



When working on the reception of art practices/items—not intended for exhibition, but other forms of public access—we have entered the topic of *exposition*: one form of such public access being *research*. How to make sure we get a piece of the action, or a piece of the *art* in the art?

A plausible claim is that by exposing the public to materials downstream of artistic research, they can place themselves upstream of the artistic contents and embody their own ideas of it. However, they are also taking the risk of triggering reactionary attacks from existing cultural discourses.

This places the artist in a perpetual vulnerable condition. As the habilitation s/he seeks for her work can run into disaster. One of the important priorities of artistic research—as a field—may therefore be to put the work of reception on its agenda, to achieve a sufficient artistic- and cultural *precision*.



If we are living through a *crisis* of communication in art—what is the art in art?—is there a *care* for it in artistic research? The idea is that if only we spend time with art, it will deliver its value (or point) as art to us. It is a plausible condition for us to enter a debate on it, and thereby work for it.

Let us define this as a *premise* for the work of reception in the art field: a way of levelling with the existence of an art-item, based on professional respect and artistic trust. What are the entailments for how dissenting with the item, may unfold such that it works *for* art (hatching new repertoires)?

Again, how does the ‘work of reception’ hatch new repertoires in *ways-of-knowing*? In the work of reception that I have done on Mette Edvardsen’s (ed. 2019) book *Time falls asleep in the afternoon sunshine* I first took the book on a walk into a sunset, then I matched a *précis* with images from her.

That is, images she selected *without* aiming at a project narrative, to see if something ‘indigenous’ could hatch from the book, though on *non*-mimetic terms: that is, feature how the art in the book comes out, without our being hostage to her practice. That is, my caring without *a priori* being partisan.

I *can* become partisan through, or *after*, the work of reception: but *not* as a premise, or a ticket. If I make claims to having reaped an understanding from working with the piece, I can do so without being partisan/hostage to it. In the terms of criticality, can one inhabit someone else’s art-practice?

This question is of vital importance to me as an anthropologist. It *could* be relevant to artistic research, if we accept the premise that a practice—as an outcome from an artistic activity—is an [artistic proposition](#). One that seeks to hatch/derive epistemic claims from artistic ideas: communicating the art.

In Laruelle’s idea of non-philosophy as a first science—upstream of *both* science and philosophy (within & beyond)—this claim is an *in one* claim. Our understanding of the art-work is *in* the art-work. This is one step in his programme for radicalising and imploding Deleuze’s *immanent* realism.

However, claiming that the keys to understanding the mountain are in the mountain—if you are a geologist—rather than (say) than from chemistry and astronomy, is not something new. It is the basic attitude of natural history, and in the work-description of a natural historian. So, too, is exhibition.

In the tradition of natural history the exhibition is a *piece* of nature. It claims to be idempotent: $1 + 1 = 1$. But this cannot be proved. It reveals an attitude to what is found interesting: in the work of reception, we are interested in material-presentational aspects, *before* the symbolic-representational ones.

The two simply bring us in very different directions. The priority is argued in this way: if we give precedence to symbolic-representational aspects of an item/practice these will readily *substitute* the material-representational ones. Which means that an opportunity is lost to inquire (publicly) at this level.