



**University of
Zurich** ^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2010

Narration/Non-Ville/Description

Binotto, Johannes ; Gerber, Andri

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-45960>

Journal Article

Originally published at:

Binotto, Johannes; Gerber, Andri (2010). Narration/Non-Ville/Description. *le Journal Spéciale 'Z'*:32-39.

Narration/Non-Ville/Description

Johannes Binotto and Andri Gerber

“Dans tous les cas, la ville, au lieu d’être pensée comme processus ou problème, est toujours posée comme une chose, un objet reproductible.”

Françoise Choay, 1965¹

Non-ville

The city is not. Not because of a hypothetical, physical absence—the city is well present—but because it escapes naming. It escapes any verbal representation or depiction. We are not capable of grasping the city through language, thus, it is not, because we can only comprehend what we can speak of. This is particularly the case with the emergence of “nonlieux” or post-urban conditions, but it was somehow always implicit in the relation of human beings to their urban environment, be it the imagined or ideal sites (the heavenly Jerusalem) projected on the reality of medieval cities. The position behind this way of looking at things could be called a structuralist

one in the linguistic/philosophical sense: assuming a correspondence between the structure of the world and the structure of our language, where in this case, the correspondence is somehow incomplete. Like many movements of the past, structuralism was dismissed too early, without acknowledging its potential to uncover these kinds of relationships and thus these kinds of problems. Every generation of urbanists had to come to terms with their own city and tried to establish a language capable of grasping it. This language could be verbal; mostly it was comprised of plans, statistics, diagrams or pictures. In a classical, oedipal situation, every generation of urbanists declared the language of the precedent generation to be useless and moved to find a new one. One recent example stems from the work of Stefano Boeri: “A condition impossible to decipher with the vocabulary and the interpretative categories constructed in the 1960s to analyze the old European city.”² He furthermore speaks

of a “Useless vocabulary.”³ Indeed, this is also in keeping with the rapidly changing conditions of its object of desire, the city, which is mirrored in the explosion of terms and metaphors used to describe it. That is, it was not only the will to overcome fathers but also because of changes inside the depicted object—in particular since the industrial revolution—that new instruments and methods had to be developed. These tools were instrumental to a certain agenda, just as the use of statistics in modernism reflected the attempt to underscore the scientific status of urbanism.

The search for more apt instruments and methods or depictions and representations also reveals another aspect. As German Ethnologist Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs explains: to understand the world, we have first to understand our understanding.⁴ Thus the search for other and better instruments and methods also reveals a rising awareness of the instruments and methods *per se*.

Description/narration

This difficulty to depict and represent the city can generally be subsumed into two different types of approaches: description and narration. Even though the two terms are often charged with different contents, we can say that description is considered to be scientific, objective and its instruments mostly an index—like a list—while narration appears to be subjective and sequential. It is revealing that this dichotomy, as such, was almost never treated or theorized, but (re)surfaces every now and then in urbanism, but also in literary theory, philosophy or in the theory of science. In the following paragraphs we will first discuss an urbanistic case study of this dichotomy, then look at it in relation to other disciplines and, finally, propose our own interpretation of the dichotomy for urbanism through a discussion of Gilles Deleuze and Jacques Lacan.

But to discuss the urbanist case studies, we have

to make a short historical detour: in the 1990s a paradigmatic change took place through the emancipation of urbanism from architecture as a discipline. This change meant the end of a generation that considered—in reaction to the *tabula rasa* urbanism of (postwar) modernism—everything to be “architecture” and banned “urbanism” from their agendas. Aldo Rossi’s *The Architecture of the City* could be considered this generation’s manifesto. The paradigm shift from this generation of “architects” to the rediscovery of urbanism as an independent discipline was announced in 1994 with the seminal text by Rem Koolhaas with the revealing title “What ever happened to urbanism?” As a consequence, a whole range of urban research programs emerged that focused on cartographic representations of a political and social geography. The object of these investigations was post-urban conditions that revealed the inadequacy of traditional instruments—such as morphology and typology—to depict them, and subsequently led to the invention of new modes of investigation.⁵ These new modes of investigation were strongly influenced by Marxist geography and the “reassertion of space in critical social theory.”⁶ It was the acknowledgement of the existence of a non-ville (*Zwischenstadt*, Posturban, Urbanscape, etc.) that was impossible to depict with traditional instruments.

Interestingly enough, this new form of research, this new gaze on the non-ville was also introduced through the opposition between narration and description. The generalized use of these terms implied an interest and a growing awareness of the modes of investigation rather than of the investigation itself. It should be mentioned how the return to terms such as “narration” and “description” in the context of the above mentioned paradigm-shift represents a paradox. One of its declared goals, besides the re-establishment of a discipline of urbanism, was the denial of what has generally been termed the “critical”: the tendency in architecture to construct

theoretical instructions through loose references to other discourses such as philosophy or linguistics.⁷ As an example of this changed attitude one could quote Alejandro Zaera-Polo—at the time dean of the Berlage Institute, the school where this paradigm shift was cultivated and even elevated to a whole study program. In 2003, explaining the agenda of the school, he postulated the necessity of a “productive” rather than “critical paradigm”.⁸ This paradigm change implied a shift from meta-theories to micro investigations of social and political subjects and their influence on space, in part through readings of neo-Marxists authors such as David Harvey or Edward Soja. This also implied a shift in interest from Europe to Asia, and finally to developing countries, as case studies and from new forms of urbanism to “social inequality”—the title of a conference in 2001—as subjects. Consequently the use of “critical” terms such as “narration” was surprising. But this paradox is only a relative one. Here the recurrence to such terms is intentionally loose and corresponds to what Micheal Speaks in his critique of the “critical” ironically calls “philosophy lite.”⁹ In urbanism this would correspond to “urbanism lite” (Koolhaas).¹⁰ In this context it should be remarked how the same paradox has been identified in cultural studies departments in the shift from the “culture-as-text” paradigm, to what is generally called the “spatial turn”, where the latter still needs the textual vocabulary of the former, even though it rejects the critical program.¹¹

In urbanism, the use of the opposition between narration and description appears to be, in particular at the beginning, mainly an Italian affair. And Italian researchers such as Bernardo Secchi at the Istituto Universitario di Venezia had an important role in the introduction of the above mentioned paradigm shift. In this context one could quote his essay “Descriptive City Planning”, which appeared in 1992 in *Casabella*. In this essay, he postulates the rise of a new approach to

the city that would no longer be “descriptive”—as it was until then in his understanding—in the sense of statistical and objective, but narrative and subjective.¹² He compares “narration” with “theory” but without giving a clear definition of what the content of this “narration” should be. The relevance of this subject is confirmed by the reply by André Corboz to the essay of Secchi. It contained mainly a defense of description. For Corboz, description can be both a “reading” and a “writing” of an urban context. Description for him is never only an objective reading, but also always implies a subjective and constructive reading therefore transferring to description what Secchi implied in narration.¹³ Another example of the importance given to this pair of terms, can be found in the 19th Milan Triennale in 1996 dedicated to “urban narrations.” While the term “narration” is used loosely here, in his contribution —“Architettura e narrativa”—to the catalogue of this exhibition, the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur, relates to this opposition.¹⁴ His essay points to the necessity of a “narration” to get hold of the temporal aspect of architecture. Description is here called “configuration” and is subordinated to “narration.” It should also be mentioned that the entire March/April 2007 issue of the Italian architectural magazine *Parametro* was dedicated to this essay by Ricoeur. Again the title was “Urban narrations.” In the year 2000—to quote another Italian example—the urban planner Alberto Magnaghi published *Il Progetto Locale*, where, among other things, he criticized topographical descriptions and proposed a yet undefined “other representation” that he called “narration.”¹⁵ The only specification about the nature of this narration was a reference to antique cartography that in his understanding contained different kinds of “descriptions,” among them also “narration.” Therefore, the author subsumes narration to description, but again, without giving more than a hint of the contents associated to these terms. The most recent example of this Italian “lineage” is the anthology *La città come testo critico* (The City as a

Critical Text) where Nicolò Privileggio formulates an interesting but not completely traceable critique against what he calls the “anthropological and ethnological turn,” that in his understanding bears only on “description” and thus ignores the fact that a description makes sense only when it is part of a narration.¹⁶ It is not completely clear in which way the terms are understood and interpreted here. The recurrence of this pair of opposites, particularly in the Italian context, might also be explained by the background of what could be called “Italian structuralism”: the movement in architecture and urbanism that, starting from the 1950s around authors such as Italo Gamberini, Umberto Eco or Gillo Dorfles, tried to translate structuralism and semiotics to architecture and consequently to consider architecture as a language and the city as a text. But this opposition can be found also outside the Italian context, for example in the critique of the Studio Basel research program by Roger Diener, Marcel Meili, Jacques Herzog and Pierre de Meuron at the ETH Zürich, formulated by the architectural critic Hans Frei. In his discussion of their *Die Schweiz, ein städtebauliches Portrait*, he criticizes their pretended claim to have produced an objective representation of reality, which in fact, in his eyes, is nothing but a constructed fiction.¹⁷ Besides the question of whether his critique is justified or not, it is interesting to note how, here again, we have a fallback to this opposition, with fiction standing in for narration.

Beyond urbanism

Looking at the ways in which narration/description have been contextualized and interpreted in other disciplines, we can start by discussing the theory of science. There it is the question of whether science can objectively depict reality or if any scientific theory in the end only constructs a fictional reality. “Constructive realism,” for example, criticizes the assumption of the neutrality of scientific research and postulates that any research is never a “description” of reality

but the “construction” (narration) of something related to that reality. The philosopher of science, Paul Feyerabend, also postulates the necessity of “narrations” opposed to “descriptions” in his questioning of the boundaries between art and science.¹⁸ He associates description with abstraction and identifies the moment of the separation between these two poles in ancient Greece. In philosophy, to take just one example, one of the founding fathers of postmodern thought, Jean-François Lyotard, postulates scientific knowledge as “discourse” (narration) rather than as “description.”¹⁹ He opposes a narrative, to a scientific knowledge, and a (modern) “large” narration (*grand récit*), to a postmodern “small” narration. This new, “small” narration, for him, means a new mode of legitimation opposed to the old one. In the history of art, there exists a long tradition of description—*ekphrasis*—that is bound to the question of how to approach the object that is described. From antiquity to the Middle Ages, narration and description were seen as complementary (*ekphrasis* and later *descriptio* were part of *narratio*). It was only with the introduction of the *paragone* to the arts that narration and description began to be understood as opposite approaches to reality, where the former was supposed to install a poetic, mediated relationship, while the latter implied an unmediated and true relationship to the world. In literature, we find an essay by Georg Lukàcs from 1936 using this dichotomy to make a distinction between two kinds of literature.²⁰ He defines a certain type of literature as “description” when the reading of it produces an image of what is told for the reader. The opposite is the case with a “narrative” literature, where what is told is experienced by the reader as if he would be part of the story. Lukàcs categorizes literature through these two poles and through the effects they have on the reader. As a last example we can cite the French philosopher and linguist Gérard Genette, who considered the opposition between narration and description as one of the most important

distinctions that could be made by the theory of literature, specifying that this distinction regards form less than content.²¹ Still, this would remain a marginal remark in his work, which is again revealing of the small importance with which this opposition was invested.

Also in (social) geography—a bridge to the case studies from urbanism discussed above—we can find a distinction between “descriptive-,” “interpretative-” and “explanatory concerns”²² that touch the narration/description distinction. In general, one has to underline how contemporary geography celebrates the subjective and mythical dimension of ancient cartography opposed to the rise of the scientific paradigm. At that time, maps were charged not so much “to mirror reality” as “to engender the re-shaping of the worlds in which the people live.”²³ In particular, regarding the deterritorialisation of Gilles Deleuze, “mapping” is seen not only as an instrument of description but also of making.²⁴

In this context we should refer to urbanism again and how this difficulty of depicting reality calls for an awareness of the fact that any representation is somehow already a construction, or in the words of Corboz: “*Représenter le territoire c’est déjà le saisir. Or cette représentation n’est pas un calque, mais toujours une construction.*”²⁵ Furthermore, this leads to an observation about the nature of representation: that the representation itself differs based on the person who is observing. The most impressive reference to this being Queneau’s *Exercices de style* (1947), where the same event is told in 99 different styles and manners.

These examples testify both to the relevance of the narration/description paradigm and the different interpretations these terms are charged with. But beyond the different associated contents, these examples use their specific interpretations to broach the issue of the relation their disciplines construct towards reality. It is therefore all the

more surprising that no real theory exists on this subject.

Literature/film

The difficulty of depicting the city is not only specific to urbanism but also obtains to literature and film where the city becomes the privileged scene—although not necessarily the protagonist—calling for different strategies of representation. Even though, in this case, the distinction between narration and description is only implicit, it helps to understand changing approaches. Already, the first truly modern city, Paris of 19th century, represented a challenge for writers (“*Paris est un océan. Jetez-y la sonde, vous n’en connaîtrez jamais la profondeur.*”²⁶) calling for a wide range of non-conventional methods such as the exterior perspective of a visitor to Paris, (Hetzel, *Le diable à Paris*, 1845-6), or the “list” of aspects (Mercier, *Le tableau de Paris*, 1781) or even the collectively written book (*Paris ou Le livre des cent-et-un*, 1831-34). This shows how already the “simple” Paris of the 19th century was in our terms, a non-ville, lacking a description and representation or rather representing a challenge in these terms. The canonical text on Paris of the time is obviously Walter Benjamin’s *Passagenwerk* (1927-), which, while being a description—as it is constructed on a list of literary fragments—questions the very nature of description, being instead like a surrealist collage. Furthermore the complexity of the modernist city—New York being its most representative example—called for new and unconventional methods of writing: the cubist technique of the architect-cum-writer John Dos Passos in *Manhattan Transfer*. Later, the new condition of the post-modern city—Los Angeles being the ideal “scene of the crime”—where the Modernist “*ecbe*” to depict the city called for a new strategy that would not attempt to represent the real city, but to create fictional ones that would declare their fictional status, as in Thomas Pynchon’s novels such as *The Crying of Lot 49*. A comparable

critique of realism and of representation can be found in the contemporaneous French *Nouveau Roman*, that—besides showing an interest in theorizing the act of writing literature as is the case in American postmodern literature—is also grounded in a conscious search for production and practice as opposed to representation. As Benjamin constructed a particular description of Paris through a collage of quotations, images and text-passages, it was Koolhaas who took over the task of describing the New York of Modernity. While being less radical in its abstraction than Benjamin and being a book rather a narration, it is worth noting the role he declares for himself in the text: to be the ghost writer of New York.²⁷ Much earlier than Koolhaas, the architectural critic Reynar Banham abandoned any strict canon to write his book dedicated to Los Angeles, where, among “classical” architectural history chapters dedicated to the ecologies of the city, are rather unscientific tales.²⁸ It is revealing how Banham was puzzled by the difficulty to describe Los Angeles and how he was aware that he would need new methods and instruments rather than the classical instrumentarium of architectural history or critique to get hold of this city.²⁹

As for film, in 2003 Bart Keunen and Bart Eeckhout published an essay, “Whatever Happened to the Urban Novel?” that paralleled Koolhaas’ observation on the absence of the discipline of urbanism and denounced the lack of contemporary urban literature in the moment of the triumph of the (post)urban *per se*.³⁰ It appears that film and video-clips have advanced to become a more successful medium for representing the complexity of the post-urban. Considering this observation, it is interesting to point to a particular technique that instead of telling one story through one perspective, constructs a collage of different points of view acting in different contexts, thus giving a more accurate, larger picture: in a sense, a collage as in *Passagenwerk*. Examples of this would be *Short Cuts* by Robert Altman (1993),

Crash by Paul Haggis (2004), *Traffic* by Steven Soderberg (2000) and *Magnolia* by Paul Thomas Anderson (1999). All are constructed around this multiple perspective, mostly taking place in Los Angeles and thus mirroring the difficulty of its depiction in their structure.

Acting-out / passage à l’acte

As stated at the beginning of this essay, we would like to propose an alternate interpretation of the narration/description opposition that could also shed a different light on the nature of the above mentioned paradigm shift. As indicated, it would be absurd to try to reduce what has been discussed above to one ultimate meaning of the narration/description opposition, except to note that all point to an increased awareness of the modes of approach rather than to the approach itself. The only common aspect of these case studies is the use of this opposition to broach the issue of the relationship established towards reality. But beyond this, most of the interpretations all disagree on the associated content of the two terms and/or use them without giving a precise definition.

To explain our own interpretation of this pair of opposites, we have to take a short explicative detour: description—and this is already implied by its name—presumes an object that it tries to describe, to circumscribe. Its ambition is the maximal approach to the described phenomena. Description is therefore intensive. Narration, on the contrary, subtends to the principle of intensive description that of a breakout. We have already in the notion of “narration”, the idea of counting, of a perpetual addition, an $n+1$ that will never reach an end. Narration traces a line leading *ad infinitum* that Gilles Deleuze has described as a “deterritorialisation”. Contrary to intensive description, narration is extreme: it goes beyond the territorial boundaries of both the medium and the phenomena.³¹ Deterritorialising narration proves to be an act in the sense of Jacques

Lacan.³² In his seminar of the years 1962/63 Lacan introduced into psychoanalytical theory the distinction between acting-out and *passage à l'acte*. While acting-out means the bringing out of a neurotic symptom, and literally asks for a description, the subject in the *passage à l'acte* goes beyond the territory of that which can be described. It is not by accident that Lacan illustrates the *passage à l'acte* through suicide, through defenestration (which tragically is also the way Deleuze killed himself): the same way one tries to jump out of the window, so one tries to get outside of the known. Now, should design not likewise be considered as such a *passage à l'acte*, a project outside of the territory of description? The act of designing reveals itself as being related to deterritorialisation and extreme narration. It is not possible to describe the act of design which the recent discussion of the relation of science (objectivity) to experiment is once again questioning.³³ The continued processing of a design resulting, finally, in a project, will then inevitably become a description, quasi a completion, an acting out of the design act. Therefore the passage from design to its realization can be understood as the passage from extreme narration to intensive description. Only when architecture becomes occupied, when it is used by

its inhabitants, when it becomes estranged from the architect, can it become a narration again.

Looking at the discussed paradigm shift through the perspective of our definition of narration as *passage à l'acte* and of description as acting-out, we can state the following: the non-ville is itself an act. It is in a permanent state of change whose causes are not intelligible—and becomes, more and more, such an indescribable act through its growing complexity and through the number of the agents influencing it—a narration, consequently. It can be caught only by another narration that runs parallel. And it is not, exactly for that reason. The post-urban condition cannot be described, it can only be narrated. Any description of its acts, will result, because of its complexity and diversity, in a simplistic Lukàcsian “image.” Acts cannot be described. But is it possible to narrate them? The interest in the term “narration” and the privilege accorded to it in contrast to “description” can be explained through the following reasoning: narration as a strategy bears the promise of being able to narrate the narration of the non-ville. The impossibility of a description of the non-ville calls for a narration that itself tries to remain an act. This, because if it becomes itself a description again, the

Notes

01 Françoise Choay, *L'urbanisme, Utopies et réalités* (Paris: Editions du seuil, 1965), 25.

02 Stefano Boeri, “USE, Uncertain States of Europe,” in *Mutations*, ed. Rem Koolhaas (Barcelona: Actar, 2000), 366.

03 Boeri, “USE, Uncertain States of Europe,” 366.

04 Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs, *Erzählte Welt. Lesarten der Wirklichkeit in Geschichte, Kunst und Wissenschaft*, (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1996).

05 “The multiplication, for example, of maps in scale 1:500 of the oldest part of historical cities demonstrates the difficulties of typological analysis.” Bernardo Secchi, “Descriptive city planning,” *Casabella* 588 (March 1992): 62.

06 Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies* (London: Verso, 1989), 47.

07 Michael Hays, “Critical Architecture, Between Culture and Form” *Perspecta* 21 (1984): 14–29.

08 Roemer Van Toom, “Interview with Alejandro Zaera-Polo, Equipping the Architect, The Berlage Menu” *Hunch, Special Issue Architecture Biennale Venetia*, (2006): 13.

09 Michael Speaks, “Theory Practice and Pragmatism,” *AVA* 372 (2001): 19–24.

10 Rem Koolhaas, “What ever happened to urbanism?”, in *Small, medium, large, extra-large: Office for Metropolitan Architecture*, Rem Koolhaas and Bruce Mau (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1998), 971.

11 Sigrid Weigel, “Zum topographischen turni. Kartographie, Topographie und Raumkonzepte in den Kulturwissenschaften,” in *KulturPoetik* 2 no. 2 (2002): 151–162.

12 Secchi, “Descriptive city planning”, 61.

13 André Corboz, “La description: entre lecture et écriture” in *Le Territoire comme palimpseste et autres essais*, André Corboz (Besançon: Les Éditions de l’Imprimeur, 2001).

14 Paul Ricoeur, “Architettura e narritività”, in *XIX Esposizione Internazionale, Integrazione e pluralità nelle forme del nostro tempo* (Milano: Electa, 1996), 64–72.

15 Alberto Magnaghi, *Il progetto locale* (Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 2000).

16 Nicolò Privilegio, *La città come testo critico* (Milano: Franco Angeli, 2008).

17 Hans Frei, “Unfall auf der Landstrasse,” *Werk, Bauen + Wohnen* 1–2 (2006): p. 70–72.

18 Paul Feyerabend, *Wissenschaft als Kunst* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1984).

19 Jean-François Lyotard, *La condition postmoderne* (Paris: Les éditions de minuit, 1979).

20 Georg Lukács, “Erzählen oder beschreiben? Zur Diskussion über den Naturalismus und Formalismus,” in *Probleme des Realismus, Band 4, Essay über Realismus*, Georg Lukács (Neuwied und Berlin: Hermann Luchterhand Verlag, GmbH, 1971), 197–242.

21 Gérard Genette, “Frontières du récit,” in *Figures II* (Paris : Editions du seuil, 1969), 49–69.

22 Tim Hall, *Urban Geography*, 3rd ed., (London, New York: Routledge, 2006).

23 James Corner, “The Agency of Mapping,” in *Mappings*, ed. Denis Cosgrove (London: Reaktions Books, 1999), 213.

narrated post-urban falls back into a static and communicable image which fails to depict the non-ville and its spatiality.

Though, through our interpretation, the description/narration dichotomy becomes, in this context, a wholly new meaning, in particular in relationship to an either/or dialectic. The posturban cannot be depicted through an either/or—either through description or narration—but only through a process where the two follow each other permanently. Therefore, as a consequence, this interpretation of narration/description implies a condition of permanent turn rather than another appended—linguistic-, cultural-, iconic-, spatial-, critical-, projective-,— turn. The non-ville is a narration, but any narration, sooner or later, will turn to a description and that is exactly what the discussed paradigm shift in recent urbanism thematizes and, in the end, wants to avoid with their research programs.

24 "The application of judgement, subjectively constituted is precisely what makes a map more a project than a 'mere' empirical description. The still widely held assumption that maps are mute, utilitarian tools, of secondary significance to the milieu they represent, and lacking in power agency or effects beyond simple, objective description, is to grossly misconstrue their capacity for shaping reality. Both maps and territories are 'thoroughly mediated products' and the nature of their exchange is far from neutral or uncomplicated." Comer, "The Agency of Mapping," 223.

25 André Corboz, "Le territoire comme palimpseste" in André Corboz, *Le territoire comme palimpseste et autres essais* (Besançon: Les éditions de l'imprimeur, 2001), 46.

26 Honoré de Balzac, quoted in *Paris and the Nineteenth Century* Christopher Prendergast (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 11.

27 "Movie stars who have led adventure-packed lives are often too egocentric to discover patterns, too inarticulate to express intentions, too restless to record or remember events. Ghostwriters do it for them. In the same way I was Manhattan's ghostwriter." In Rem Koolhaas, *Delirious New York, A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 1994), 9.

28 "In order to accommodate such extremes, the chapters that follow will have to deviate from accepted norms of architectural histories of cities." In Reyner Banham, *Los Angeles, The Architecture of four Ecologies* (1971), 9.

29 "Historical monograph? Can such an old-world, academic, and precedent-laden concept claim to embrace so unprecedented a human phenomenon as this city of Our Lady Queen of Angels of Portununcula?" In Banham, Reyner, *Four Ecologies*, 8.

30 Bart Keune and Bart Eeckhout, "Whatever Happened to the Urban Novel? New Perspectives for Literary Urban Studies in the Era of Postmodern Culture," in *Postmodern New York City, Transfiguring Spaces - Raum-Transformationen*, eds. Günter H. Lenz and Utz Riese, (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, Winter 2003), 53-70.

31 Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka. Pour une littérature mineure* (Paris: Editions du minuit, 1975).

32 Jacques Lacan, *Le Séminaire. Livre X: Langage* (Paris: Seuil 2004).

33 Ian Hacking, *Representing and Intervening. Introductory topics in the philosophy of natural science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).