University of Groningen

Do it yourself!

Kok, Annemarie

Published in:
Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art/Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek

DOI:
[10.1163/22145966-06801013](https://doi.org/10.1163/22145966-06801013)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kok, A. (2019). Do it yourself! Lessons in participation in a dynamic labyrinth. *Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art/Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 68(1), 378-405. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22145966-06801013>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Do it yourself!

Lessons in participation in a dynamic labyrinth

Annemarie Kok

The so-called first wave of participatory art in Europe took place in the 1960s.¹ This form of art invited spectators to participate in the artistic process and contribute to the animation, completion or creation of the artwork. In 1962, the Dutch art audience was confronted with a remarkable participatory art project in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam: a dynamic labyrinth that visitors could enter, be part of and contribute to. *Dylaby* (short for dynamic labyrinth) was not a traditional exhibition, 'simply' to be looked at. In an article about the show, the poet and journalist Gerrit Kouwenaar highlighted its appeal to 'the individual visitor' who was 'pitchforked into becoming a creator, a co-creator'.² He or she was expected to take on an active attitude and participate in the creative process. At the time the dynamic labyrinth was installed in Amsterdam, participatory art was relatively new to most museum visitors, and they did not always know what was expected of them when confronted with this form of art. In other words, these spectators still had to be instructed on how to participate in (the creation of) art. But a more trained audience needs directions as well, when facing participatory art. All forms of participatory art require a form of guidance – no matter how small. This article analyses the particular relation between participation and instruction, with a focus on one of the most notable participatory art projects in the Dutch art world of the 1960s: *Dylaby*.

Detail fig. 8

The first part of this text presents a brief sketch of the setup of the participatory and dynamic labyrinth in Amsterdam and of the ideals, plans and precursors leading to the realisation of this construction – partly based on archival materials. In connection, some other proposals for labyrinths stemming from artistic circles in the 1950s and 1960s will be briefly discussed. This is followed by a short excursion into theoretical interpretations of participatory art, centring on the dynamics of freedom and control in this particular art practice. From there, the focus shifts to procedures of guidance and instruction related to participatory artworks, which will be regarded not only as controlling, but also as didactic mechanisms. On the basis of historical source material (such as photographs, the catalogue and newspaper reports), forms of instruction that were employed in the context of *Dylaby* will be reconstructed and examined. Also, from a practical perspective, the need for instruction – of both participants and artists – will be discussed. After the analysis of the ways in which visitors to the dynamic labyrinth were instructed about their participation in the creative process, the possibilities to discover for *themselves* how to participate will be addressed as well, with a short detour to the pedagogical theory of Paolo Freire.

In recent years, interest has been growing in *Dylaby*, especially in the fields of exhibition history and curatorial practices.³ It is considered a pioneering and significant show and an important source of inspiration for present-day curators, artists and academics. Also, from an art historical perspective, attention has been paid to this remarkable installation, focusing on, for instance, elements of play, the labyrinthine dynamic and the realisation process of the project.⁴ This article aims to provide further insight into the various roots of *Dylaby* and seeks to shed light on the conceptualisation and use of participation in the labyrinthine environment created in 1962. In particular, the case of *Dylaby* is used to scrutinise the relationship between art, participation and education. This relationship can be examined from various perspectives. In the past few years, for instance, there has been increasing debate about artistic and curatorial practices that rely on educational models and seek to educate audiences.⁵ These 'pedagogic projects' – defined by art historian and critic Claire Bishop as 'projects that appropriate the tropes of education as both a method and a form: lectures, seminars, libraries, reading-rooms, publications, workshops and even full-blown schools' – are obviously participatory in character.⁶ In order to educate members of art audiences, these members first have to participate in the educative settings realised by artists or curators (i.e., education through participation). In the following, however, the focus will not be on the participatory art practice that claims to be pedagogic and consciously aims to educate people about a specific topic, such as politics, art or social issues. This article, rather, is concerned with the ways in which participants are given instructions about their participation in art projects: instructions one might call 'lessons in participation'. Instruction – that is, communication about how something should be done or operated – is a basic but vital and very concrete part of education, which is understood here as the larger process of acquiring knowledge, skills, habits, attitudes, values, moral principles and beliefs. It is this particular aspect of education that will – against the background of *Dylaby* – be examined in connection to art and participation, providing insights into the game of give and take between artists and participants that lies at the heart of participatory art.

The realisation of a dynamic labyrinth

In the summer of 1962, six artists worked intensively for a period of three weeks to create a large *Gesamtkunstwerk* in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Jean Tinguely, Niki de Saint Phalle, Per Olof Ultvedt, Robert Rauschenberg, Daniel Spoerri and Martial Raysse had joined their forces to construct a lively labyrinth consisting of seven interconnected rooms. In these successive rooms, the artists created, on site, various gangways, corridors and installations using all kinds of building materials (such as wood, wire netting and plaster) and everyday ready-made objects (among them beach balls, clocks, bicycle wheels and furniture). Spoerri, for instance, constructed a dark room (room I) through which visitors had to grope their way, along warm and cold walls, strange-smelling surfaces, animal skins, foam rubber, a toilet bowl and other materials and objects.⁷ In room V, Ultvedt installed a raised gangway with a row of wooden tourniquets (fig.

1). As visitors passed these turnstiles, horizontal wheels with white shirts attached to them started to move above their heads (suggesting floating ghosts). The last room of the labyrinth was filled with balloons by Tinguely, which could be put in motion by two fans and by the visitors (fig. 2).⁸ Within the larger context of the labyrinth, the various artists were engaged with their own project(s), but whenever possible they helped each other, as appears from a diary that was kept during the installation period and the photographs that were taken by Dutch photographer Ed van der Elsken and curator Ad Petersen.⁹

There was no Dutch artist among the team responsible for *Dylaby*. However, the show – a pioneering undertaking, as art historians generally

1

Exhibition view of *Dylaby*, room V, with an installation by Per Olof Ultvedt, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1962 (photo: Nederlands Fotomuseum / © Ed van der Elsken).

2

Exhibition view of *Dylaby*, room VII, with an installation by Jean Tinguely, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1962 (photo: Nederlands Fotomuseum / © Ed van der Elsken).

agree – took place in a Dutch museum.¹⁰ Under the guidance of director Willem Sandberg, the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam had developed into a meeting place of international artists, museum directors and curators and become an important platform for artistic experiments.¹¹ Therefore, it is perhaps not surprising that Sandberg put part of his museum at the disposal of a group of artists to build a complete labyrinth there in relative freedom.¹² The initial ideas for a 'Labyrinthe Dynamique' in Amsterdam were first put on paper in August 1961. A handwritten note by Sandberg, dated '19 . 8 '61', has been saved and mentions the period that was at first suggested for the project (May and June 1962) and the names of artists who could possibly contribute to the installation (Rauschenberg, Spoerri, Jasper Johns, De Saint Phalle and Tinguely).¹³ One can also find Tinguely's name next to the date on the scribble. This seems to indicate that Sandberg discussed these early plans for the dynamic labyrinth with him. Preserved correspondence between the two confirms that the museum director, in the first place, contacted Tinguely about the project.¹⁴ The artist had made a big impression on him during the exhibition *Bewogen Beweging* in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam in 1961.¹⁵ It was, eventually, Tinguely who proposed the names of the other artists participating in *Dylaby*, who were, at the time, all friends and direct colleagues of his.¹⁶ He would also become the coordinator of the project and the spokesman for the international team.¹⁷

It must be noted, however, that various other plans, models and initiatives, in which a labyrinthine structure combined with a participatory element played a key role, preceded the project in Amsterdam. In 1960,

for instance, Tinguely, Spoerri and the artist Bernhard Luginbühl had, for the coming Swiss National Exhibition (1964), made a design for a building with a maze-like character, in which various functions and elements could be brought together. The ideas of the three artists for 'ein dynamisches labyrinth' (i.e., a dynamic labyrinth) were written down by Spoerri in August 1960.¹⁸ In his text, a vertical and open steel construction is described, housing a maze of corridors, gangways, stairs, elevators and moving walkways which would lead to several cells, rooms and terraces. In certain rooms, visitors would be exposed to phenomena that appealed to various senses, often opposing in nature, such as heat, cold, wetness, smoke, air circulation and mirror reflections. In addition, the structure would be filled with amusement park-like attractions, such as a shooting gallery (to be created by De Saint Phalle), a haunted house (by Tinguely) and an obstacle course. Visitors would also operate, control and move various machines and objects themselves in the proposed labyrinth, which would enhance their participatory role in it: 'as animator, the viewer is constantly occupied, by triggering contacts, operating handles or turning cranks in a conscious or unconscious way, that trigger sounds, windmills, light sources, water sprinklers, movable elements and other mechanisms'.¹⁹ According to the artists, the complete construction could be used for any large fair or exhibition and easily adjusted to new circumstances. In the end, however, the design – of which Spoerri also made a wire frame model – was rejected by the organisers of the National Expo because it was deemed 'non Swiss'.²⁰ The plan for a 'dynamic labyrinth' would eventually be executed in Amsterdam, although in amended form and on a much smaller scale.

One can, however, go further back in time for plans to create a dynamic labyrinth. According to a written account of Pontus Hultén, then director of the Moderna Museet in Stockholm, his conversations with Tinguely about a giant labyrinthine construction to be created by various artists go back to 1955. The project had important aims: to break down the boundaries around the work of art and to replace the role of the passive spectator by that of an active participant. In the late 1950s, Hultén writes, various attempts were made to create such a construction.²¹ In 1958, for instance, he and Tinguely worked, together with the artists Hans Nordenström and Ultvedt, in the Liljevalchs Konsthall in Stockholm on the installation of a 'festival d'art total' that was to take the shape of a labyrinth.²² The manifestation was cancelled at the last minute by the management of the art centre. The recollections of Hultén, nevertheless, make clear that endeavours to realise a labyrinthine and participatory structure had already been made by Tinguely and his friends in the 1950s.

Another line of development can be traced from Spoerri's early involvement in experimental theatre.²³ In 1958, Spoerri – who started his career in the world of dance and theatre – wrote a text together with dramaturge and poet Claus Bremer about dynamic theatre.²⁴ In this article, entitled 'Beispiele für das dynamische Theater', the writers give examples of experimental forms of theatre that offered the spectators the opportunity to determine the course of the play. Spoerri's ideas about dynamic and participatory theatre eventually resulted in the production of 'autotheater', a form of theatre in which the spectators were actors and audience at the

same time. In 1959, for instance, he created, together with Tinguely, an installation in Antwerp consisting of a wall with flexible, vibrating mirrors and, in front of that, a horizontal round bar with paper rolls attached to it. When the bar started to rotate, with the help of an electric motor, the rolls with texts would turn as well, functioning as a kind of teleprompter. Visitors to this *Autotheater* were invited to perform their own play, with the help of the rotating texts and the distorting mirrors, and stimulated to discover and develop their own potentials with regard to the making of theatre.²⁵ Soon after, Spoerri wrote a text about 'autotheater', in which he describes point by point how this kind of theatre can be realised.²⁶ He suggests, among other things, to make use of various rooms through which visitors can move and writes that the arrangement of rooms can be 'like a labyrinth'.²⁷ In addition, gags, props (such as balloons, chairs and bicycles), projections, text rolls, mirrors and arrows pointing in the wrong direction in order to increase confusion should be placed in the rooms, which were to be designed by individual artists.²⁸ Throughout the 'labyrinth', members of the audience (or participants) were to be stimulated to create light, sound or movement. A first version of this article was published under the title 'Dynamisk labyrint. Autoteater-Skådespel', which translates as '*Dynamic labyrinth. Autotheatre-Spectacle* [emphasis added]'.²⁹ But even without this title, a link between Spoerri's ideas about experimental theatre and the eventual construction of a dynamic labyrinth in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam comes to the fore.

An important intermediate station between Spoerri's early ideas, texts and experiments and the creation of *Dylaby* was the exhibition *Bewogen Beweging*, which was organised by Hultén, Sandberg, Spoerri and Tinguely in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam in 1961.³⁰ In the summer of 1960, Spoerri sent Sandberg a proposal for an exhibition about kinetic art, eventually leading to *Bewogen Beweging*.³¹ As appears from this proposal, he had an exhibition design in mind that consisted of various cells in which visitors could experience all kinds of opposing optical and physical impressions. Spoerri also provided concrete examples of such cells, such as a completely darkened room, a mirror room and a labyrinthine room with movable panels made of coloured Plexiglas. Such an exhibition design was never used for *Bewogen Beweging*, but one can argue that part of this plan – that also shows overlap with the design for the Swiss National Expo and the descriptions of 'autotheater' – was eventually partly implemented with the installation of *Dylaby*.³²

In this context it is also important to mention a plan made in 1959 by the Dutch section of the Situationist International. This group wanted to build a labyrinth in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam as well. The environment they envisioned would consist of corridors and doors that were visible or openable from one side only, and would mix interior characteristics (such as furniture) and exterior, urban elements. Artificial climatic effects such as rain, fog and wind were to be incorporated in the labyrinthine structure, along with temperature and lighting changes, sound interventions and a number of provocations. Eventually, the situationists withdrew their plan, because they feared that the project would be too much subjected to restrictions and controls of the museum and city authorities. Later, the

artist Constant recalled that *Dylaby* was in the eyes of the situationists a caricature and popularised version of their plan, stripped of its theoretical background. It is too strong to state that the dynamic labyrinth of Tinguely and his team was a realisation, whether popularised or not, of the plans of the Situationist International (at least in the framework of this research no sources were found pointing that way). However, there are indeed some remarkable resemblances between the two projects, just as between *Dylaby* and Constant's *New Babylon* project, in relation to which he also used the words 'dynamies labyrint' (Dutch for 'dynamic labyrinth').³³ It is difficult to determine to what extent the two groups of artists were aware of each other's ideas and plans, but it must be emphasised that none of these artists functioned hermetically isolated and that their texts circulated throughout Europe.³⁴

It might be added that from the circle of the situationists an even earlier proposal for the construction of a labyrinth had arisen. Already in 1956, Guy Debord, writer, filmmaker and founding member of the Situationist International, developed a plan for an *Educational labyrinth* that he wanted to realise in the framework of the first exhibition of psychogeography in Brussels.³⁵ He proposed to install a series of identical corridors that would be arranged in such a way that orientation would be impossible. To achieve further disorientation, objects, pictures, slogans, false windows and useless arrows would be installed in the labyrinth. Debord also suggested to augment the environment with lighting contrasts, sound effects, the provision of wine and spirits and books for educational purposes and intellectual pleasure. The labyrinth was to urge its visitors to start a 'dérive', a technique of rapid passage through varied ambiances that would lead to a new relationship to the surroundings and to others. Eventually, the writer withdrew his project, and the labyrinth was never materialised. A few years later, other 'didactic labyrinths' – as artist and scholar Karen O'Rourke calls them – would be conceptualised and realised by Groupe de Recherche d'Art Visuel (GRAV), a group of artists founded in 1961 in Paris.³⁶ For the third Paris Biennial in 1963, for instance, GRAV constructed a labyrinth, consisting of various experiment rooms, which subjected the public to a series of perceptive, physical and participatory stimulations. In the successive cells, visitors could experience various categories of participation, ranging from 'visual activation' to 'voluntary participation' and 'active spectatorship'. While traversing the labyrinth the visitor would move closer and closer toward a form of 'true' participation. In a tract entitled *Assez de mystifications*, which GRAV handed out during the exhibition, the group explains:

We propose to engage the viewer in an action that sparks his or her positive qualities in a climate of communication and interaction.

Our labyrinth is only a first experiment, deliberately aimed at eliminating the distance that exists between the viewer and the work of art.

(...)

We want to interest viewers, to lead them out of their inhibitions, to help them relax.

We want them to participate.
 We want to place them in a situation that they activate and transform.
 We want them to be aware of their participation.
 We want them to move towards interacting with other viewers.
 We want to develop in the viewer a strong capacity for
 perception and for action.³⁷

The interactive labyrinth, thus, was to contribute to the release of its visitors' inhibitions and stimulate the development of their capacities and qualities with regard to perception, action and interaction.

The proposals for labyrinthine installations coming from artistic circles in the 1950s and 1960s were notably aimed at the involvement, activation and participation of visitors. The plans developed by Debord and GRAV demonstrate that a maze can have a didactic connotation as well. Traditionally, the labyrinth has been associated with processes of initiation, growth and enlightenment.³⁸ In such cases, it was believed that traversing a labyrinthine structure offered possibilities to develop particular qualities and gain specific insights. But even the basic process of wayfinding that takes place in almost every maze can be seen as a way of exploring and learning.³⁹ Below, it will become clear that participatory *and* didactic elements also appeared in the context of the dynamic labyrinth in Amsterdam.

After this brief overview of realised and unrealised precursors of *Dylaby*, it can be concluded that at least two of its initiators had a long-held dream of creating a maze-like environment that would spur its visitors into action and participation (and, also, that they were not the only ones with such a dream at the time). In addition, the analysis shows that the dynamic labyrinth was based not solely on the ideas and ideals of the project's coordinator Tinguely, but also on those of his colleague and friend Spoerri. Because of their close cooperation and their exchange of ideas, the two had, of course, also developed shared ideals. *Dylaby* was a joint production and, also, its underlying concepts emerged from a dialogue between several artists from different countries who had known each other for several years already and had collaborated on various occasions. The collaboration and 'dialogue' with the audience played an important role in the realisation of the project as well, as will be elaborated upon in the sections below.

From open invitation to concrete instruction

When *Dylaby* opened to the public on 30 August 1962, the installation was – to a certain extent – unfinished: it asked for the audience's action and contribution. Museum visitors who entered the labyrinth were encouraged to go on a voyage of discovery through the several rooms, where they would be overwhelmed by all kinds of sensory impressions. At the same time, these visitors had to put the labyrinth and its various parts in motion. They were invited to animate the art project and contribute to it. One of the central objectives of the dynamic installation was to stimulate participation. As Sandberg states in the catalogue to the exhibition, 'artists gathered from several countries/ with the aim to let the public/ participate in their work/ to let you see, feel, cooperate with them'.⁴⁰ 'Take part yourself' (in Dutch,

‘zelf meedoen’) was the idea behind the project, according to the museum director.⁴¹

Moving people in a literal and figurative way, *Dylaby* is a clear example of what is presently known as ‘participatory art’: art that allows members of the audience to intervene in the creative process and encourages these participants to create art themselves. Art historian Anna Dezeuze uses the term ‘do-it-yourself art’ to describe these kinds of art practices, underlining that they can exist *only* through actions that are performed by an active spectator.⁴² ‘The invitation comes from the artists’, she writes in her book *The ‘do-it-yourself’ artwork*, ‘and the “yourself” becomes anyone willing to participate’.⁴³ It should be emphasised here that terms such as ‘participation’ and ‘do-it-yourself’ were also already used by artists themselves in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1968, for instance, Lygia Clark stated with regard to her artworks that could be touched and manipulated by the viewer: ‘I want people to do it themselves’.⁴⁴

Tinguely also used the words ‘do it yourself’ with reference to his participatory works. Since the mid-1950s, he created so-called *Méta-matics*, drawing machines that relied upon the participation of the viewer. In the case of *Méta-matic no. 8 (Méta-Moritz)* (1959), for instance, people could insert a coin into it, pick a marker pen and push a button, whereupon the machine started to produce abstract artworks that were different each time. When this work was exhibited in Moderna Museet in Stockholm in 1959, it was accompanied by the text: ‘In cooperation with this drawing machine of Jean Tinguely, Meta-Matic nr 8, you can create an original postcard’.⁴⁵ The sign made clear that ‘you’ (the spectator) could make a drawing in collaboration with the machine designed and provided by the artist. In that same year the idea of ‘do it yourself’ was brought forward more prominently in Paris. For the promotion of an exhibition of his *Méta-matics* in the Iris Clert Gallery, Tinguely distributed flyers that stated: ‘do it yourself and create your own abstract painting with tinguely’s meta matics (a machine producing paintings)’.⁴⁶ The French part of the flyer also contained the words ‘libérez-vous’, encouraging the inhabitants of Paris to start creating their own art in order to free themselves. The freedom of the participants was, however, relatively restricted, as they were working with a machine over which they had – after pushing the button – no further control; in a sense they were no more than a cog in a bigger machine. Nevertheless, members of the audience were given the opportunity to intervene in the creative process, and a triangular cooperation between artist, machine and participant could be realised.

The phrase ‘do it yourself’ can, on the one hand, be interpreted by the reader as an open invitation from the artist to pick up the materials that are provided and to create art. On the other hand, however, the phrase is an imperative clause and, as such, in itself an instruction. One can state that all forms of participatory or do-it-yourself art are to a greater or lesser extent defined by some form of instruction. Artists can provide the spectator/participant with written or spoken directions, but also the materials and forms that are given or the room in which a participatory project takes place can direct the participation of the audience and guide the course of the creative process.⁴⁷ Participatory art always brings a

certain mandate along, as has been ascertained in recent scholarship on this art practice.⁴⁸ Dezeuze, for instance, compares do-it-yourself artworks with scientific experimental protocols, since they share a concern with maintaining a balance between limited variables and an openness to a range of results, including unexpected ones. She writes: 'If the variables are too restrictive, the experiment will not prove anything new – just as constrained participation becomes "merely mechanical". If, on the other hand, they are too open, then the experiment risks being as "arbitrary" as a do-it-yourself artwork with no meaningful result'.⁴⁹ Do-it-yourself artworks always provide a minimal framework for the range of participatory activities they invite, because without such frameworks, Dezeuze reasons, the works would be entirely arbitrary and truly chaotic.⁵⁰

This was also already concluded by Umberto Eco in his book *Opera aperta*, published in 1962 – the same year that the dynamic labyrinth in Amsterdam was built. Eco noticed a specific form of 'openness' in contemporary works of art, in music, literature, theatre and the visual arts alike.⁵¹ He named this particular species of art 'open work' or 'work in movement'. According to Eco, a work in movement discloses a 'field of possibilities' that is open to all sorts of interpretations and productive choices of readers, viewers or listeners. The artwork is no longer made up of elements that are tied to one another by a 'term-to-term determination', but is a field of components that can be arranged and linked to each other in different ways by the addressee. He or she is free to choose his or her own route through this field and to make his or her own connections, on an interpretative level, but in some cases also on a formative level. These open works are, thus, quite literally 'unfinished' and can be compared to a 'construction kit': the artist (or author) offers the addressee the components of a work to be completed.⁵² Eco explains that this demands a particular involvement and also creativity from the audience. In a footnote, the Italian writer mentions the drawing machines of Jean Tinguely as an example of this family of 'works in movement'.⁵³ On the basis of Eco's descriptions, the dynamic labyrinth in Amsterdam (a field of possibilities in which visitors could choose their own route) can also be labelled as an 'open work'.

Throughout his publication, Eco emphasises that the openness he discerns in art and the possibilities to react and contribute that come with it are always to a certain extent restricted. He points to two important factors that cannot be escaped with regard to the experience of the open work: the work itself and its initiator. Via the work, the addressee is offered a particular form, a specific structure or a certain field of relations, and he or she can, subsequently, elaborate on that format, or take his or her own route through that field. On the one hand, the work appeals to the audience's capacities for response, but on the other hand, the format provided by the artist directs and limits the reactions of the addressees, Eco reasons. The reaction or contribution of the reader, listener or viewer is therefore always rooted in the 'original data' communicated via the work *and* provided by the artist or author.⁵⁴ Eco states that the tendency toward disorder that is characteristic of the poetics of openness must be understood 'as a tendency toward *controlled* disorder, toward circumscribed *potential*, toward a freedom that is constantly curtailed by *the germ of formativity* present in any form that

wants to remain open to the free choice of the addressee'.⁵⁵ According to Eco, this prevents the work in movement from complete chaos, from arbitrary responses and from indiscriminate participation. In his view, the oscillation between order and disorder is the essence of the open work.⁵⁶

For now, one can conclude that the dynamics of freedom and control are always at work in participatory art and can manifest themselves in various forms and at different levels. On the one hand, there is, inevitably, the invitation from the artist to the spectator to contribute to the creative process. On the other hand, there is in all instances a certain starting point, framework or instruction given by the artist(s), which guides the direction of the creative process and the actions of the participant(s) to a greater or lesser extent. On his or her turn, however, the participant has on all occasions the freedom to decide what he or she will do with the instructions and elements that are offered to him or her. A spectator can even decide not to take part at all. From this perspective, procedures of instruction and guidance in participatory art can be regarded as controlling mechanisms; artists can deploy them to control the course of the creative process and the behaviour of the participants. However, instructions and guidelines in the context of this particular art practice can also be considered as important didactic tools. After all, participants need to be informed on how they can take part in and contribute to the creative process and, to a certain extent, learn how to deal with the participatory artworks they are confronted with – particularly when this art form is completely new to the art audience, as was often the case in the 1950s, 1960s and even early 1970s. Clear instructions can help them to gain an understanding of do-it-yourself works, grasp what is expected of them and acquire skill in participating in the creation of art. The question arises, in what way the visitors to *Dylaby* were guided in and instructed about their participation in the realisation of the project? What lessons in participation did they receive while entering the labyrinth? The analysis below will demonstrate how in the labyrinthine environment in Amsterdam instructions and directions functioned as educational tools. In addition, on the basis of the practice of participatory art, it will be explained why such forms of instruction are, indeed, needed.

'Are you prepared to create art yourself?'

According to Gerrit Kouwenaar, the intention of the initiators of the dynamic labyrinth in Amsterdam was clear: '(...) above all they seek to get the public to participate in the making process, in the creativity'.⁵⁷ There were various ways in which visitors could take part in the 'making process' of *Dylaby*. In the second room, for instance, they could enter a complex wooden construction of stairways and doors, created by Ultvedt. When participants opened these doors, chairs began to swing through the space, a church bell started tolling or a zither would make sounds.⁵⁸ In the fourth, beach-like room, filled by Raysse with a swimming pool, inflatable animals, beach balls and a beach chair, people could drop a coin into a jukebox and play their favourite record (fig. 3).⁵⁹ And in the shooting gallery of De Saint Phalle, part of room V, they could use an air gun to shoot at little bags of paint to explode them and thereby add colour to the group of white sculptures below.⁶⁰ The

photographs of Ed van der Elsken – who was commissioned to document the installation activities of the artists and the actions of visitors going through the participatory labyrinth – show children and adults interacting, playing and laughing. Some of the written reviews of the show, however, point out that the ‘fun fair’ in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam also evoked irritation and even anger among the audience.⁶¹

Visitors to *Dylaby* – according to one reporter there were tens of thousands of them – were given direct and indirect instructions on how to participate in the project.⁶² In the entrance hall of the museum, the audience was right away confronted with a sign with the illuminated word ‘Dylaby’ and on top an illuminated arrow (fig. 4). This neon sign, designed by Raysse, had to entice people to visit the labyrinth and showed them the way to the entry of the installation.⁶³ On their arrival, they faced an assemblage created by Rauschenberg, consisting of a car tyre and part of a timber packing case with a double-headed arrow painted on it. This ambiguous sign, with an arrowhead on either end, one pointing left and one right, indicated the two possible entrances to the labyrinth.⁶⁴ The visitors were given some degree of guidance here, but at the same time, they had to choose their own route (left or right). Apparently, the double arrow was considered a suitable and representative symbol for *Dylaby*, because Rauschenberg also designed one for the cover of the show’s catalogue (figs. 5, 6).⁶⁵ It is perhaps not surprising that the arrow, a direction indicator, appeared repeatedly in and around the labyrinth

3

Exhibition view of *Dylaby*, room IV, with an installation by Martial Raysse, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1962 (photo: Nederlands Fotomuseum / © Ed van der Elsken).

in Amsterdam. After all, searching and finding one's way is at the core of maze-like constructions, and arrow-shaped signs can assist in this. Arrows are, indeed, also prominently present on the detailed floor plan of *Dylaby* that Ultvedt created, at the request of all the participating artists (fig. 7).⁶⁶ This map, which was added to the catalogue as a loose fold-out page, indicated very precisely which objects and installations could be found in the labyrinth and where, and who had placed them there. Moreover, the floor plan with the arrows provided directions for possible routes through the environment and information about elements that could be put in motion (in particular with regard to room II). The catalogue and the fold-out map were printed shortly after the opening of the show and could thereafter be used by visitors to find their way and learn more about the possibilities for participation in the labyrinth.

Inside the maze-like structure as well, various means were employed to guide participants on their journey and instruct them on how to contribute to the art project. For instance, museum employees were stationed at various locations in the labyrinth. When necessary, they gave instructions to the roaming audience, such as 'you are going the wrong way, sir' or 'keep on walking'.⁶⁷ The situation was to a certain extent new to museum staff members: they were accustomed to warning visitors not to touch anything, but now they had to – on the contrary – encourage them to do so. Nevertheless, staff members still had to keep an eye on the art installation, to ensure that nothing would break because of visitors'

4

Sign to the entrance of *Dylaby* created by Martial Raysse, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1962, (photo: Nederlands Fotomuseum / © Ed van der Elsken).

5

Front cover of the *Dylaby* catalogue designed by Robert Rauschenberg, 1962 (photo: author).

6

Back cover of the *Dylaby* catalogue designed by Robert Rauschenberg, 1962 (photo: author).

‘enthusiastic’ participation.⁶⁸ One museum employee was standing at the shooting gallery of De Saint Phalle (fig. 8). He handed participants the air gun with which they could shoot at the paint-filled bags and, accordingly, colour two large monsters and some smaller figures, animals and objects. The man was dressed in a white suit and wore a safari helmet on his head, enhancing the idea of a hunting expedition. Because of this costume, which De Saint Phalle bought one day before the opening of the show, the employee also became more explicitly part of the installation.⁶⁹ Besides, the man had direct contact with the audience members and could inform and instruct them verbally. He functioned, consequently, as an important mediator between the artist, the artwork and the participants. Visitors to the shooting gallery were, in addition, also informed and instructed with the aid of a sign (fig. 9). The message on it explained that they could contribute to the painting of an artwork in the shooting gallery, but that they were allowed to shoot only at the moving bags of paint.⁷⁰ Moreover, the labyrinth itself functioned as an instructional device as well. By means of the labyrinthine structure, the artists provided participants with a clear and guiding framework. It offered a particular routing, and visitors were steered in a certain direction with the help of the rooms and (in particular) walls. Such a structure could, of course, be experienced as restricting or compelling, but it also functioned as a navigational aid.

The forms of guidance and instruction that have been reconstructed here on the basis of historical source materials were employed to turn visitors into participants. On the one hand, these instructional means helped visitors to find their way through the labyrinth – a basic level of involvement in the art project. On the other hand, participants were given instructions on how to put things in motion and to add colour to *Dylaby* (in a literal and figurative sense) – stimulating them to actually transform and contribute to the structure of the art project. These lessons in participation were offered to visitors in various ways: either in word or image, via signs or via human beings, explicitly (e.g., participants were personally addressed by museum employees) or implicitly (e.g., participants were guided by the walls of the labyrinth). In particular, with regard to De Saint Phalle’s

shooting gallery, people received direct instructions. After all, in the framework of this installation participants were allowed to shoot, and clear directions were required. De Saint Phalle also offered the most extensive possibilities to participate and create, as was underlined by some reporters at the time, and this asked for more extensive lessons.⁷¹ One can conclude, however, that all the instructional means analysed here, one way or another, functioned as didactic mediators that were aimed at the activation of the visitors and the animation of *Dylaby*.

As was touched upon above, several *Dylaby* initiators had been experimenting with the employment of participatory strategies in art for some time. In connection with this, forms of instruction were developed and presented. For example, Tinguely created signs and flyers with appealing and guiding texts that had accompanied his *Méta-matics*, as mentioned before. Instructions also played a pivotal role with regard to a do-it-yourself work that the artist made for an exhibition in Museum Haus Lange in Krefeld in 1960. During the show, visitors could buy an instruction manual that gave them the possibility and right to build their own version of the work *Maschinenbild*. In exchange for 60 German marks, they received a detailed plan (full size), a construction description and a photograph of the (possible) end result. After buying the right materials, one could start making one's own piece of art. This do-it-yourself kit – reminiscent of the 'construction kit' mentioned by Eco – also contained a label on which Tinguely could, eventually, place his signature, after the work was finished. According to the instruction manual, the machine 'remains an original of Jean Tinguely and yet you can identify yourself with the image as producer'.⁷² The artwork was, thus, the result of a collaboration between the artist and the (co-)producer, who received, however, very clear instructions about his or her tasks in the creative process, while the artist retained the possibility to sign the work. Tinguely was not fully prepared to relinquish his authorship and control over the creation of the piece of art. But the extensive instruction manual not only functioned as a means of control, it was also supplied to guide the co-producers step by step through the production process and teach them how to create an artwork themselves. In the case of *Maschinenbild*, the artist created a 'recipe' and the participant had to do the 'cooking'. The same concept underlay, and was literally communicated in, the above-mentioned *Autotheater* ('auto' meaning 'self', 'one's own' or 'by oneself') that Tinguely and Spoerri had initiated in Antwerp. On the one hand, visitors were invited to create their own theatre, and, on the other hand, they were provided with a rotating script. The content of the text rolls emphasised the central idea of the piece with texts such as 'Are you prepared to create art yourself?', 'Get your do it yourself kit here' and 'An artist makes the recipe you do the cooking'.⁷³

One can conclude that artists such as Tinguely and Spoerri, indeed, stimulated art viewers to do it themselves – to create their own art, or at least contribute to the creative process – but also that they gave specific instructions on *how* to do it. From a theoretical perspective, it has been argued above that participatory art, or do-it-yourself art, requires a form of framing and instruction in order to prevent chaos and arbitrariness. The practice of this particular art genre underlines this. At the Museum

VI robert rauschenberg

- 1 deur
- 2 canvas met coca cola bord
- 3 lamp
- 4 bad met water en luchtpomp
- 5 stukken van een vliegtuig, autoband, etc.
- 6 laag ding met licht en zes snel-draaiende klokken
- 7 fietsframe
- 8 tafel op wielen
- 9 tuin
- 10 witte wegmarkering
- 11 schelpen
- 12 grond
- 13 hout

VII jean tinguely

- 1 grote ventilator
- 2 kleine ventilator
- 3 luchtstroom
- 4 ballon
- 5 knappende ballon

8

Exhibition view of *Dylaby*, room V, with Niki de Saint Phalle's shooting gallery, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1962 (photo: Nederlands Fotomuseum / © Ed van der Elsen).

of Modern Art (MOMA) in Oxford, for instance, the exhibition *POPA at MOMA. Pioneers of Part-Art* was organised in 1971, showing works of, among others, Lygia Clark, Graham Stevens, John Dugger and David Medalla.⁷⁴ The show was announced as 'the first full scale survey of the latest movement in world art', with objects for people to touch, wear, bounce on, manipulate, experiment and make come alive.⁷⁵ The opening of the exhibition, however, resulted in 'a public "riot"', as one of the participating artists stated later.⁷⁶ Art critic Guy Brett reported about this event: 'Some people seemed to arm themselves with the word "participation" as a kind of mocking justification for working off aggressive energy and breaking things up'.⁷⁷ Part of the audience took 'participation too far', as another journalist wrote at the time.⁷⁸ The artists Dugger and Medalla, who arrived late that evening, got upset and frustrated when they were confronted with the behaviour of some visitors. They accused these spectators of being 'destructive Philistines' and withdrew their works on the spot.⁷⁹ One of the organisers of the show would afterwards explain that people were trying to participate but that they 'didn't fully understand the work and the artists were a bit late in arriving to explain'.⁸⁰ Brett came to similar conclusions in his report and added that 'one needs to be initiated into the use of these works'.⁸¹ Members of the audience in Oxford were clearly not prepared to create art themselves. They did not know how to approach this pioneering art or what to do with it. The event demonstrates how vital instructions are for a good understanding of and proper interaction with participatory art.

Viewers had to learn how to engage with this type of art. In turn, however, the artists had to learn how to engage with their audience, if participation was to succeed. As Dugger later recalled, the incident in Oxford made him realise 'the real-life conditions that pertained to participation art'.⁸² From that moment on, Dugger and Medalla tried to create more robust works and also provided clear instructions when they presented their 'part-art'.⁸³ When John Dugger exhibited his *Perennials* – flower-like, flexible constructions that responded kinetically when activated by the energetic movements of the participant's hand – in Utrecht in 1972, for example, he accompanied them with a sign reading: 1. COIL TUBE AROUND YOUR FINGER 2. FOLD BACK NETTING OVER COIL 3. RELEASE.⁸⁴ In capital letters, he explained step by step how participants could animate his participatory works. Spectators, of course, still had the freedom to decide to follow the instructions that were provided, or not.

The analysis of the historical source material has demonstrated that artists who pioneered with participatory art also experimented with procedures of instruction and guidance, which functioned as both controlling and didactic mechanisms. In the case of *Dylaby*, various forms of instruction were employed that, on the one hand, gave the initiators a certain amount of control over the creative process and, on the other hand, offered them possibilities to coach visitors to the labyrinth in their participation. The example of the show in Oxford underlines that openness in art asks not only for controlling means, but also for forms of education. The audience members were in need of lessons in participation, whereas

9

Sign at Niki de Saint Phalle's shooting gallery in *Dylaby*, room V, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1962 (photo: Nederlands Fotomuseum / © Ed van der Elksen).

the artists had to learn how to initiate and present their participatory art, in order to make participation work properly. Instructions are, consequently, vital to both participants (teaching them how to participate) and artists (helping them to make their art understood and function). Viewing participatory art through the lens of education offers a new perspective on instructions and presents them as important mediators in the game of give and take between artist and participant.

Learning by doing it yourself

In the previous section it was shown that the initiators of *Dylaby* provided the audience with clear instructions on how to participate, in line with the manuals, scripts and recipes that Tinguely and Spoerri had offered to art viewers before. Conversely, however, visitors to the dynamic labyrinth were given room to discover for themselves what could be found and done within the walls of the art installation. So, in that sense, 'learning by doing it yourself' also played a role in the participatory project in Amsterdam. Visitors were stimulated to explore for themselves how to, among other things, find a route through the maze, engage with the art project and contribute to the animation of the work. In addition, by going on an expedition through the labyrinth, participants could learn more about a particular vision of art and artishood. The initiators of the dynamic labyrinth removed art, literally and figuratively, from its pedestal and wanted to bring it closer to the people. Also, they believed that everyone could be creative and, consequently, participate in the making of art. By touching, climbing and shooting at an actual artwork, visitors to the labyrinth could experience – for themselves – art in a completely different way and become acquainted with the vision of art underlying *Dylaby*. The principle of 'learning by doing' was supported by the labyrinthine structure of the project. The labyrinth – both a symbol of imprisonment and liberation – offered possibilities to direct visitors in their participation, but also to let them discover for themselves and learn from the experiences resulting directly from their own actions and decisions.⁸⁵

The maze-like construction in Amsterdam also stimulated playful behaviour. In participatory art of the 1950s and 1960s, play was a frequently recurring element, also in conjunction with the structure of a playroom or a labyrinth.⁸⁶ As was touched upon above, the amusement park served as an example for the installation in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. A few days before its opening, Spoerri explained to a Dutch journalist that the dynamic labyrinth was nothing more than a classic fun fair.⁸⁷ The forms of play that this Luna Park-setting brought also added to the atmosphere of 'learning by doing it yourself'. Various scholars of pedagogy, sociology and psychology have described the didactic potentials of play, among them John Dewey, Maria Montessori, Friedrich Fröbel, Hans Scheuerl and Jean Piaget. Play or playfulness can offer a pathway for intellectual, social, emotional and physical development for people of all ages.⁸⁸ In situations of 'playful learning', indicated by patterns of delight, wonder and choice, learners 'try out ideas, test theories, experiment with symbol systems, explore social relations, take risks, and reimagine the world.'⁸⁹ Several of these activities were, to a greater or lesser extent, possible in the context of

Dylaby. Moreover, one can state that the situations of play that could take place in the framework of the labyrinth encouraged visitors to participate and contribute creatively. After all, participation is a crucial condition of play, and, consequently, participatory behaviour can be stimulated and developed via forms of play.⁹⁰

So, in various ways visitors to the dynamic labyrinth in Amsterdam were given lessons in participation. On the one hand, they received direct and indirect instructions on how to participate in the project. On the other hand, there was room for them to playfully discover for themselves what the labyrinth contained and how they could contribute to it. On this particular level of education one can discern a similar oscillation between forms of guidance (or control) and openness, which also characterises participatory art in general. It connects, to a certain extent, to what the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire wrote about progressive education in the 1960s. Various parallels can be drawn between the domain of the visual arts and the field of progressive pedagogical thought – in which Freire's text played a key role – as they existed in the 1960s. In both fields, for instance, progressive ideas concerning participation, a reversal of power relations, liberation of individuality, democracy, empowerment, et cetera emerged at that time, and analysis of these parallels or shared ideas could offer another perspective from which to scrutinise the relationship between art, participation and education.⁹¹ Here, however, some ideas ventilated by Freire will be only briefly touched upon, to shed light on the dynamics of freedom and control that relate to (both) participatory and educative situations. In his *Pedagogia do oprimido*, published in 1970 and translated into English as *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, Freire promotes education as a dialogical and collective undertaking, in which students take up the roles of active, participating and critical 'co-investigators' (instead of being passive receivers).⁹² This active participation of students in the educational process leads to true reflection and action or, more specifically, to critical thinking, creativity, making one's own choices and, eventually, liberation. The model of education proposed by the Brazilian educator can, in his view, function as an instrument of liberation, on condition that power relations are redefined and teachers and students become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. This does not mean, however, that authority or forms of direction have to be abandoned completely. According to Freire, it is, above all, important that they are deployed for the greater good (i.e., liberation instead of oppression). He states: 'arguments based on "authority" are no longer valid; in order to function, authority must be on the side of freedom, not against it'.⁹³ Later he would write in another text: 'Dialogue means a permanent tension between authority and liberty. But, in this tension, authority continues to be because it has authority vis-à-vis permitting student freedoms which emerge, which grow and mature precisely because authority and freedom learn self-discipline'.⁹⁴ Here as well – on the terrain of progressive participatory education – the dynamics of freedom and control manifest themselves. Freire's perspective also underlines that forms of authority, direction or instruction do not necessarily lead to oppression, but that they can be employed as well to help, guide or liberate others: a teacher can direct a student in his or her search for self-direction, just as

an artist can guide a participant in his or her contribution to the making or completion of an artwork – in doing it him- or herself. It supports the view that procedures of instruction and guidance that can be discerned in participatory art from the 1950s and 1960s should be regarded not only as controlling mechanisms, but also as important didactic tools (to move participants forward).

Conclusion. Art, participation and education

Participatory or do-it-yourself art gives viewers the possibility to contribute to the creation of a work of art. As argued above, also on the basis of theories by Deuze and Eco, this openness in art always goes hand in hand with controlling elements or, more specifically, with some level of instruction. It has been demonstrated that various forms of instruction were employed in the context of *Dylaby* (such as arrows, signs and spoken directions from museum employees) and in conjunction with some do-it-yourself artworks that preceded the project in Amsterdam. From a theoretical and practical perspective it has also been made clear that such structures of guidance and instruction in participatory art are necessary, in order to prevent arbitrary responses, indiscriminate participation and 'Philistine' behaviour on the part of audience members. Art viewers need to be informed about what is expected of them when they are confronted with participatory art, learn how to deal with this particular art form and develop their do-it-yourself skills. In other words, they are in need of lessons in participation, and instructions are vital to this. Consequently, instructions in the framework of participatory art can be regarded as controlling, but also as important didactic means. The perspective of education demonstrates that forms of instruction play a pivotal role in the 'negotiations' between artists and participants and are essential for making participatory artwork. Both artist and participant benefit from it. However, analysis of the dynamic labyrinth in Amsterdam also shows that in addition to procedures of instruction, a more open form of education is possible as well with regard to lessons in participation: learning by doing it yourself.

The scrutinisation of *Dylaby* and the lessons in participation related to it have brought to the surface a (basic) connection between art, participation and education. In the course of the 1960s the connection between the three fields intensified. Various art projects that made use of educational methods and devices can be pointed out throughout the 1960s and 1970s. The event scores created by Fluxus artists, for example, were in a general sense proposals, propositions and instructions, but were in some cases even brought forward as lessons.⁹⁵ In 1963 the Fluxus artist Ben Vautier wrote an event score entitled *Lesson*, reading: 'Like a classroom teacher with a blackboard, performer gives a lesson to other performers on a subject such as geography, Latin, grammar, mathematics, etc.'⁹⁶ The best-known example of an artist who brought art, participation and education together is probably Joseph Beuys.⁹⁷ He not only was a teacher at the Düsseldorf Arts Academy for years (claiming, 'to be a teacher is my greatest work of art'), but also incorporated pedagogical formats and devices in his artistic practice.⁹⁸ In 1972, for instance, he installed his *Büro der Organisation für direkte Demokratie durch Volksabstimmung* in the

Museum Fridericianum in Kassel. This was a kind of information office/class room, including desks, chairs and a blackboard, where Beuys could converse and debate with others about topics such as art, politics and education. The artist hoped that visitors to his office (or 'independent free school') would learn more about democracy and freedom. He also wanted to contribute to the formation of their individual creativity and (political) consciousness.⁹⁹ These antecedents or early examples of so-called pedagogic projects from the 1960s and early 1970s would eventually lead to the much-discussed educational turn in art, which brought together even more profound art, participation and education.¹⁰⁰

The *Dylaby* case study also reveals how the dynamics of freedom and control manifest themselves, at various levels and in various forms, in participatory art. These dynamics were reflected in contemporary written reports of the 1962 project. According to Ton Frenken, who visited *Dylaby* and wrote an article about it, the labyrinth displayed traces of coercion.¹⁰¹ Kouwenaar emphasised, on the contrary, that the maze was not really aggressive but, in fact, 'cheerful and human', offering enough possibilities to co-create.¹⁰² The oscillation between freedom and control, between openness and restrictiveness, revealed itself even in the smallest details. The sign in De Saint Phalle's shooting gallery, for instance, contained both an open invitation and concrete instruction: 'You can participate in the painting of an artwork. Only shoot at the moving bags!' This underlines that the dynamics of freedom and control are at the core of participatory art, but also that it is crucial to analyse all aspects of this art practice, the instructional signs included. Instructions are significant mediators in the network of actors that together constitute a participatory artwork and, consequently, an important object of study.

Notes

- 1 See also Deuze 2010, 4.
- 2 Kouwenaar 1962: 'Met andere woorden de individuele bezoeker wordt hier (...) tot maker, méé-maker gebombardeerd'. For the English translation, see Altshuler 2013, 35-36.
- 3 See, e.g., Petersen 1991, and Altshuler 2013. In 2011, the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam organised a series of exhibitions entitled *Recollections*. The aim of this series was to revive legendary exhibitions from the museum's past with the help of catalogues, pictures, films and artworks. The first edition of *Recollections* was dedicated to *Bewogen Beweging* and *Dylaby*. During a recent symposium at the same museum, entitled *Lose yourself!* (February 2017), the legacy of labyrinthine exhibition models and its relevance in the 21st century was investigated, with a particular focus on *Dylaby* and *HON-en kathedraal* (1966, Moderna Museet in Stockholm).
- 4 See, respectively, Schoenberger 2017, Bätzner 2007, and Petersen 2000. Ad Petersen was, as a curator of the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, a direct witness to the realisation process of *Dylaby*. Together with Tinguely, he also kept a diary during this period, which was published (in his handwriting) in the *Dylaby* catalogue, cat. Amsterdam 1962, n.p.
- 5 See, e.g., Podesva 2007; Rogoff 2008; O'Neill & Wilson 2010; Allen 2011; and Birchall 2017.
- 6 Bishop 2012, 241.
- 7 Spoerri 2001, 77, 279; Pisa 1962.
- 8 See, for descriptions and photographs of the various rooms, cat. Amsterdam 1962 and Petersen 2000.
- 9 See also, about this diary, note 4. For the photographs made by Van der Elsen and Petersen, see also cat. Wolfsburg etc. 2000, 151-209. The original wish of Sandberg was that the artists would work together on one design, but this was never realised. See Leeuw Marcar 2004, 261-262.
- 10 In *Biennials and beyond*, Bruce Altshuler documents 25 of the most 'significant and pioneering exhibitions' that took place between 1962 and 2002, among them *Dylaby*. See Altshuler 2013.
- 11 About this, see also curator Harald Szeemann in Obrist 1996, 78; and Petersen 2000, 154.
- 12 See also Sandberg 1963, 59; and a letter from Ad Petersen in Verheul 2005.
- 13 See the handwritten note of Willem Sandberg mentioning the 'Labyrinthe Dynamique' in the digital archives of the Stedelijk Museum library in Amsterdam, folder 4160. The name of Jasper Johns was in a later stage replaced by the name of Ulvedt.
- 14 This correspondence can be found in the digital archive of the Stedelijk Museum library in Amsterdam. See, e.g., a handwritten letter from Tinguely to Sandberg, received 31 August 1961, in folder 2707. In 1963 Sandberg recalled that he discussed the plan for *Dylaby* with Tinguely, over coffee in New York. According to a later account of his, Rauschenberg joined them as well. It

- is, however, unclear whether this coffee meeting took place before or after 31 August 1961. A handwritten note in the digital archive of the Stedelijk Museum library in Amsterdam (folder 4160) only makes clear that Sandberg had a meeting with Tinguely in New York on 30 April 1962. See also Sandberg 1963, 59, and Leeuw Marcar 2004, 261.
- 15 Petersen 1991, 160; Schavemaker 2016, 155.
- 16 See, for the final list with names proposed by Tinguely, a letter from Tinguely to Sandberg, received 25 May 1962, and a letter from Sandberg to Spoerri, Raysse, De Saint Phalle and Tinguely, dated 5 June 1962, in the digital archives of the Stedelijk Museum library in Amsterdam, folder 4160. Initially, the artist Jim Dine was invited to contribute to the project as well, but he had to cancel his participation. The artists who, eventually, contributed to *Dylaby* were all friends and acquaintances of Tinguely. Spoerri and Tinguely had been friends since 1949 and were both living in Paris in the late 1950s, where they met and collaborated frequently. Tinguely got to know Niki de Saint Phalle in 1956 and the two became friends, collaborators and also lovers. Tinguely, Spoerri and De Saint Phalle were all associated with Nouveau réalisme, a French art movement founded in 1960. Martial Raysse also joined this network of new realists in 1960. Tinguely and Rauschenberg had met in New York in 1960, and the American artist became friends with Tinguely and De Saint Phalle; they collaborated on various occasions in 1961 and 1962. Tinguely and Ultvedt had also known each other for a while, since the two had already worked together in 1958 in the Liljevalchs Konsthall in Stockholm.
- 17 Petersen 1991, 161; Petersen 2000, 160.
- 18 See Spoerri 2001, 68–72.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 70–71: 'der zuschauer wird als animator ständig beschäftigt, indem er auf bewusste oder unbewusste weise kontakte auslöst, hebel betätigt oder kurbeln dreht, die töne, windmühlen, lichtquellen, wasserbrausen, bewegliche elemente und andere mechanismen auslösen'.
- 20 For a photograph of the now lost wire frame model, see Spoerri 2001, 71. See also, about this project, cat. Amsterdam 1962, n.p.
- 21 Hultén 1972, 245. According to Hultén, the design for the Swiss National Exhibition was an extension of this plan.
- 22 Cat. Amsterdam 1962, n.p.; Hultén 1972, 245.
- 23 See also Spoerri 2001, 279.
- 24 An early version of this text was published in *das neue forum* 7 (1958/1959), 109–112. A later (slightly revised) version was published in F. Mon *et al.* (eds.), *Movens. Dokumente und Analysen zur Dichtung, bildenden Kunst, Musik, Architektur*, Wiesbaden 1960, 117–121. This version was reprinted in Spoerri 2001, 56–60.
- 25 This installation was part of the exhibition *Vision in motion – Motion in vision* (1959) in the Hessenhuis in Antwerp. It was the first visual arts exhibition in which Spoerri took part. See Spoerri 2001, 60–62.
- 26 A first draft of this text, entitled 'autotheater', was written in February 1960, and a second (slightly revised) version was published in *Zero* 3 (1961) and reprinted in Spoerri 2001, 61–62. A Swedish translation of the first draft was published in the catalogue to the exhibition *Rörelse i konsten* (Moderna Museet, Stockholm, 1961), the Stockholm version of *Bewogen Beweging*; see cat. Stockholm 1961, 10.
- 27 Spoerri 2001, 61.
- 28 In the first draft of the text, Spoerri suggested a cooperation with the artists Tinguely and, eventually, Jesús Rafael Soto.
- 29 Cat. Stockholm 1961, 10.
- 30 This exhibition later travelled to the Moderna Museet in Stockholm under the title *Rörelse i konsten* and to the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art in Humlebæk.
- 31 The letter with this proposal from Spoerri to Sandberg, dated 8 June 1960, is in the digital archives of the Stedelijk Museum library in Amsterdam, folder 3982. Spoerri and Sandberg had earlier spoken about an exhibition of movement in art in Zurich, where Sandberg invited Spoerri to send him a proposal. See Spoerri 2001, 90.
- 32 Moreover, in the first place, Spoerri wanted to install a house of mirrors within the context of *Dylaby*; a room with mirrors like one he had described in his earlier texts. See the letter from Spoerri to Sandberg, dated 12 June 1962, in the digital archives of the Stedelijk Museum library in Amsterdam, folder 4160. The house of mirrors was, in the end, never realised.
- 33 Sandberg once drew a connection between *Dylaby* and Kurt Schwitters's *Merzbau*, a large-scale three-dimensional architectural sculpture that the German artist initially created in his house in Hannover. This structure has been described as an environmental sculpture in its purest form that 'engulfed the spectator within a cavernous maze of smooth, cubed forms that varied extensively in shape, size, and proportion'. See Leeuw Marcar 2004, 259, and the introduction by J. Coplans and W. Hopps in Trauman Steinitz 1968, xx.
- 34 See also Anonymous 1960; Anonymous 1963; Arian 1996; cat. The Hague 1974, 60.
- 35 See also Theodoropoulou 2016, 82–85; O'Rourke 2013, 104–105.
- 36 See, for the use of the words 'didactic labyrinth' in connection to the work of GRAV, O'Rourke 2013, 107.
- 37 An English translation of this tract can be found on the website of Julio Le Parc, <http://www.julioleparc.org/phone/mystifications2.html>. See also Hohlfeldt 2013.
- 38 See Jaskolski 1994.
- 39 See also O'Rourke 2013, 112–113, and Sellers & Moss 2016.
- 40 Cat. Amsterdam 1962, n.p.
- 41 Anonymous 1962a.
- 42 Dezeuze 2010, 3–4.
- 43 *Ibid.*, 3.
- 44 Lygia Clark, 'Letter to Guy Brett', 10 November 1968, quoted by G. Brett, 'Lygia Clark. Six cells', in: G. Brett *et al.*, *Lygia Clark*, Barcelona 1997, 23, cited in Dezeuze 2010, 1.
- 45 See a photograph of this installation in Stockholm in cat. Wolfsburg etc. 2000, 27: 'I samarbete med denna tecknarmaskin av Jean Tinguely, Meta-Matic nr 8, kan Ni framställa ett originaltyvkort'.
- 46 For a photograph of this flyer for the exhibition *Les Méta-matics de Tinguely. Les sculptures qui peignent* in the Iris Clert Gallery in Paris in 1959, see Hultén 1972, 91.
- 47 Sometimes the terms 'instructional art' or 'instruction-based art' are used with reference to artworks that consist of instructions given by the artist. See, for example, *do it*, a travelling exhibition conceived and curated by Hans Ulrich Obrist, <http://curatorsintnl.org/special-projects/do-it>.
- 48 See, e.g., Dezeuze 2010; Kwon 2010; Bishop 2012; Huybrechts 2013.
- 49 Dezeuze 2010, 9.
- 50 *Ibid.*, 9–12.
- 51 See, in particular, Eco 1989, 1–23.
- 52 *Ibid.*, 4.
- 53 Tinguely's name is mentioned in Eco 1989, 261–262n4.
- 54 Eco 1989, 19–20.
- 55 *Ibid.*, 64–65.
- 56 See, in particular, *Ibid.*, 1, 19–20, 35, 60, 64–65, 93–99.
- 57 Kouwenaar 1962: 'Want als men de samenstellers van *Dylaby* al een bedoeling in de schoenen wil schuiven, dan is het

- deze: zijn [sic] zijn vóór alles uit op de deelneming van het publiek aan het proces van het maken, van de creativiteit'. For the English translation, see Altshuler 2013, 35-36.
- 58 Van Straten 1962; Hs. R. 1962.
- 59 Van Straten 1962.
- 60 Kouwenaar 1962.
- 61 Pisa 1962; Hs. R. 1962.
- 62 Frenken 1962.
- 63 See a photograph of this sign in cat. Wolfsburg etc. 2000, 153.
- 64 Spierdijk 1962; Anonymous 1962b; Petersen 1991, 161-162. See also the diary that was kept by Tinguely and Petersen during the installation period in cat. Amsterdam 1962, n.p., and a letter from Petersen to Sandberg, dated 17 September 1962, in the digital archives of the Stedelijk Museum library in Amsterdam, folder 4160. The assemblage is now in the Art Gallery of New South Wales in Sydney.
- 65 See also cat. Wolfsburg etc. 2000, 160; and Petersen 1991, 163-164.
- 66 See also Petersen 1991, 163.
- 67 Pisa 1962; Anonymous 1962b.
- 68 *Ibid.*
- 69 See also the diary that was kept by Tinguely and Petersen during the installation period in cat. Amsterdam 1962, n.p., and the photographs by Ed van der Elsken, which can be viewed digitally in the library of the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam.
- 70 See Pisa 1962, Van Beek 1962, and the photographs by Ed van der Elsken, which can be viewed digitally in the library of the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam.
- 71 Spierdijk 1962.
- 72 A version of the work *Maschinenbild Haus Lange (Do-it-yourself sculpture)* (1960), property of the Daimler Art Sammlung, Stuttgart/Berlin, was part of the exhibition *Jean Tinguely – machinespektakel* (2016-2017) in the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam: 'es bleibt ein original von jean tinguely und doch können sie sich als hersteller mit dem bild identifizieren'.
- 73 Spoerri 2001, 63-64.
- 74 The show ran from 14 till 28 February 1971. The Museum of Modern Art was renamed Modern Art Oxford (MAO) in 2002.
- 75 See the press release for the exhibition: MAO Archive, box 'Oct 1970-Feb 1971', folder 'Popa at Moma'. See also Oakes 1971, and Hutton 1971a.
- 76 See John Dugger in James 2011, 39.
- 77 Brett 1971.
- 78 Hutton 1971b.
- 79 See Anonymous 1971; Brett 1971; and Hutton 1971b.
- 80 Hutton 1971b.
- 81 Brett 1971.
- 82 See John Dugger in James 2011, 39.
- 83 *Ibid.*, 39-40.
- 84 A photograph of this sign is archived at RKD Netherlands Institute for Art History, collectie Haks/Blotkamp, archive nr. NL-HaRKD.0297, box VIII.
- 85 See also, about the labyrinth as a symbol of imprisonment and liberation, Jaskolski 1994, 55-65, 161-176, and O'Rourke 2013, 103-111.
- 86 See also O'Rourke 2013, 103-111; and Popper 1975, 178-203.
- 87 Van Straten 1962.
- 88 Tanis 2012; Mardell *et al.* 2016. The working paper 'Towards a pedagogy of play' was written in 2016 in the context of the *Pedagogy of play* project at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, carried out by Project Zero, a research centre based at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, in collaboration with the International School of Billund in Denmark and the LEGO Foundation.
- 89 Mardell *et al.* 2016, 4.
- 90 The element of play automatically brings with it a certain paradox. On the one hand, it provides room for (among other things) spontaneity, choice making, a feeling of agency and coincidence. On the other hand, however, it is always accompanied by certain rules, constraints and external boundaries. See also Kwastek 2013, 71-88, and Floe 2014.
- 91 See also Darder *et al.* 2003, 1-6; McCulloch & Crook 2008, 143.
- 92 See, in particular, Freire 1972, 57-74.
- 93 *Ibid.*, 67.
- 94 P. Freire & I. Shor, *A pedagogy for liberation. Dialogues on transforming education*, London 1987, 102, cited in Bishop 2012, 266.
- 95 See, e.g., Friedman *et al.* 2002.
- 96 *Ibid.*, 104.
- 97 See also Bishop 2012, 243.
- 98 Beuys made his famous statement in an interview with Willoughby Sharp; Sharp 1969, 44.
- 99 Beuys & Schwarze 1972. See also the documentary *documenta 5 1972* by Jef Cornelis (1972) in the media collection of the documenta archiv Kassel (ref. no. 30003185).
- 100 The educational (or pedagogical) turn is a tendency in artistic and curatorial practices in which educational and pedagogical forms, structures, methods, programmes, etc., are incorporated in artworks, exhibitions and projects. For instance, models of education, such as lectures, seminars, libraries, reading rooms, schools, etc., are used as method, medium and/or form within artistic or curatorial projects. The rise of this tendency is often situated in the 1990s, although antecedents of the educational turn can be found in the 1960s and 1970s. There has been increased debate about this implementation of pedagogy and education into artistic and curatorial practice since the early 2000s. It was also then that this particular tendency was identified as a 'turn'. On the educational (or pedagogical) turn in particular, see Podesva 2007; Rogoff 2008; O'Neill & Wilson 2010; Allen 2011; and Birchall 2017.
- 101 Frenken 1962.
- 102 Kouwenaar 1962. For the English translation, see Altshuler 2013, 35-36.

Bibliography

Allen 2011

F. Allen (ed.), *Education. Documents of contemporary art*, London 2011.

Altshuler 2013

B. Altshuler, *Biennials and beyond. Exhibitions that made art history. 1962-2002*, London 2013.

Cat. Amsterdam 1962

Cat. Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, *Dylaby. Dynamisch labyrinth. Robert*

Rauschenberg, Martial Raysse, Niki de Saint Phalle, Daniel Spoerri, Jean Tinguely, Per Olof Ultvedt, Amsterdam 1962.

Cat. Amsterdam etc. 2016

Cat. Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, Düsseldorf, Museum Kunstepalast, *Tinguely. Meta-matic* (M. Schavemaker *et al.*, eds.), Cologne 2016.

Anonymous 1960

Anonymous, 'Die Welt als Labyrinth', *Internationale Situationniste* (1960), no. 4, 5-7. Transl. as 'The world as labyrinth', in: Altshuler 2013, 34-35.

Anonymous 1962a

Anonymous, 'Schieten op verpakjes op duistere expositie. 'Dynamisch Labyrint' in Amsterdams Stedelijk geopend', *Het Parool*, 31 August 1962.

Anonymous 1962b

Anonymous, 'Kunstenmakers lopen met platvoeten door de kunst. Lachen in het donker. Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam tijdelijk kermis', *Maas- en Roerbode*, 20 September 1962.

Anonymous 1963

Anonymous, 'L'avant-garde de la présence', *Internationale Situationniste* (1963), no. 8, 20-21. Transl. as 'Editorial notes. The avant-garde of presence', in: T. McDonough (ed.), *Guy Debord and the Situationist International. Texts and documents*, Cambridge, MA & London 2002, 137-151.

Anonymous 1971

Anonymous, 'Visitors wreck modern art show', *Birmingham Post*, 15 February 1971.

Arian 1996

M. Arian, 'Constant in opstand', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 17 January 1996.

Bätzner 2007

N. Bätzner, 'Die Dynamik des Labyrinthischen', in: H.R. Brittnacher & R.P. Janz, *Labyrinth und Spiel. Umdeutungen eines Mythos*, Göttingen 2007, 113-126.

Van Beek 1962

M. van Beek, 'Dynamisch labyrint. Spookhol in het Stedelijk Museum. Het fatalisme van deze tijd', *De Tijd-Maasbode*, 15 September 1962.

Beuys & Schwarze 1972

J. Beuys & D. Schwarze, 'Report on a day's proceedings at the Bureau for Direct Democracy', 1972, in: C. Bishop (ed.), *Participation. Documents of contemporary art*, London & Cambridge, MA 2006, 120-124.

Birchall 2017

M. Birchall, 'Situating participatory art between process and practice', *ARKEN Bulletin* (2017), no. 7, http://www.arken.dk/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/situating-participatory-art-between...-by-michael-birchall_bulletin-2017.pdf.

Bishop 2012

C. Bishop, *Artificial hells. Participatory art and the politics of spectatorship*, London & New York 2012.

Brett 1971

G. Brett, 'Just a few hours of participation', *The Times*, 16 February 1971.

Darder et al. 2003

A. Darder, M. Baltodano & R.D. Torres (eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader*, New York & London 2003.

Dezeuze 2010

A. Dezeuze, 'An introduction to the "do-it-yourself" artwork', in: A. Dezeuze (ed.), *The 'do-it-yourself' artwork. Participation from Fluxus to new media*, Manchester & New York 2010, 1-21.

Eco 1989

U. Eco, *The open work*, Cambridge, MA 1989.

Floe 2014

H. Floe, "Everything was getting smashed". Three case studies of play and participation, 1965-71', *Tate Papers* (2014), no. 22, <http://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/22/everything-was-getting-smashed-three-case-studies-of-play-and-participation-1965-71>.

Freire 1972

P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, New York 1972.

Frenken 1962

T. Frenken, 'Het einde van het DYNAMISCH LABYRINT. Wordt de kloof gedicht tussen kunstenaar en het publiek?', *De Sirene*, Oss, 29 September 1962.

Friedman et al. 2002

K. Friedman, O. Smith & L. Sawchyn, *The Fluxus performance workbook*, a Performance Research e-publication, 2002, <http://www.deluxxe.com/beat/fluxusworkbook.pdf>.

Cat. The Hague 1974

Cat. The Hague, Haags Gemeentemuseum, *New Babylon* (J.L. Locher & C. Nieuwenhuys), The Hague 1974.

Hohlfeldt 2013

M. Hohlfeldt, 'The collective oeuvre of the GRAV. The labyrinth and audience participation', *Critique d'art* (2013), no. 41, <http://critiquedart.revues.org/8335>.

Hultén 1972

K.G.P. Hultén, *Jean Tinguely. 'Méta'*, Berlin 1972.

Hutton 1971a

A. Hutton, 'Things to wear, jump on, touch and explore', *Oxford Mail*, 13 February 1971.

Hutton 1971b

A. Hutton, 'Artists call spectators philistines – and quit', *Oxford Mail*, 15 February 1971.

Huybrechts 2013

L. Huybrechts (ed.), *Participation is risky. Approaches to joint creative processes*, Amsterdam 2013.

James 2011

N.P. James, *John Dugger. Ergonic sculpture & other ventures*, London 2011.

Jaskolski 1994

H. Jaskolski, *Das Labyrinth. Symbol für Angst, Wiedergeburt und Befreiung*, Stuttgart 1994.

Kouwenaar 1962

G. Kouwenaar, 'Publiek is meemaker aan Dylaby in het Stedelijk Museum', *Het Vrije Volk*, Amsterdam, 8 September 1962.

Kwastek 2013

K. Kwastek, *Aesthetics of interaction in digital art*, Cambridge, MA & London 2013.

Kwon 2010

M. Kwon, 'Exchange rate. On obligation and reciprocity in some art of the 1960s and after', in: A. Dezeuze (ed.), *The 'do-it-yourself' artwork*.

Participation from Fluxus to new media, Manchester & New York 2010, 229-239.

Leeuw Marcar 2004

A. Leeuw Marcar, *Willem Sandberg. Portret van een kunstenaar*, Amsterdam 2004.

Mardell et al. 2016

B. Mardell et al., 'Towards a pedagogy of play', a Project Zero working paper, 2016, <http://pz.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/Towards%20a%20Pedagogy%20of%20Play.pdf>.

McCulloch & Crook 2008

G. McCulloch & D. Crook (eds.), *The Routledge international encyclopedia of education*, London & New York 2008.

Oakes 1971

P. Oakes, 'Listen to the radar tree', *Sunday Times*, 14 February 1971.

Obrist 1996

H.U. Obrist, 'Mind over matter. Hans-Ulrich Obrist talks with Harald Szeemann', *Artforum* 35 (1996), no. 3, 74-79, 111-112, 119, 125.

O'Neill & Wilson 2010

P. O'Neill & M. Wilson (eds.), *Curating and the educational turn*, London & Amsterdam 2010.

O'Rourke 2013

K. O'Rourke, *Waking and mapping. Artists as cartographers*, Cambridge, MA & London 2013.

Petersen 1991

A. Petersen, 'Dylaby, ein dynamisches Labyrinth im Stedelijk Museum 1962', in: B. Klüser & K. Hegewisch (eds.), *Die Kunst der Ausstellung. Eine Dokumentation dreißig exemplarischer Kunstausstellungen dieses Jahrhunderts*, Frankfurt am Main & Leipzig 1991, 156-165.

Petersen 2000

A. Petersen, 'Dylaby im Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. September 1962', in: cat. Wolfsburg etc. 2000, 151-209.

Pisa 1962

W. Pisa, 'Dylaby. Woede en vreugde om een getimmerte. Dynamisch labyrint in het Stedelijk Museum te Amsterdam', *De Linie*, Amsterdam, 8 September 1962.

Podesva 2007

K.L. Podesva, 'A pedagogical turn. Brief notes on education as art', *Fillip* (2007), no. 6, <https://fillip.ca/content/a-pedagogical-turn>.

Popper 1975

F. Popper, *Art. Action and participation*, London 1975.

Hs. R. 1962

Hs. R., 'Dylaby. Een revolutie op kermisgebied. Surrealistisch doolhof in Sandbergs Stedelijk', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1 September 1962.

Rogoff 2008

I. Rogoff, 'Turning', *e-flux* (2008), no. 00, <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/00/68470/turning/>.

Sandberg 1963

W. Sandberg, 'Bewogen beweging + dylaby', *Museumjournaal* 8 (1963), nos. 8-9, 59.

Schavemaker 2016

M. Schavemaker, 'Verlangen naar verloren labyrinten', in: cat. Amsterdam etc. 2016, 155-160.

Schoenberger 2017

J.T. Schoenberger, *Ludic conceptualism. Art and play in the Netherlands, 1959 to 1975*, New York 2017 (unpub. diss. New York).

Sellers & Moss 2016

J. Sellers & B. Moss (eds.), *Learning with the labyrinth. Creating reflective space in higher education*, Basingstoke 2016.

Sharp 1969

W. Sharp, 'An interview with Joseph Beuys', *Artforum* 8 (1969), no. 4, 40-47.

Spierdijk 1962

J. Spierdijk, 'Het "Stedelijk" als wondertent. Dylaby de uitsmijter van jhr. W. Sandberg. "Gaaf dat zien, gaaf dat zien" zij ons devies', *De Telegraaf*, 4 September 1962.

Spoerri 2001

D. Spoerri, *Anekdotomania. Daniel Spoerri über Daniel Spoerri*, Ostfildern-Ruit 2001.

Cat. Stockholm 1961

Cat. Stockholm 1961, Moderna Museet, *Rörelse i konsten* (P. Hultén et al.), Stockholm 1961.

Van Straten 1962

H. van Straten, 'Doolhof vol Dada in het Stedelijk Museum. "Bewogen Beweging" met stukken geslagen', *Het Vrije Volk*, 29 August 1962.

Tanis 2012

D.J. Tanis, *Exploring play/playfulness and learning in the adult and higher education classroom*, State College, PA 2012 (diss. State College).

Theodoropoulou 2016

V. Theodoropoulou, 'Against the spectacle. The construction of situations', in: S. Bianchini & E. Verhagen (eds.), *Practicable. From participation to interaction in contemporary art*, Cambridge, MA & London 2016, 77-90.

Trauman Steinitz 1968

K. Trauman Steinitz, *Kurt Schwitters. A portrait from life*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1968.

Verheul 2005

T. Verheul, *Dylaby. Een dynamisch labyrint in het Stedelijk Museum*, Amsterdam 2005 (unpub. BA thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam).

Cat. Wolfsburg etc. 2000

Cat. Wolfsburg, Kunstmuseum, Basel, Museum Jean Tinguely, *L'esprit de Tinguely* (H. Broeker & J. Horstmann, eds.), Ostfildern-Ruit 2000.