

Written Response

Name: Yike Liu

ID: 24006407

1. Bibliography of references

1.1 Lawrence Weiner – Statements

This book is made of 24 short texts by Lawrence Weiner. He thinks that art can exist only through language, without making anything physical. This idea made me think again about how language works. At first, I was influenced by him and asked: can language exist without image or object? But later, I changed my project to focus on sound and image. I tried to repeat the word “door” until it loses meaning and becomes something new. Weiner’s book did not shape the form of my project directly. But it helped me understand that language is not just a tool—it can also create and become something by itself.

1.2 Joseph Kosuth – One and Three Chairs

This work shows three things: a real chair, a photo of a chair, and the dictionary meaning of “chair.” Joseph Kosuth wants us to think about the link between objects, images, and words. When I first saw this work, it made me ask: do we need to see an object to understand it? Can language replace our senses? This idea helped me begin thinking about “door” in my project. Like Weiner’s work, this was an early influence. But later, I focused more on how language loses meaning and can be changed. I care more about how repeating a word like “door” can make it abstract, and how we can give it new meaning again. So, Kosuth’s work gave me a starting idea, but my project followed a different path.

1.3 Roland Barthes – The Neutral

In this book, Roland Barthes talks about how language can stay in the middle. He says it can avoid clear meaning or taking a side. This idea is not about being unclear, but about choosing to not give a fixed answer. This helped me think

about language in the beginning of my project. In my video, the word “door” is said many times. After a while, it loses its meaning and becomes something strange. Later, I used “door” to make other simple shapes and a made-up creature. But before I could do this, I needed to take away the meaning. Barthes helped me understand that when language has no meaning, it is not broken. It can be the first step to design something new.

1.4 Roland Barthes – The Rustle of Language

In this book, Barthes says that language is not only for giving meaning. It can also be something soft, floating, and not easy to explain—like a “rustle.” This idea helped me think about how I used the word “door” in my video. At the start, “door” had a clear meaning. But after repeating the sound many times, it started to lose its meaning and became more like a sound form. This change is what Barthes calls language after meaning. It is not empty, but not like normal words. Because of this idea, I started to care more about how language connects to sound, time, and image. In the later part of the video, I replaced “door” with strange broken sounds. Barthes gave me the idea to let go of meaning and just listen to the shape of sound.

1.5 Alvin Lucier – I Am Sitting in a Room

In this sound work, Alvin Lucier records himself reading a text. He plays it in a room, records it again and again. After many repeats, the words slowly disappear, and only the echo and sound stay. This work made me understand that sound does not need meaning to be strong. In my early video project, I used this idea. I said the word “door” again and again. After a while, “door” was not about a real door anymore. It became a sound pattern. In the video, the image of a door also changed into shapes like a square or a ball. “Door” was changed by sound and space. Lucier’s work helped me see that sound can be a structure by itself, and that language can become something new when we break its meaning.

1.6 Ferdinand de Saussure – Course in General Linguistics

Saussure says that the link between a word and its meaning is not natural. The sound and the idea are not fixed together—they are chosen by people. This helped me think in a new way. In my project, I repeat the word “door” again and again. After some time, people cannot hear it as a word anymore. It just becomes a sound or a shape. Later, I use this word to make a new kind of creature in a fake magazine. The word “door” is not about a building anymore. It has a new meaning that I made. Saussure’s idea tells me this is okay, language is not always stable. If meaning is made, then it can be changed. I don’t just ask “what does ‘door’ mean?”—I remove that meaning and build something new.

1.7 Christian Marclay – Doors

This video by Christian Marclay shows many short parts from movies. Every clip has someone opening or closing a door. He puts them together to make a long chain of doors. The doors come from different films, but they look like one action. This turns “door” from a thing into a rhythm. It becomes a type of language. This idea helped me think: if we repeat a door many times, can we break its meaning? In my work, I also repeat the word “door” in sound and image. I change it again and again, until it is not just a door—it becomes a moving sound and shape. Marclay helped me see that “door” does not have to mean a way to go somewhere. It can be part of a system of rhythm and form.

1.8 Stefan Themerson – Semantic Divertissements

In this book, Stefan Themerson uses funny and strange ideas to break our trust in definitions, logic, and language rules. He says, “a definition is like a button—it is useful, but it will fall off.” This helped me think about how I broke and rebuilt the word “door” in my project. In the third week, I made a small book. I deleted the old meaning of “door” and gave it a new one. In the book, “door” is not a thing you open. It is now a new animal called “door.” I was not trying to find the

right meaning—I made up a fake system with many facts. This is like a game that looks real. Like the video work before, I repeated “door” until it lost meaning. But in the book, I repeated new facts to give “door” a new meaning. Themerson helped me understand: language does not have to tell the truth. It can be used to design, to play, and to create.

1.9 Samuel Beckett – Not I

In this play, the audience only sees a mouth in the dark. It speaks very fast. Most people cannot understand the words. The language becomes something else. It is not for talking anymore. It becomes a strong sound. This made me think: can language still exist when it has no clear meaning? In my video, I repeated the word “door” many times. Slowly, it lost its meaning and became just rhythm and sound. Later, I changed the sound to “ball.” This showed me that meaning can break, but sound can still stay. This idea helped me in the next part of my project. I made a fake magazine about a new animal called “door.” I gave it a full system with facts and biology. This shows how I broke the word first, and then gave it new life. It is the key idea in my work: break old meaning, then build a new one.

1.10 Xu Bing – Book from the Sky

This art work shows thousands of symbols that look like Chinese characters. But they are not real. They cannot be read. They have no meaning. Xu Bing makes us think: does language always need to tell something? His work looks like a real book, but it is full of fake signs. It still feels like knowledge. This gave me ideas for my “door creature magazine.” I also made a system with many facts and pictures, but it is not real. I just made it look real. Xu Bing helped me understand that the shape of language can give power, even when there is no true meaning. I used this to make “door” become a new thing, not a real word, but a new kind of meaning I created.

1.11 Beatriz Colomina & Mark Wigley – Are We Human? Notes on an Archaeology of Design

In this book, Colomina and Wigley say that design is not just about how things look or work. Design also changes how we think, speak, and understand ourselves. They think design is like a kind of archaeology. It builds how we know what is human, what is a thing, what is a language.

This idea helped me create my “door creature magazine”. First, I removed the normal meaning of the word “door.” Then I gave it a new role. In my book, “door” is not about going in and out. It is now a new life form, with data, pictures, and facts. I designed this new system to look real. This is more than art—it is like designing a new kind of meaning. Just like the book says: design is how we build our world. I used design to make “door” into something new and alive.

1.12 Marshall McLuhan – The Medium is the Message: An Inventory of Effects

In this book, McLuhan says that the way we send a message is more important than the message itself. The medium shapes how we feel and think. The book uses pictures and strange page design to show this idea. It is not only what it says, but how it looks and feels.

This helped me understand my own project. I turned the word “door” into sound, then into image, and then into a made-up animal. The meaning changed because the medium changed. McLuhan showed me that language does not just live in words. It also lives in sound, shape, and design. In my project, I used sound, video, and a fake magazine to explore this. I was not only changing the word—I was changing the way people receive it. That is why this book was so important for me.

2. Critical analysis

2.1 Critical Analysis: Roland Barthes – *The Rustle of Language*

In *The Rustle of Language*, Roland Barthes writes about how language does not always need to explain or communicate clearly. Instead, it can stay in a middle place—between meaning and no meaning. He calls this the “rustle,” like the sound of leaves or soft paper. It is quiet, unclear, but always moving. This makes language feel more like a texture or rhythm, not only a tool for giving information.

This idea gave me a new way to think about language in design. I used to believe that words in graphic design should always help people understand something. But Barthes shows that language can be used in another way. It can create an experience or a feeling, even if the meaning is hard to find. This is very important for how I began my own project.

Barthes’s writing also uses the same ideas in its own form. The sentences are soft and poetic. The book layout is clean and simple. There are no hard arguments. It gives space to think and feel. So the design of the book becomes part of the idea. It is not just saying “language can be soft.” It is showing that through how it is written and presented. This connection between content and form is something I wanted to try in my project too.

In my video work, I repeat the word “door” many times. At first, people hear it as a normal word. But after some time, the word feels different. It becomes strange. People may forget its meaning. This is like Barthes’s “rustle”—language without clear message, just sound and rhythm. I also learned that repetition is a tool. It can make people tired of a word, and then start to hear it in a new way. This “semantic fatigue” was something I used on purpose.

Later in the project, I used the word “door” in a different way. I made a magazine that describes “door” as a new life form. It is a fake animal with its own system. This is not a joke—it is a serious design of a new meaning. The original meaning is gone. The word becomes a shell for something else. Barthes’s theory supports this. If language is unstable, then we can rebuild it.

Barthes also helps me understand design as a space for feeling, not only for telling. Graphic communication does not always need to be clear or direct. It can be abstract, slow, or open. In this way, *The Rustle of Language* gave me both theory and method. It helped me start with sound, lose meaning, and build a new system from it.

This changed how I think about language in graphic design. It does not always need to speak. Sometimes, it just needs to make us listen.

2.2 Critical Analysis: Christian Marclay – *Doors*

Christian Marclay's *Doors* is a video montage composed of dozens of door-opening and door-closing scenes taken from films. These clips are carefully edited into one long, rhythmic sequence. Although the clips come from different stories and genres, they are stitched together to create a new kind of meaning—not based on narrative, but on repetition, timing, and movement.

Marclay transforms the “door” from a background object into the main subject. In most films, a door is used to move the story forward. But here, it becomes the story itself. Each opening leads directly into another, forming a loop. The video stops being about where the characters go. Instead, it focuses on the action of opening and closing—a kind of gesture or beat. In this way, *Doors* turns a common object into a visual and audio rhythm. The door is no longer about “what’s behind it,” but about “what it does.”

This approach challenged how I understand narrative, sequence, and symbols in graphic communication. Marclay shows that even without words or plot, a pattern of repeated actions can become its own language. This inspired me to use the word “door” in a similar way in my video. I repeated the sound “door” until it lost its meaning. I also distorted the image of the door—first showing it clearly, then as a block, and finally as a round shape. This echo of Marclay’s technique helped me turn a noun into a rhythm, and then into something abstract.

Unlike traditional visual communication that aims to deliver a message clearly, Marclay's work creates meaning through rhythm, editing, and viewer experience. It shifts the focus from "what it is" to "how it moves." This pushed me to treat repetition not just as a design tool, but as a method of language breakdown.

Later in my project, I extended this logic by designing a fictional magazine. In it, "door" becomes a biological creature with fake data and stories. This step—moving from breakdown to redefinition—was strongly influenced by Marclay's way of building structure from fragments. I no longer saw design as a translation of ideas into visuals, but as a system where images, words, and gestures form new meanings through repetition.

In conclusion, *Doors* helped me see repetition not as boring or empty, but as a powerful way to erase, reshape, and reimagine meaning in visual language. It showed me that a door is never just a door—it is what we make it become.

List of References

- Weiner, L. (1968) *Statements*. New York: Seth Siegelaub.
- Kosuth, J. (1965) *One and Three Chairs* [installation]. Museum of Modern Art, New York.
- Barthes, R. (2005) *The Neutral*. Translated by R. Krauss and D. Hollier. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Barthes, R. (1986) *The Rustle of Language*. Translated by R. Howard. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lucier, A. (1969) *I Am Sitting in a Room* [sound work]. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fAxHILK3Oyk> (Accessed: 21 May 2025).
- Saussure, F. de (2011) *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by P. Meisel and H. Saussy. Translated by W. Baskin. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Marclay, C. (1995) *Doors* [video montage]. Available at: <https://youtu.be/nQxYq7Z5tO8> (Accessed: 21 May 2025).
- Themerson, S. (1975) *Semantic Divertissements*. London: Gaberbocchus Press.
- Beckett, S. (1972) *Not I* [performance]. First performed at the Repertory Theatre, London, directed by A. Schneider.
- Xu, B. (1991) *Book from the Sky* [installation]. Beijing: Xu Bing Studio. Available at: <https://www.xubing.com/en/work/details/206?type=year&year=1991> (Accessed: 21 May 2025).
- Colomina, B. and Wigley, M. (2019) *Are We Human? Notes on an Archaeology of Design*. Zurich: Lars Müller Publishers.
- McLuhan, M. (1967) *The Medium is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects*. New York: Bantam Books.