

**Bacheloropleiding
Algemene Cultuurwetenschappen**

Docent voor wie dit document is bestemd:

.....
Timotheus Vermeulen
.....

Cursusnaam:

.....
Bachelorwerkstuk
.....

Titel van het document:

.....
Acting the part?
.....

Datum van indiening: 20 Juli 2015

Het hier ingediende werk is de verantwoordelijkheid van ondergetekende. Ondergetekende verklaart hierbij geen plagiaat te hebben gepleegd en niet ongeoorloofd met anderen te hebben samengewerkt.

Handtekening:

.....

.....

Naam student:

.....
Iris Verschuren
.....

Studentnummer:

.....
S4225643
.....



Acting the Part? An analysis of an urban script



Fig. 1 Gabriella Ceom, Studio InterAlter

by
Iris Verschuren
s4225643

Timotheus Vermeulen

BA Paper

28 June 2015

List of Contents

Introduction – 2

Chapter 1: The City as Text – 4

Chapter 2: The City as Performance – 11

Conclusion: The Urban Script – 17

Works Cited – 20

Acting the Part? An analysis of an urban script

For a few seconds nothing happens after you have pressed the play button. Then, all of a sudden, there is a voice addressing you as a visitor of the Swedish city Malmö. It questions if you are a frequent visitor, a tourist or an inhabitant and you probably answer that yourself in your head. I was a tourist and had only arrived in the city a day before. The group I was with, however, I had no idea of if they were strangers like me. This group, including myself, was participating in *From A to B* as part of Malmö Festivalen, the city's summer festival. This so-called performance walk needed a future participant to download an audio beforehand and to put it on any kind of mobile device. Then at a certain time you meet up with other people wanting to take part in this walk in the city center church. When given the sign everyone starts the audio and you are welcomed by a narrator's voice. The rest of the walk you are only required to listen to the voice and, as is explained during the walk and in this paper, to the city.

The creator of this performance walk, artist Tim Bishop, has not made this into a one-time event. He has actually already put two versions out there: one made for the city of Lund and one as described here for Malmö. There is even a third version being performed this summer in another Swedish city, Helsingborg.¹ With each performance he aims to do the same: to lead people on an 'immersive journey' through the cities and to invite 'participants to explore their cities afresh' (Bishop). Urban exploring is in no way something very recent or uncommon. Rather, as David Pinder already points out in his article 'Arts of Urban Exploration' from 2005, artists tend to use it more and more (385). The multiple forms of urban exploration are valuable, as Pinder has argued, to develop critical approaches to the city (385). In this paper I would like to analyse Bishop's *From A to B* and see what kind of representation of the city it presents. Perhaps there is also a critical note to be detected in this

¹ More information about this event can be found on the artist's website: www.timbishopartist.com

performance walk and form of urban exploration.

To figure out what sort of critique *From A to B* could give I will focus on one theme that Pinder has also used in his article: the city as writing. I am taking this concept in a broader sense as the city as text, which allows me to analyse the text that is actually at the basis of Bishop's work. Even though the participants never see this, but only hear it, there is a script that presupposes the performance. Other than looking at the actual text, I also want to take into account the form of *From A to B*. It is not called a performance walk without reason and thus I will also focus on the performance aspects. The urban text is after all not the only concept in urban studies, nor has it been uncontested. The city as performance is a newer idea that adds to or maybe even challenges the less recently developed concept. Apart from exploring them both separately with regards to *From A to B* I also aim to relate the two since I think both are crucial to Bishop's performance walk. Other than looking for a relation between performance and text in the work by the British artist I also want to conclude with an analysis of how the city is represented and if there is a critical note to be found in *From A to B*.

The City as Text

The concept of a city as text developed in the 1970s and 1980s, when the interest in the concept of space increased (Stevenson 54). Deborah Stevenson talks about these theories in her book *Cities and Urban Cultures*. According to her this approach to the urban enabled thinkers and academics ‘to reveal a complex tapestry of meanings and underpinning relations of powers’ by reading the urban ‘texts’ (Stevenson 54). Thinkers such as Roland Barthes and Michel de Certeau have contributed influential theories to the concept. It therefore has a very diverse set of disciplines it lends from. From semiotics and poststructuralism to psychogeography and architecture, they have all had their part in developing concepts of the city as text. It is now considered a very crucial idea in urban studies and one that I find useful to look at *From A to B*. The performance is categorizable within the definition of the urban text that Stevenson presents in her book:

An *urban* text, therefore, can be a physical structure, like an individual building, a monument or a building façade, or it can be a particular ‘lived’ space – a neighbourhood, a park or shopping plaza. An urban text can also be any of the various official and unofficial ways in which the city is represented, including architectural elevations, maps, planning documents and real estate publications, as well as those influential representations of city life and spaces featured in films, music, art, literature and other cultural forms. (Stevenson 59)

Stevenson’s description gives no insight though about what it means for something like the work by Bishop to be considered an urban text. Nor, if we take the idea of the city as text literally, does this definition tell us what kind of text there is to read. If, as Roland Barthes argues, the city is writing what kind of text does it write (95)? If, as Michel de Certeau and others state, the city can be read what kind of text is this (92)? Are there characters? Is there a

protagonist? Does it have a narrative or does it have a certain writing style and use of language? If the city is a text, then to analyse the text would be to analyse the city. To be able to gain insight in this specific representation of the city I will therefore use a textual analysis. The method I am going to use is that of A. J. Greimas's actantial model that allows me to focus on the ongoing action and its actants (Hebert 71).

The model made by Greimas and based on earlier theories by Vladimir Propp focuses on actions and what roles certain elements of the story play with regards to that action. It is acknowledged that one story often has multiple actions and that when viewed from different perspectives the model might be conceived differently (Hebert 71). In other words; there is not the one actantial model. Therefore I will also not try to find one fixed model in *From A to B*, but demonstrate how certain roles change and how exactly this fluidity is of importance in the whole. My focus in the end will be on one actantial model, but the possibility of others is present. Before I start analysing a short explanation of the different components of the actantial model is needed.

Within Greimas's actantial model there are six basic actants who take part in three different axes and surround one action. Each axis has an opposition within it. There is the axis of desire which links the subject and the object, the axis of power between helper and opponent and the last one entails the transmission between sender and receiver (Hebert 71). These roles are very abstract and even the model itself seems very straightforward. In practice however, there can be many nuances of the strict oppositions between actants or the axes (Hebert 72). There is for instance the possibility of actantial syncretism. In that case one character, an actor, could for example be classified as both a helper and a sender (Hebert 73). This syncretism which allows for multiple actantial roles to be ascribed to one actor functions within one model (Hebert 73). If a character is a subject in one model but becomes object in another, this is not actantial syncretism but still an interesting development.

‘So, here you are, dear visitor. Maybe you know Malmö well, maybe you don’t.

Maybe, you’re a frequent visitor to this church in front of you, maybe you’ve never been here before. Either way, let’s take this opportunity to look at the city and to listen to it.’ (*From A to B* – The introduction)

First off we should, like the narrator does at the start of the audio, focus on the participant.

You, as visitor, are right away spoken to and will be constantly addressed throughout the walk. The recurring vocative form of addressing the listener creates an awareness of being central to *From A to B*. Without a group being there to participate there is no walk anyways.

This engagement with the participant creates a protagonist or in the context of the actantial model it seems logical that this person becomes the *subject*. As part of the axis of desire the subject pursues a certain goal or *object* (Hebert 71). Just by being a participant it seems clear that its goal would be to participate in the tour and to, as is implied in the synopsis that is given on the website and in the festival’s program, to be ‘led on an immersive journey around their urban environment’ (Bishop). A key word in this sentence is that of ‘leading’ which brings us to the next character in *From A to B*: the narrator.

For the listener the role of the narrator is very significant. Without this character – whom I consider to be separate from the artist even though Bishop himself has provided the voice – the participant would not know where to go on this ‘journey’. The voice is literally leading the group through the city by giving directions. He delivers the text and makes it accessible for the protagonists by narrating it to them. He is the one giving the directions, not only when it comes to the route but also to what the people could and maybe even should think about when there is a stop in front of the city’s theatre or in the cemetery. This tendency and goal to direct the subject firstly indicates towards the narrator being a *helper*.

By showing the city and all its possibilities the narrator surely assists to achieve the goal of journeying through the city. It should be noted that he does it in a typical manner. The

directions are given as if they are spontaneous decisions or as if they are optional to take as directions. 'Let's see what's around the corner' or 'let's go left' are examples of this peculiar way of saying what the participant has to do. The use of language is an often explored aspect of the urban text and as Barthes has claimed the city truly has a language (92). The citizens speak it and so does the city but again it is not specified what type of language this is (92). In the case of *From A to B* it is a suggestive language and above all informal in addressing the listener. When it comes to the other practice of directing it is mostly in the form of asking questions and in this way making the listeners wonder about the answers. Whenever the narrator wonders about something, the participant is encouraged to do the same. Talking about people passing by or on the side sitting on benches in the park he asks himself and the group what their story could be or what their relationship with the city is. In this way the narrator not only leads the group through the city but also through strands of thought.

Guiding the group is however not limited to being a helper. Especially in the beginning these qualities are just as much part of being the *sender*. Potential confusion with the actantial model is that it is hard to distinguish the one from the other (Hebert 71). Concerning *From A to B* it is hard to say what exactly initiated the action or what sent someone to become a participant. This could even be the person him- or herself or indeed the narrator who at the beginning of the tour initiates the actual action. The actantial syncretism makes for an interesting play between directing and leading, pointing in the right direction or steering when it comes to the narrator. The interrelation of the categories already starts to show a blurring of lines and this once more contributes to the possibility of a fluid model. Above all the thought that the participant might be its own sender gives him or her even more the sense of being able to make decisions. The narrator is not that clear of a sender or even that direct in his steering. There remains room for the participant and subject to have this ironic idea of having a hand in all of this.

Another actor should be acknowledged, namely the city itself. It would be easy to consider the city as the *object* in the structure. Through the immersive journey the subject might get a better understanding of the city. The end goal might then be described as a getting closer to the city, as a conjunction of object and subject as it is defined in the actantial model. The city is however characterized as more than just the object, a material or a setting against which the action is taking place. Stevenson mentions how the city is able to become more than just a backdrop in literature in and after the twentieth century (119). It can get human aspects and it can influence and guide characters (Stevenson 119). This is definitely what happens in *From A to B*. The narrator contemplates how ‘the city becomes its own person, its own character, indistinguishable from the people who first made and still make it’ (Bishop 2). Furthermore the grid or plan of the city determines where the participants can go. You obviously cannot go through a building or walk in the middle of busy streets. Thinking along these lines it does not necessarily have to be the narrator who is leading the group when he says ‘let’s see where it leads us’, but the ‘it’ mentioned would be something guiding both narrator and participants. A crucial point can be made here: this ‘it’ is the city and it is another *helper*.

To add to the list of characters there is one left. After half an hour of listening to the audio and following the directions the narrator mentions seeing a man with a yellow backpack walking in the distance. The group has already been going along with its guide and thus easily listens and, as suggested by the narrator, starts following this stranger. And so this man leads, like the streets and like the narrator, the group through Malmö. His route determines where the walkers go. Besides, the narrator lets part of the journey be led by questions concerning this man with the yellow bag. The group should wonder what he is doing in the city and where he is going, what he has been through and what his relationships with and within the city are. His story becomes part of the framework of the participant. It is a very vague story, one without a clear structure because we do not know what drives him, but it starts to steer the

participant. Figuring out what this life could entail becomes another *object*. Hence there is not only an eagerness to understand the city, but also to understand this mysterious character with his yellow backpack. This man is an object for the participant as subject, but also a *helper* in the sense that his storyline helps create an awareness of the city. Those two descriptions of the man with the bag could be presented in two different actantial models. For now the focus remains on the one where he is a helper.

Two actants have not yet been discussed. Both opponent and receiver have been absent so far in my analysis. With regards to the *opponent* there is not one thing or character working against the subject. There could be practical things preventing the participant from for example hearing the audio and thus not having the assistance of the narrator. It could for instance be that the city is too loud, that there is too much traffic, with the result that the audio has to be turned up. Perhaps the journey could be complicated by the actual complexity of ‘the city’ or the participant’s own unwillingness could make it harder to go on this immersive journey and to re-experience the city. Even so this role of opponent is I think not as important as the others I have already described. The *receiver* on the other hand I am not discussing in detail because it seems clear that the participant will gain from achieving its goal.

By using Greimas’s model I have been able to point out that the focus in the text is on the participant in *From A to B*. The action of the immersive journey, which is most valuable for this paper, mostly puts the listener in the spotlight. Other actants’s roles mainly consist in relation to the participant. There is however the option to make other actantial models for example with the narrator as subject with its object being to make the re-experience of the city possible for the participant. Again, there is not the one model when it comes to Greimas’s analysis. More importantly the roles are also not strictly divided. A textual analysis aptly shows the narrator being able to be both sender and helper. The participant, although clearly the subject, can be considered as having different actantial roles and is even made to believe to

be more than a subject that is just being steered around. Even more so this particular model gives the city a role and actor status. If we think along theories that concern themselves with the urban text this is no surprise. Barthes states after all that it is not only the citizens speaking the city, but the city also speaks to them (92). The role division is therefore not only important because it is fluid, but also because it gives the city an active role as if it were a character, someone that can speak to, look back at and surely also influence the participant.

Interestingly enough all this 'speaking' is not necessarily portrayed in the text. Only the narrator can be fully analysed when it comes to his text, because his words are in the audio. The participant, the subject, has no text, nor does the man with the yellow bag or the city – as Barthes has already argued: the city can speak – have words in the script (92). Some moments the thoughts said out loud by the narrator might be ones the participant or man with the bag might have had but neither open their mouths. They are just supposed to listen and to walk. More options for them lie in the performance part.

The City as Performance

Since Bishop has described *From A to B* as a performance walk it seems only reasonable to look closer at this aspect of the artwork. Another reason to delve into theories about performance related to the city is that it has been presented as an addition or alternative to the concept of the city as text. In *Performance and the City*, for example, a series of essays with regards to this newer concept is combined into one book. In the introduction written by the editors they explain their acknowledgement of the value of the urban text, but there is also a questioning of the concept's ability to grasp the city (Hopkins 5). The urban text might at some point 'fail fully to account not only for the multiple physical, material and psychic interactions between city and citizen, but also for the city as a space of tension and negotiation framed in countless ways by formal and informal works of performance' (Hopkins 5). The importance of performance related to the city is not something that is claimed as revolutionary nor is their attempt to provide an alternative to concept of the urban text a new development (Hopkins 5). Henri Lefebvre has already been quite influential in stating that the attention given to the textual can be rejected and has replaced it in favor of something else (Elden 5). Lefebvre turns to rhythm. The contributors in *Performance and the City* turn to performance. They question why it has remained in the background and why this should change (Hopkins 6). This paper will contribute to bringing performance into focus when thinking about the city by analysing *From A to B*.

It is certainly important to look beyond the text when it comes to *From A to B*. The performance is ultimately what the participant experiences. Of course the text is present, but by being read out loud and by being part of the walking it is in a lot of ways performed. To start of the analysis of the performance I want to look at the use of language. Roland Barthes speaks of a language of the city multiple times and of course it is interesting to question what kind of language the narrator uses as I have done shortly in the first chapter (92). This

language is not only defined by the choice for certain words, but also by the way it is expressed. It is more than just text. Obviously pronunciation, intonation, rhythm and volume are all factors that can influence what is expressed. In this performance the narrator uses a form of speech that is steady with regards to speed, rhythm and tone. It makes the audio calm and easy to listen to. The voice seems to influence the group's pace. The participants move through the city with a leisurely stroll. Gaps in the audio usually occur when the group is moving while interruptions in the walking are always filled up with talking. It creates a constant rhythm and also a continuing performance. If it is not the narrator performing the text, then it is the man with the yellow bag or the participants acting out their parts. One way for them to do this is through walking.

Michel de Certeau's essay 'Walking in the City' is one that is full of metaphors of the city as text. Someone with a view from above, his example is that of the view from the World Trade Center, can 'read' the city (92). The walker on the other hand, de Certeau's preferred perspective, is immersed in city life and is able to 'write' but without being able to read (93). The relation between this walker and text does not stop there. Later on de Certeau gives 'a preliminary definition of walking as a space of enunciation' (98). Though still sticking with the dominant metaphor of the urban text – Hopkins critiques this in his argument – he allows for other concepts to become meaningful (4). It could be that the participant in *From A to B* finds its voice not necessarily in text in the script but in the act of walking. The constant alternation between the participant's walking and the narrator's talking or the simultaneity of those two acts make it easy to conceive of this interaction as a conversation. Besides, de Certeau's walker is not only related to performance through his metaphor of the pedestrian speech act. The idea of performance is not absent in his discussion of the walker. Hopkins mentions this as well and here aptly quotes de Certeau's own words in which he describes walking as 'a spatial acting-out of the place' (4, 98). In this way walking is even more closely

linked to performance.

To be able to relate performance to the participant is an important step to once more show the crucial role this person plays in *From A to B*. She or he is not just walking along and listening to the audio, but takes active part in the performance walk. The performance is not only executed by the man with the yellow bag or the narrator or the artist, but also an action undertaken by the group of listeners and above all walkers. That they become part of the performance is revealed at certain specific moments during the walk. These are all related to the man with the yellow bag who remains as vague and mysterious throughout, but does get a connection with the walkers. Both the group and this man are performing and that brings the participant into an intriguing situation.

At first it might seem really strange to have to follow a random stranger with a yellow bag when the narrator tells you to. It probably will not take long for the realisation to set in that this 'stranger' is part of *From A to B*. There are moments the man with his bag stops and the group has to do the same because the narrator tells them to. Dependent on the performance you participate in there could have been a situation that the group gets dangerously close to this character, but never does he acknowledge their presence until halfway into the performance. Again using the theme of the city as a stage the narrator wonders about the routes we take in the city, if they might not be rehearsed and repeated by others, as if they were actors.

Two crucial things happen. The man with the yellow bag turns around and looks at the audience. After following in his footsteps and staring at his yellow bag for over half an hour suddenly looking at the man's face is startling. This feeling will mostly come from the character having been unable to return the gaze until now and also from the emphasis on the awareness of this just being an act. It is not at all a spontaneous happenstance like a participant might have ironically thought at the beginning. The subject being discussed and

the words spoken over the audio only add to the experience. ‘Am I an actor? Am I just acting?’ are the questions asked and this time not necessarily by the narrator. Something that has not yet happened before occurs here. The voice that is heard asking these questions is oddly similar to the narrator’s but it is made to sound distant. It is only those two lines that have this sound ‘effect’ and so are made to stand out from the rest of the narrator’s text. In the script this is called, with a technical term, a ‘second person binaural’ and so already points to the fact that the sound is recorded as if to hear it come from a different direction, like a 3D sound. Combining this with the man suddenly looking at the group and standing a bit further away than their headphones in their ears it is easy to associate this voice with him. It might not be spoken out loud by the man, but it is imaginable that he would think this. On the other hand it would be very easy for the participant to think of these words as comparable to what they are thinking at that moment and this might be a concerning and critical thought. Besides it now could be argued that there is some kind of break with the fourth wall going on. The group has been led by the narrator to believe this person to be there randomly and thus they can still ask themselves why he is walking around in the city and where he is going. The simple answer could be that he is there just to lead them through the city. This would break with the fiction. Suspension of disbelief is no longer truly possible. More than this the returning of the gaze and the sudden acknowledgement has created the need for reconsideration with regards to the power structure in the performance walk. This would be a very interesting case for the voyeur-theory.

Introducing the opposition between fiction and non-fiction seems inevitable when discussing performance, but more specifically when analysing *From A to B*. The lines are blurred between what is fiction and what is not as the situation with the man with the bag demonstrates. There are other elements playing with this. The audio is for example interwoven with city sounds. Cars driving by, birds chirping or the wind blowing are heard as

background music to the narrator or when he is not speaking. These sounds add a layer to the ones that are actually heard by the participant and so make it hard to pinpoint which one is actually 'live'. An observation made in *Performance and the City* by Marla Carlson resonates with this experience of *From A to B*: 'the mixture of artifice and accident raises the challenge to distinguish the one from the other, thus heightening our awareness of the difference between fiction and reality and, in turn, our sensitivity to our actual surroundings' (29). Carlson here discusses an artwork in several ways similar to *From A to B*.² Both walks play with the continuous question of what is an act and what is not, what is 'real' and what is not. As the 'am I an actor' situation shows Bishop has not only used this in the form of his walk but also in the content of the narrator's text. The world as stage, the routes and routines in the city as scripts are returning ideas that the narrator mentions and expects the listeners to think about as well.

The blurring of lines between fiction and non-fiction and distinguishing what is an act is here mainly thought of in performance practices. It also finds resonance in the actantial model from the first textual analysis. The ending of *From A to B* is able to capture this perfectly. The group has arrived at the docks of Malmö and is made to stand in a line on either side of the man they have been following for over an hour. Looking out over the water the narrator instructs – after once more contemplating about the surroundings, about the relationships between past and present, about the fabric of the city – to take off the headphones. The man with the yellow bag now steps in front of the group, he also removes his own headphones and then starts talking to the group. In this moment it is revealed that the man with the yellow bag is the artist himself. The division of actants and roles that is already ambiguous in the actantial model is revealed to be even less fixed all throughout the performance but especially in this last moment. The artist, narrator and stranger with his

² Also working with audio material the 'soundwalk' *Her Long Black Hair* from artist Janet Cardiff takes groups through New York City and discusses its history as well as present day.

yellow bag converge into one person and so defying the distinction between roles or actants, between fiction and non-fiction and between what is scripted and what not. In the end it is all based on a script.

Conclusion – The Urban Script

Until now performance and text have been discussed as mainly separate elements.

Nonetheless the observations I have made in the analyses find leverage in both concepts.

Performance and text assist one another and definitely do not have to be considered as isolated from each other. Even *Performance and the City* that criticizes the urban text concept and how it is lacking makes the argument that performance and text are ‘linked cultural practices that work together to shape the body of phenomenal, intellectual, psychic, and social encounters that frame a subject’s experience of the city’ (Hopkins 6). The two are definitely intricately linked in *From A to B* that is based on text, but executed via performance. The idea of a script is what enables to connect them inherently. It is possible to think of this urban script as fixed because it has the textual connotations. Returning to David Pinder and his praises of urban exploration this thought can be reversed. If we, like Pinder, recognize that the city cannot be grasped in its entirety because of its ‘openness’ or in other words because it is constantly changing than a script should adapt to this idea (403). Still to get a sense of having integrated the city fully people might feel the need to fill up the gaps of fragments that we have no knowledge of. Greimas, who has already provided us with a model for the textual analysis, considers our image of the city to be like the filmic ‘beyond the frame’ (51). De Certeau’s walker comes to mind here as well. Only fragments are visible or experienced but we recognize there is more than what we see and so we complete the image with what is given to us (Greimas 52). The image of the city is thus in no way without influences from ideologies put forward by people from above, by the ones in power, nor will the urban script be free of this (Greimas 52). They are constructions, made up or even fictional. Even so performance gains in importance which can be noted in Hopkins discussion of the relation between text and performance:

The fictional text of the city is adapted, appropriated, improvised upon, innovated, and/or disregarded through pedestrian performance in much the way that a dramatic text is treated in theatrical performance: not as simply an iteration of a text, but as in and of itself productive of new meaning. (47)

Rather than letting the text that is the city overtake the citizens this quote shows how performance enables the people living in cities to have a sense of control. It gives them a powerful role to go against what is already set out for them. Just because there is a script does not mean people have to follow it word to word and act to act. Interpretation and appropriation are very important here. These notions have already been thought out by De Certeau where he considers the 'concept city' created by the planner or other institutions to be considerably different from the 'lived city' (Stevenson b 16). Just like Hopkins De Certeau thinks a sort of resistance is possible in the form of lived space and the practice of everyday life (96). Bringing this back to *From A to B* the narrator voices a similar thought just after the crisis situation – Am I an actor? Am I just acting? – between the man with the bag and the listeners has occurred:

But the thing about acting is the detail, the slight variations where the spontaneous meets the rehearsed, where the actor varies from the script, where you get a glimpse behind the curtain. The actions similar to something you've seen before but, somehow, completely unique in their execution in the unrepeatable moment. Like lovers sitting in the park, similar but different to every other couple. The beauty of something new and fresh, the beginning of something not restricted by convention but breathing the possibility of the new.

Though being slightly on the romantic side, Bishop's interpretation is in line with the more theoretical ones. Besides, the artist in a way gives his listeners this 'glimpse behind the

curtain' and not in the same complicated way De Certeau and Hopkins do. He simply takes them on his performance walk. Bishop reveals the 'scriptedness' of the city but also of his own work through confronting the participant with certain thoughts or elements of the performance. The man with the yellow bag entails the friction between act and 'reality' and even demonstrates how the participant is just as much part of the performance and thus acting out a script. It might seem easy to remain ignorant but then, as when you are wearing headphones and forget about them, your wires get caught on something or you remember being stuck to the computer. Bishop makes it very clear you cannot acknowledge the artificiality in his performance walk.

The irony remains in the fact that Bishop tries creating awareness of this script by using a scripted form of performance. That only adds to the concept that we all have to work with what is already there: the city. The conclusion is not negative though. The performance walk shows that there are many options to move within this scripted space. Bishop is very optimistic about the capabilities we have even in our daily lives to engage with the city that has existed before us and will after. An earlier used quote from *From A to B* fits here: 'the city becomes its own person, its own character, indistinguishable from the people who first made and still make it'. The interaction people take on with their city might not only change their perspective but could also have an effect the other way around since we all contribute to making the city.

This brings me to the last question if and in what way Bishop is able, through urban exploration, to critique what is going on in cities. Rather than being a big criticiser himself he shows the platform that is available for people with more specific concerns. *From A to B* is almost like an exercise for people living in and visiting cities and indeed as the synopsis on the website indicates can recontextualize these places for them as something with possibilities alongside, beyond or maybe even against the script.

Works Cited

- Barthes, Roland. 'Semiology and the Urban' in *The City and the Sign*. Eds. Mark Gottdiener & Alexandros Ph. Lagopoulos. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven F. Rendall. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien. 'For a Topological Semiotics' in *The City and the Sign*. Eds. Mark Gottdiener & Alexandros Ph. Lagopoulos. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Hebert, Louis. 'Tools for Texts and Image Analysis: An Introduction to Applied Semiotics'. Trans. Julie Tabler. *Signo Semio*. 2011.
- Hopkins, D.J, Orr, Shelley and Solga, Kim. Eds. *Performance and the City*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life*. Trans. Stuart Elden and Gerald Moore. London: Bloomsbury, 1992.
- Pinder, David. 'Arts of Urban Exploration' in *Cultural Geographies*. Vol. 12, 2005, 383-411.
- Stevenson, Deborah. *Cities and Urban Cultures*. Maidenhead: Open UP, 2003.
- . *The City*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.
- Tim Bishop, Artist*. Web. 20 July 2015.
- Bishop, Tim. *From A to B*. Lund, Malmo. 2013-. . Performance Walk.
- Cardiff, Janet. *Her Long Black Hair*. Central Park, New York. 2 July 2005. Audio Walk.