affective, and social relations

21.

there is no such thing
as “getting it right”,
only “getting it”
differently contoured
and nuanced

22.

Meaning production therefore does not function in terms of the author’s “intentions” and the reader’s “reception,” but rather in a much wider, more complex set of possible resonances and interconnections

23.

It is timely, then, to reconsider how and why we write.

24.

*Not disorientation but a shift in orientation.
Elemental transformation. Composition.
Composure. Compose. Fall into an arrangement.*

25.

Something from each of you, from each of us.
Small pieces of thread and fabric, of selves sharing,
reaching out into the spaces between us,
between ourselves and our selves.

26.

These phrases return,
call to me,
evoke a response,
call my body to respond,
to open arms and gather in
Gathering in,
gathering others, gathering ourselves, gathering pieces.
Quilting with words. Writing in a room with all of you.

27.

JUST WRITE, WRITE, WRITE

28.

References

26. 27. Alexander, D., Bradford, J., Gannon, S., Murray, F., Partridge, N. Simopoulou, Z., Wyatt, J., McCulloch, C., Naylor, A., and Williams, L. 2018. An Experiment in Writing that Flows: Citationality and Collaborative Writing. In: *Writing with Deleuze in the Academy*, 107-117. Ed. by Riddle, S., Bright, D., Honan, E. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2065-1_8
6. Anzaldúa, G. 1987, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*, San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 67
11. 14. Avasilichioaei, O. 2016. Linguistic Alter-Ec(h)o. *Town Crier*. October 12, 2016. URL: <https://expuritan.ca/blog/language-ecosystem> last retrieved Sept. 29. 2023.
8. 9. Bammer, A., Joeres, RE.B. 2015. Introduction. In: Bammer, A., Joeres, RE.B. (eds) *The Future of Scholarly Writing*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York: 2. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137505965_1
1. Barthes, R. 1967. The Death of the Author. First published in *Aspen*, No 5+6. The Minimalism issue. URL: <https://www.ubu.com/aspen/aspen5and6/threeEssays.html#barthes> Last retrieved 21.10.2024
2. 3. ———. 1973. *Le Plaisir du texte*. Éditions du Seuil. Transl. by R. Miller: *The Pleasure of the Text*. Hill and Wang. 1975.
20. 21. 23. Braidotti, R. 2011. *Nomadic Subjects. Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. Columbia University Press.
4. Cixous, H. 2010. *Le Rire de la Méduse*. Galilée. Transl. by P. Cohen and K. Cohen: *The Laugh of the Medusa*. California State University (Original published in 1975).
25. Cocker, E., 2018. Writing without writing: conversation-as-material. In *The Creative Critic: Writing as/about Practice*, K. Hilevaara and E. Orley, (eds.), 47-54. Routledge.
16. Cotter, L. (ed.). 2019. *Reclaiming Artistic Research*. Hatje Cantz.
17. 18. Haraway, D. J. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble. Making Kin in the Chtulucene*. Duke University Press.
10. 12. 13. 15. Pollock, D. 1998. Performing writing. In P. Phelan & J. Lane (Eds.), *The Ends of Performance*, 73–103. New York University Press.
19. Rantala, T., Leppänen, T., & Koro, M. 2020. Mucous Bodies, Messy Affects, and Leaky-Writing in Academia. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 19 (5). Retrieved from <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/taboo/vol19/iss5/8>
22. Richardson L., St. Pierre E. A. 2005. Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In Denzin N. K., Lincoln Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.) 959-978. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
28. St. Pierre, E. A. 2018. Writing Post Qualitative Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24(9), 603– 608. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417734567>
5. 24. Ulmer, J. B. 2018. Composing Techniques: Choreographing a Postqualitative Writing Practice. *Qualitative Inquiry* 24(9): 728-736. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417732091>
7. Wesseling, J. 2016. Why Write? On Writing as Art Practice. In H. Borgdorff and A. Lewin (eds.), *SAR International Conference Catalogue: Writing*. Amsterdam: Society for Artistic Research & The Hague: University of the Arts, 2016. <https://www.analyticalpha.nl/alphalab-tools/sow-for-teachers/why-write-on-writing-as-art-practice/> last retrieved Oct. 1. 2023.