

ANNIKA WIK

Sharing Stories

My first encounter with Esther Shalev-Gerz's work was in 2002 at the Historiska Muséet in Stockholm. I had been invited to contribute to a seminar at the museum by giving a presentation of a part of my Ph.D. thesis about artists using existing film material within the contemporary art scene.¹ I remember sometime around this occasion, standing between the two projections of Åsa Simma, the participant in Shalev-Gerz's artwork *White Out-Between Telling and Listening* (2002) and, being fascinated by her appearance. I also recall being struck that I tended to be more interested in the images of her listening than those of her telling her story. My thoughts were wandering towards the project in relation to Historiska Muséet as an institution. Who do we allow to decide how history is represented? How do we decide what to collect? What stories are relevant to tell and preserve? How can Simma's and, for that sake my personal story, take part in a museum that represents history?

When standing between the two screens of Åsa Simma in the Fall of 2012 in Lausanne the same work communicated something completely different to me. This time I was much more taken by Simma's story. I was overwhelmed by how she was sharing her story and I was fascinated by the reception and the interaction of the other visitors in the room.

In the Fall of 2010 I was invited to be a co-researcher on Esther Shalev-Gerz's research project *Trust and the Unfolding Dialogue* with Stephanie Baumann and Jason E. Bowman. During the first three months of the project I mainly worked on gaining deeper knowledge of Esther Shalev-Gerz's art productions and publications. Parallel to this I prepared a one-day workshop for the two of us that took place in my apartment in Stockholm in March 2011. I wanted to introduce her to my perspective as a film theorist and at the same time test some ideas on how I saw her work, or more exactly, how I as a film theorist, understand her method of working as an artist. Departing from

Shalev-Gerz artworks, I had mapped out a number of dialogue scenes in fiction films I considered relevant for me in order to open up a dialogue with her and her artwork. I wanted to hear her thoughts on the audio-visual representation of dialogue in three films that I found interesting in relation to her art: *Persona* by Ingmar Bergman (1966), *Cléo from 5 to 7* by Agnès Varda (1962) and *Angst essen Seele auf* by Rainer Werner Fassbinder (1974).

Maybe it is impossible to investigate someone else's methodology from the outside without paying too much attention to the intention of the artist, but within the framework of this project I found it intriguing to try to identify and describe Esther Shalev-Gerz's artistic method from a perspective based more on reception and contextualization. My first approach, after the workshop, was to apply a film theoretical aesthetic perspective to her work and to compare her working method with that of Ingmar Bergman's in *Persona*. In the text that ensued, "In-between: The Cut" which was published in the catalogue for Shalev-Gerz's 2012 retrospective at the Musée cantonal des Beaux Arts in Lausanne, I compared different artistic methods in order to put words to and understand Shalev-Gerz's dialogical aspect of her work, focusing on editing and specifically in her conceptual approach to editing.ⁱⁱ As the project continued I wanted to engage more deeply with Shalev-Gerz's artistic method-in relation not only to 'dialogue' but also to 'trust'. By studying her moving image material I wanted to see how I could gain deeper theoretical knowledge and thereby further understand the roles of both trust and dialogue in her work. In order to establish and communicate what trust and dialogue mean to her practice, I have therefore teased out here a number of instances in which I feel the two notions appear most clearly in her work. By doing this I hope to show how dialogue is a tool and trust is a condition that opens up shared experiences in Esther Shalev-Gerz's art.

Inviting Participants

Esther Shalev-Gerz was an early proponent of working with participation within art, long before it became the established artistic praxis that it is today. She works with extensive processes, most often by commission and site-specifically. Almost her entire oeuvre contains some element of inviting participants to share their opinion, reflection or story and giving them a central role in the project. In this process she always works with people who have experienced the stories they share. Never does she work with actors. This seems to be of great importance for achieving authenticity, and more importantly, in order for the stories to become accessible. The participants can be many or few, but what they have in common is that those who are invited to participate are trusted to share their stories with the viewer and the world through art. Shalev-Gerz is together with us, in this part, yet another listener or witness to the participants' (hi)story.

One of Esther Shalev-Gerz's most recent artworks, *Describing Labor* (2012), shows how she, in her method, generates accessibility by incorporating the personal. The participants' personal way of relating to the objects they describe gives us an entry to history. The choice of participants in the artistic process is both specific and yet haphazard. The participant is not there to bring something pre-determined to the project. In this particular project

the participants were art specialists, curators and collectors. They were there to tell his or her own stories about art and historical artifacts.

Describing Labor is about the representation of the worker. During her residency in the Wolfsonian-FIU in Miami Beach in 2011, while researching the archive and the collection of the museum, from the industrial revolution between 1885-1945, the artist was struck by the fact that we do not have images of the worker today. So many cameras, so much documentation, and yet no images of the worker. How come? From very thorough research Shalev-Gerz worked her way through the collection and eventually selected 41 artistic depictions of workers. This is where the participants came in.

From the 41 pre-selected objects, participants were asked to choose one piece that they felt drawn to, interested in or perhaps provoked by. They were then asked to describe the item and tell us about it as if in a dialogue with the object. While they constituted this dialogue with the artwork they were filmed by Shalev-Gerz, who is not depicted in the images. At the same time as the participants were describing the objects, they were also implicitly speaking about themselves.

So while describing the chosen art works the participants also shared something of their own history. As Shalev-Gerz works neither with actors nor scripts, she has almost no influence over the stories told. There are no retakes. Speech is undisturbed. The artist is constructing a situation where the personal story has to be trusted. The personal story is what gives us connections to the historical objects, historical things that are stored and preserved in collections and institutions where we treat, deal with and shape history.

The stories told in *Describing Labor* are addressed to me as a visitor, viewer and listener, but also become a contribution to the institution and its storing of history. To achieve this dialogue the stories and reflections need to be personal and at the same time formal, they also need to be specific but somehow general. This way the personal story can add a layer to our institutionalized history. The dialogue between the stored art objects in the collection, chosen first by the artist and later by the participant, tell us about our history and how it is constructed and can be reconstructed by layers of personal stories, all framed by the institution. It takes certain courage to share a description or a story, and even more to share something so profound as one's own experiences and histories. The stories and experiences that the participants share in front of the camera will be shared with the audience in the exhibition. The dialogues that start on a small scale are nurtured and formed there with the art institution as its external frame.

When the participant is invited into a project within an institution, all included in the project invest in particular risk taking. According to Bengt Kristensson Uggla, Amos Anderson Professor in Philosophy, Culture and Management at Åbo Akademi University and an expert on the philosopher Paul Ricoeur, trust must be treated as a multidimensional relation. It is necessary to understand that trust simultaneously functions as something that

holds us together but always with the risk of keeping us divided.ⁱⁱⁱ This ambivalence forms the basis of his hermeneutic discussion of relationships built on trust; that is in dialogues between people, and our relations to institutions. The personal dialogue is built on trust but can, in certain contexts, spill over into corruptions; the institution, on the other hand, if it follows agreements, certain rules and regulations too strictly, may always risk losing its dialogical function.^{iv} It is the ambivalence within these two positions that shows us that trust, by definition, always encapsulates ambivalence and a certain element of risk in order to overcome distrust.

Listening and Telling

The project *Konstens plats/ The Place of Art* (2006) is a fine example of how simple or open the questions of Shalev-Gerz can be: 'How would you define art?', 'Where is the place in which art happens?'. In the neighborhood of Bergsjön in Gothenburg she posed these questions to thirty-eight artists and their answers revealed how important the simplicity of the questions was. Responding to relatively simple questions, the participants are given the space to answer and tell their stories without feeling categorized by or included in the project because of a preconceived notion of who they are and without expectations of what story they may tell. In this way dialogue and a sense of trust are gradually established in Shalev-Gerz's projects.

The dialogue that is built up between the participant and the artist in Shalev-Gerz's works is the basis of the dialogue that is later established between the audience and the work. Accomplishing such a dialogue requires time and therefore time can be seen as a parameter for establishing trust. Trust is a precondition for sharing one's story, and trust is also necessary in order to come close with the camera. Or as Paul Ricoeur puts it in *Time and Narrative [Temps et récit]*: "[...] time becomes human to the extent that it is articulated through a narrative mode, and narrative attains its full meaning when it becomes a condition of temporal existence".^v

Two distinct components are significant to Shalev-Gerz's process and work—listening and speaking. In the process of making the work, in the encounter with the participants, speaking and listening bear the traits of a conversation, a dialogue, but not in a general way like: "I speak and you listen, you speak and I listen". Perhaps listening has, up until now in this text, appeared as if only belonging to Shalev-Gerz and the viewer. On the contrary: after the speaking and the filming there is often an element when participants engage with the filmed or recorded material. A situation is arranged so that they can listen to the recorded material, or see and hear themselves on film, and while doing this they are once again placed in front of the camera. This time they are not just facing the camera but also themselves. In this way they are, so to speak, literally confronted with their own image and story. The part where the participant is seeing and hearing herself is like a reaction shot stretched out in time, synched with their previously shared story. The work, *White Out-Between Telling and Listening* (2002), that I referred to at the beginning of this text, is an enlightening example of how the participant's reaction to her selves are captured in this type of reflexive mode.

The Saami woman, Åsa Simma is the only participant in *White Out*. Here Simma reacts to a large number of quotations, read by Esther Shalev-Gerz, about the possible similarities of the visions of the Saami and Swedish peoples. Simma's reaction to these quotes is recorded and filmed in her apartment in Stockholm. Two days later Simma and Shalev-Gerz go together to the North of Sweden to the house where Simma grew up. Shalev-Gerz arranged for Simma to listen there, by headphones, to what she had spoken about two days earlier in Stockholm. Simma chose to be outdoors while doing this. While she listens to her own words she is, as described above, being filmed again. So after reacting to something she hears in Stockholm, and talking about that, she then reacts to her own reaction. As she stands in the surroundings in which her life story is set, it appears as if she is seriously listening to her own story, and that this is very unusual for her.

Simma's immediate response was, according to the artist, interestingly enough: 'I did not know I was so personal'.^{vi} Once again we see how Shalev-Gerz's method allows for an entry into history on a personal level or, to put this in other words, how the personal dialogue is necessary in order to keep an ongoing dialogue with history and the way it is shaped by our institutions and us.

Filming this process, when Simma listens to herself, creates a psychological and mental space from which the viewer witnesses Simma's reaction, while at the same time a space is created for the viewer to reflect on her own life story. Where does it take place? How does it sound? Have I, you, she, ever seriously listened to our own story?

The story being transmitted has a clear narrative point of view—Simma talks about herself in the first person. Kristensson Ugglå speaks of what he calls the grammar of trust and how it occurs as a socio-cultural infrastructure that makes it possible to 'speak as well as be spoken to or spoken about from different personal pronouns'.^{vii} He asks rhetorical questions: 'How is it possible that I can understand a personal form of address when someone says "you," or how we can understand an "I" when others say "he" or "she" about us? How do we know that it is about me?'^{viii} Using Paul Ricoeur's investigation of identity problematics in *Soi-même comme un autre / Oneself as Another* (1990/1992), and his triadic structure, Kristensson Ugglå answers his own question in the following way:

'The shift of roles that is made possible through the use of different personal pronouns referring to one and the same person, implies a communicative structure that relates *self understanding* (of an "I" in the first person) to *dialogical understanding* (with a "you" in the second person) and *objectifying statements* (in the form of "he," "she," "it" in the third person)'.^{ix}

When Simma first tells her story she does so using "I" in the first person, when she listens and reacts to her own self, her dialogical understanding of herself is separated between an "I", a "you" and a "she". In the formal structure of the work, as in so many of Shalev-Gerz's artworks, the grammar of trust is brought to the fore via the

artistic practice and its exhibitionary presentation. The whole triad of pronouns, including the objectifying statement slides, shifts and is included in the work *and*, as we will see, in its spatial and temporal arrangement.

Inviting the Audience

White Out featuring Åsa Simma is projected on two screens. The viewer is free to move around these. On one screen we see and hear Simma as she talks in Stockholm. The viewer is easily drawn into her vivid and beautiful story. The visitors are positioned as listeners. On the other screen Simma's attentive mode also calls for attention as her listening and watching from this screen becomes a further element of presence in the room. There, in other surroundings, with the wind in her hair and nature behind her, Simma is seen in a different place. Listening to herself, she stands concentrated, touched and proud. At times she laughs, at other times she regards herself with tenderness, and as a viewer I move my attention back and forth between the two screens in the gallery.

The gap between the two images creates a space for the viewer to enter. It is a space in-between speaking and listening, between the person and her story, between the participant and myself, between the self and the other. That which is called *shared experience* within film phenomenology^x, or an experience of an experience, is here depicted in the format of an installation. My experiences are placed in direct dialogue with Simma's lived experience. And it is even more complex, with the experience which the work transmits—the depiction of my, your, his, or her life story activates or creates a dialogue with my own story, switching between different personal pronouns. *White Out* shows how Esther Shalev-Gerz methodologically finds ways to artistically render the direct life experience of people; and in doing so, in her *gestaltning*, manages to capture and show the other in our selves. I can switch from being the teller to the listener, and once again Ingmar Bergman's film *Persona* becomes an important reference for me to clarify my argument.

In *Persona*, a drama is enacted between two women. Elisabeth Vogler is a renowned actress who suddenly falls into existential doubt during one of her appearances on stage and decides to stop speaking. She is placed in a nursing ward, where nurse Alma is designated as her personal caretaker. Before the women's faces are combined in the emblematic image often used to represent the film, there is a long scene in two parts. The scene is about Elisabeth's sense of being a mother, and it is a story told, on the soundtrack by Alma exactly the same way twice. Even the choice of shots is identical, with the sole difference being that it is first Elisabeth, the listener, whom we see portrayed and then Alma, the speaker. Both versions of the story conclude with an extreme close-up. We take part in the same story from the perspectives of the speaker and the listener, and depending on whether we see them as two different women or two sides of one woman, we are given images of someone seriously listening to her own story, someone listening to herself.

The two women in the film being two and one at the same time is a powerful tool in this metafilm to *gestalt* the slippage between the "I" and the image; or narration of the "I", reality and representation, or shifting subject positions. In a similar way to how Bergman chose to make Elisabeth the silent and Alma the speaking parts,

Shalev-Gerz separates sound and image in order to position the viewer in-between an I. Both Bergman and Shalev-Gerz twist the way of representing the complexity of a person, or add extra layers, in order to open up characters or participants, initiating a space in-between the persona and the I of the viewer, by which they may enter in-between their self and the image of the self.

When Alma's story is told twice, once with the camera on Alma telling and once on Elisabeth listening, Bergman opens a space for the viewer to reflect herself in the double position of the other and at the same time the double position of herself – thus the viewer is placed in between the I and the representation, like in a hall of mirrors.

With *White Out*, I stand behind a woman representing herself and the same woman responding to that representation. There is a striking difference between the two subjects in spite the fact that she is one and the same, and it makes me conscious of the fact that there is a similar intermediacy or possible displacement within myself.

Sound and Image

In Bergman's film all this happens on one screen and in one film. In Esther Shalev-Gerz' works the gap between the different positions of listening and telling, and sound and image is usually spread out in different elements within the installation and its exhibiting. In a work such as *First Generation* (2003) she separates sound and image so that the viewer first encounters extreme close-ups of faces outside the building and only upon entering sound becomes present. The opposite happens in *Sound Machine* (2008). Outside the exhibition space the visitor can hear the sound of machines and once inside the building she can see the women, depicted in front of silent machines with which they share history. A similar gap as that between the "I," the "you," and the "he," or "she" on the two screens is created in several of Shalev-Gerz's works through this separating of elements.

Film is characterized by an extension in time and movement. In order to achieve filmic movement a process is required that consists of two mutually dependent parts: the analysis, or breaking down of a movement, and the synthesis of that movement.^{xii} The analysis includes dissolving the movement into separate elements, and these are then reassembled in a way that achieves movement. The second part, the synthesis, implies constructing a movement on the basis of fixed, stationary points. For the movement to be reproducible or able to be created by technology one has to understand that the movement comes about in the intervals between the still images and this is linked to the phi phenomenon, i.e. an element linked to perception psychology.^{xiii} From a film theory perspective filmic movement does of course occur in the film sequences of Shalev-Gerz's work. But over and above that, I mean that she—using similar principles as filmic movement consisting of analysis and synthesis—creates an equivalent to this movement by the separation and linking of different elements in her installations. By keeping together and apart, merging and dividing, with someone who speaks, someone who is listening, even if to herself, we see how a form of movement arises in the work. First dissolved then assembled, the viewer can literally step into the intervals or gaps between the parts. Those parts that Shalev-Gerz separates and assembles are all loaded with a communicative structure, what I suggest Kristensson Ugglå terms the grammar of trust.

Through analysis, breaking down the story into separate elements, and synthesis, then putting the same elements back together, the artist evokes a spatiotemporal dynamic or movement that I argue has its origins in the logic of filmic movement but is relational to trust in its emphasis of simultaneously holding together and allowing the risk involved in keeping apart.

Composing the Experience

By separating elements, sound and image, speaking and listening, subject and object, a spatio-temporality is inscribed into what can be seen as gaps, intervals or cuts in the presentation of Shalev-Gerz' works. Through the formal expression these gaps becomes spatial and temporal, and viewers can, through their own presence, reassemble these elements in exhibitions and via this process include their own experiences with those of other viewers. To Shalev-Gerz another's narrative seems to imply placing the viewer between the separated elements, and once there, bringing together the temporality of the moving images and the personal stories of others with different layers of our own shared stories and shared history.

The film theorist Jacques Aumont argues that it is important to differentiate two possible perspectives: the created space-time in the image or the time of film viewing.^{xiii} In *White Out* the space-time created is visible in the representation of the story told by Simma and the story she listens to. We see her talk and we see her listen. One screen is sound-based, the other image-based and together they synch numerous time planes. The experience of time becomes evident in the audience's way of bringing together the different parts. At the same time another instance of separation and re-joining emerges, another border is evoked or revoked. What Aumont calls 'image time' and 'spectator time' is being blurred in the work through the spatial composition as a whole.^{xiv} In an interesting way *White Out* illuminates the striving to let the distinction between 'image time' and 'experienced time' become clearly visible while letting it slide between the two. This shows how *White Out* and other artworks by Shalev-Gerz, which consist of separate elements, establish a relationship with the viewer in a constructed space where the viewer is activated by being allowed to reassemble the pieces and continue the dialogue started between artist and participant. Just as movement is a result of analysis and synthesis in the mind of the viewer, my understanding of the other happens when sharing the other's experience. Only when the parts have been joined and the dialogue has taken shape can the viewer experience her own experience—as a combination of 'image time' and 'experienced time'.

Documenting the Process

Esther Shalev-Gerz's artistic production is multifaceted and richly detailed. Although it is direct and accessible, engaging with her work over a longer period of time offers reward.

In between the two occasions of spectatorship separated by ten years with which I started this text, I have had the opportunity to closely read texts and view documentation of her work. I have taken part in the extensive, meticulous documentation and multidimensional philosophical writings on the works, which is emblematic for

books about Shalev-Gerz's works. In doing this I have been struck by how consistent Shalev-Gerz's method is in relation to documentation. From my point of view studying documentation has similarities to what occurs when a participant is sharing their personal stories. However, this time I am the participant bringing my personal story to the documentation of a project. Just as the participants' contributions add a layer to the institutional historical version of something, let's say representation of history, I, as a reader of the documentation, can bring my own reactions and different interpretations to it. In dialogue with the documentation I bring my personal stories to something consistent, to the institutional version of the work. It is not just a dialogue with memories, it is a document that I can relate to and that I can have a dialogue with, and also something I can return to time after time. Once again the quote from Paul Ricoeur come to my mind: "[...] *time becomes human to the extent that it is articulated through a narrative mode, and narrative attains its full meaning when it becomes a condition of temporal existence*".^{xv}

With his examples Kristensson Ugglå asks how we can understand that what is a virtue in dialogical relationships (e.g. friendship) can at the same time become corruption on an institutional level, and how it is possible that virtues such as justice and the rule of law (which are necessary from an institutional perspective) can still appear insufficient for an institution to maintain trust in dialogical relationships to its visitors, users and citizens.^{xvi} Kristensson Ugglå finds the basis for his argument in favor of interpretation and multidimensionality, as well as in his conclusion that we need to keep dialogical and institutional trust both together and apart as exemplified by Ricoeur's philosophy and terminology about establishing "a bridge between 'the prose of justice' (in which one argues) and 'the poetics of love' (where one does not argue), between 'the formal rule' and 'the hymn'".^{xvii}

Sharing the Experience of Experience

Kristensson Ugglå's confidence in philosophy and interpretation, when it comes to problematizing societal and organizational issues, is founded in Paul Ricoeur's faith in bridging the gap between explaining and understanding, as well as regulating and expressing the narrative. Kristensson Ugglå's practical application and Ricoeur's philosophical project have hence formed the foundation of what I have discussed here—trust and confidence in art.

As a humanist I have great faith in the role of art when it comes to creating a space for reflection, and the possibility of connecting with our own lives. I trust in the ability of art to take up contemporary tendencies and make them manifest in unexpected ways. Artistic expressions and shifts make things visible that we perhaps already know but need to see in a different light in order to gain new perspectives.

The acts of communication and the sharing of our life stories with everyone and no-one that we are so occupied with today—for example in social media—perhaps offers a certain kind of space in which one can put oneself in the situation of the other by virtue of the fact that we are increasingly uploading images of events from a first person perspective, and thereby communicating 'This is what it is like to be me'. Whereas previously it was more

common to find an amateur photo of people in front of an attraction, it is sufficient nowadays, to just photograph the attraction as seen from my point of view. But nevertheless the image still communicates 'this is *my* point of view'. So even if there is certain scope for putting oneself in the place of the other, there is still no real slippage or activation of myself as the other. Therefore, the image is still only from the perspective of myself, with a border between "me" and "the other", the one who speaks and the one who listens, and thereby mono-dimensional communication in comparison to the communication described in the artistic method in this text. Fundamentally the difference between 'sharing your story' and 'sharing my, your, his and her story' is the trust that is established in the latter by a multi-layered, artistic *gestaltnig* of personal dialogues anchored in the history and institutions we share.

Esther Shalev-Gerz's art is full of speech acts. She shows great belief in the speech of the other. Letting the other speak to point is an important parameter in her work. By trusting the other to speak and by letting them speak to the audience and the world is her way of showing great trust in art. By establishing trust between speaking and listening, Shalev-Gerz accomplishes a number of transitions that make it possible for the viewer to move in and out of herself. This is made possible because of the ways she provides subjects with a mobility based on a sense of trust, so that there are openings and possibilities to move freely to an in-between of different spatial positions and personal pronouns. The artistic and aesthetical *gestaltnig* make it possible for my personal story to become filtered through the other and myself, and this can lead to a deepened understanding and space for reflection and empathy. By inviting participation, courage and *trust* is at the core of the *gestaltnig*—in the sense of building trust, fostering someone else's or one's own narrative, listening and speaking, filming and its communication and by giving it space and time. In using this method in an artistic project, within a clear framework and a specific context, dialogues can unfold.

In *White Out*, Simma is sharing a fragment of her life. She tells herself and us something about her relation to history. Simultaneously she shares layers of herself and lets us take part in something usually not seen in a dialogue. In conventional representations in moving images of a dialogue, we see reaction shots, one person responding to the other in shot-reverse shot. Here we see Simma's reactions to herself. It is presented so that we simultaneously witness both image-time and experiential-time. Where there would normally be a cut or a seam in representation, a spatiotemporal gap where the personal story enters the viewer's story and vice versa - we are being offered a place in-between.

Shalev-Gerz's artworks are open to shared experience, or an experience of an experience. The ways in which she creates the works and configures them in exhibition activate one's own experiences and by letting the visitor literally stand between sound and image in a narrative – between the telling of the story and the experiencing of it, as well as the close chain of trust in the different parts of her artistic methodology, in dialogue with and framed by the institution – the stories can be received as if my own.

-
- ⁱ Annika Wik, "Filmhistory Now" in *Site*, 3-4, 2002, and *Förebild film. Panoreringar över den samtida konstscenen*, Stockholm: Aura förlag, 2001.
- ⁱⁱ Annika Wik, "In-between: The Cut" / "Entre-deux: Le montage", in *Esther Shalev-Gerz*, ed. Nicole Schweizer, Zürich: JRP Ringier, 2012.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Bengt Kristensson Ugglå, "Förtroendekapitalets komplexitet och mångdimensionalitet", in *Vem i hela världen kan man lita på?. Förtroende i teori och praktik*, ed. Marta Reuter, Filip Wijkström, Bengt Kristensson Ugglå, Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2012, p. 222.
- ^{iv} Kristensson Ugglå, pp. 207-228.
- ^v Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988, p. 52.
- ^{vi} From telephone conversation with Esther Shalev-Gerz in March 2013.
- ^{vii} Kristensson Ugglå [my translation], p. 223.
- ^{viii} Kristensson Ugglå [my translation], p. 222.
- ^{ix} Kristensson Ugglå [my translation], p. 222.
- ^x See for example: Vivian Sobchack, *The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience*, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- ^{xi} Trond Lundemo, "Rörelse", in *Film och andra rörliga bilder. En introduktion*, ed. Anu Koivunen, Stockholm: Raster förlag, 2008, pp. 252-266.
- ^{xii} Lundemo, p. 255.
- ^{xiii} Jacques Aumont, *The Image*, London: Bfi, 1997 [L'Image, 1990], pp. 118-130.
- ^{xiv} Aumont, pp. 120-122.
- ^{xv} Ricoeur, p. 52.
- ^{xvi} Kristensson Ugglå, pp. 224-227.
- ^{xvii} Kristensson Ugglå [my translation], p. 224.